

ACTA
ACADEMIAE
ARTIUM
VILNENSIS



VILNIAUS
DAILĖS
AKADEMIJOS
DARBAI

14

DAILĖ

Istorija ir
elitinės
kultūros
teigtys



Istorija ir
elitinės
kultūros
teigtys



VILNIUS
1998

FEATURES OF ROYALTY IN THE COURT OF MINDAUGAS AND HIS SUCCESSORS¹

Giedrė Mickūnaitė

CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY, BUDAPEST

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to present the cultural context of a ruler's court as revealed through incomplete and fragmentary sources but based on extensive scholarship on royal culture in general. It focuses on the mid-thirteenth century Lithuania, which emerged as a state at that time. Specifically, the inquiry concentrates on the issues of coronation and kingship. The principal questions are: (1) what did it mean to be crowned a king in Lithuania? and (2) did such crown-reception and, consequently, crown-possession imply royalty? Unfortunately, there is not enough source material to investigate the immediate surrounding of the king; thus, the article addresses statehood, considering it as the most profound reflection of royalty in the Lithuanian context.

In the sense of statehood, mid-thirteenth-century Lithuania emerges as an exceptional formation. The Kingdom of Lithuania, as actualised on the "national" level,

became an "internationally"² recognised political and economic formation and, although later periods of fragmentation can be observed, remained a *de facto* concept in European political consciousness. Therefore the personality of the first consolidator of the Lithuanian lands, King Mindaugas (ca. 1200 - 1263),³ attracts scholarly interest. During his rule for the first time Lithuania formally started developing according to the patterns of Western European government, albeit in primitive forms.

² Terms "national" and "international" do not imply the contemporary meaning on the 13th-century events and are used to denote and to distinguish between politics inside and outside Lithuania.

Henceforth, the words initially introduced with quotation marks as well as the derivatives of these words, function as "working terms" denoting the context in which Lithuanian royalty was expressed and do not necessarily mean those cultural characteristics as commonly understood in medieval scholarship.

³ Mindaugas is the Lithuanian name commonly used in Lithuanian scholarship and in modern English language publications, e.g., studies published by the Lithuanian Research and Studies Center, Chicago, IL. *Midog* as he was first mentioned in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, "Galitsko-Volynskaja letopis" (The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle), ed. O. P. Likhacheva, in *Pamiatniki literaturny drevnej Rusi, XIII vek* (Selected literature of ancient Rus': the thirteenth century), ed. L. A. Dmitrijev and D. S. Likhachev (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaja literatura, 1981), 252-3, henceforth *PLDR*; *Mindowe*, *Mindot* in Latin and German (in the latter, also *Mindowgs*); *Mendog* in Polish. On a lead seal attributed to him the name in Cyrillic is spelled as *Мѣндодовъ* [*Mengdov*], see V. Pašuta [V. T. Pashuto], *Lietuvos valstybės susidarymas* (The formation of the Lithuanian state) (Vilnius: Mintis, 1971), 224.

Henceforth the names of persons of Lithuanian origin are given in their Lithuanian, albeit imaginary, version and other versions are indicated in a footnote.

¹ The present article is based on my M.A. thesis completed under the supervision of Professor János M. Bak and Ralph Cleminson and defended at the Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, Budapest in June 1997. My thanks go to my supervisors as well as to the external readers of this thesis, Dr. Stephen C. Rowell and Dr. Rasa Mažeika. Their help and remarks helped to make this work more thorough. Last but not the least I would like to thank Rūta Vitkauskienė, who encouraged me to publish this article and informed about the most recent scholarship on the issues discussed here.

The article omits several parts of the thesis and condenses the information that cannot be directly related to the main inquiry. However, it includes a subchapter on the seal of King Mindaugas, which originally was not in the thesis.

Of the different characteristics that may reflect statehood, this study concentrates on the authority of a ruler. Since the Lithuanian state was established as a kingdom with a king as the highest authority the term "features of royalty," encompassing the principal manifestations of state government is used. Henceforth, features of royalty are defined as those elements of authority, which have been most frequently manifested in traditional medieval kingship. Among others, the following features are considered to be the most characteristic for royalty: the direct dynastic inheritance of the throne through the paternal line, the reception of the power through coronation, the establishment of a court, and a consistent pattern of political action by the dynastic successors. In addition, these features are considered narrowly, not implying any wider cultural context.

Unfortunately, the fragmentary sources that survive from the period do not provide enough information for a probable construction of the issues under inquiry; therefore, comparative material will be introduced to present complementary evidence in order to illustrate more vividly the functioning of the early Lithuanian state. Based on primary sources and commonly accepted scholarship, the parallels for comparison are selected according to the following criteria: the time period, thirteenth century (though not consistently used because certain social and political processes that occurred in Lithuania were not contemporaneous with the parallel events in other countries); the political context, an insecure kingdom on a Latin European frontier; the agent, a strong papacy; and the means, crusade. Concerning the comparative approach, the following reservations should be noted: Lithuania, in contrast to the other states, had no earlier expression of statehood and was not a Christian country.

Because of the source-limitations there is no possibility to derive completely valid suppositions about the functioning of the Lithuanian Kingdom; nonetheless, it is possible to apply an inverse method: defining firstly the most general characteristics and then extracting the corresponding source evidence. Despite the obvious "constructedness" of such an approach, it can be justified in the case of the present inquiry, considering that its goal is not to create a panorama of Mindaugas' reign but is limited to indicating those aspects which reveal or bear an allusion to medieval kingship.

MINDAUGAS: ESTABLISHING MONARCHIC RULE

THE RISE OF MINDAUGAS

The establishment of the Lithuanian Kingdom was preceded by the consolidation of the lands. However, as the

leadership over the lands was not yet dynastically inherited and the pattern of the succession seems not to be settled; therefore, Mindaugas' way to the position of the sole ruler is decisive. Further, the chronologically arranged extracts from the primary sources bearing evidence about Mindaugas are presented in order to illustrate his path to the throne.

First time Mindaugas was mentioned in the *Galician Volhynian Chronicle* in 1219,⁴ together with other dukes, representatives of Lithuanian lands, participants of the peace treaty with the Duchy of Galicia and Volhynia. Five of the dukes, and Mindaugas among them, were introduced as senior.⁵ The way Mindaugas is presented in the treaty can be considered as reflecting his position among the other representatives of the Lithuanian lands: he appears the fourth in the list of the senior dukes and is introduced as the brother of Dausprungas.⁶ This second place of Mindaugas, suggests that Dausprungas was more important and probably older, meaning an actual or potential heir of the patrimony, if the general pattern of heredity rights is assumed to be valid in Lithuanian society of the period. On the other hand, there is no contemporary evidence about the father of Mindaugas,⁷ except the note in the speech of the Samogitian envoys at the court of Mindaugas: "Your father was a great king, and / during his lifetime he had no equal."⁸

The next record dated to 1235 in the sources referring to Mindaugas is also from the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*.⁹ Although episodic, this information received a lot of scholarly attention: in the description of the alliance between Duke of Galicia Danylo Romanovych and Mindaugas against Konrad of Mazovia, there is a phrase "Lithuania of Mindaugas."¹⁰ This phrase, in contrast to earlier scholarship,¹¹ cannot be interpreted as signifying the state under the rule of Mindaugas.¹² Nevertheless, it

⁴ PLDR, 252-3.

⁵ Actually it is not absolutely clear from the text whether the word literary translated as senior (*starejshej* in Old Slavonic), meaning "of higher status," is in plural or in singular. In the latter case this word does not apply to Mindaugas, see *Lietuvos TSR istorijos šaltiniai* (The sources of the history of Lithuanian SSR), ed. K. Jablonskis, et al., vol. 1, *Feodalinis laikotarpis* (The feudal period) (Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1955), 34, henceforth *LIŠ*. However, it is commonly accepted in the scholarship that the term applies to all of the five dukes.

⁶ *Dovsprunk, brat ego Midog*, PLDR, 252.

⁷ The note about Ringaudas in the *Bykhovec Chronicle* is not under consideration here.

⁸ *Livländische Reimchronik*, hereafter the chronicle is referred according to the English translation: *The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle*, translated by Jerry C. Smith and William Urban [henceforth *LRCh*] (Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1977), 79.

⁹ PLDR, 288-9.

is worth attention as demonstrating Mindaugas' "steps" towards the power: as it was discussed in connection with the 1219 Treaty, Mindaugas appears in the political scene as a brother of Dausprungas, consequently, it could be assumed that Dausprungas was to inherit the principal part of the patrimony. However, the phrase "Lithuania of Mindaugas" and disappearance of Dausprungas from the sources suggest that around 1235 Mindaugas became a sovereign over his father's lands, the minor duchy of Lithuania,¹³ and had military units under his control.

In the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* Mindaugas, introduced as the king of Lithuania, appears for the first time in the description of the siege of Embute at the end of 1244,¹⁴ which he had lost, paying "a heavy price in friends / and relatives."¹⁵ Soon after this passage, probably in the mid-1245, there is a story of Lengvenis¹⁶ told in great detail. Lengvenis was one of the minor dukes, a son of Mindaugas' sister.¹⁷ He was at war with the neighbouring Lithuanian lands which belonged to the brothers Tučius, Milgrynas, and Gineika,¹⁸ and "he was held in great honour by . . . King Mindaugas" and "eventually Lengewin won . . . his / support."¹⁹ Aware that Mindaugas plans an attack, the brothers fled to the Livonian master, were baptised and joint the service of the Livonian Order. The story told to

the master is worth attention: the brothers said that "a king seeks with all his might to drive us from our land" and the author mentions that "they had broken / honourably with their king, and he was furious. They were / determined to drive out Mindaugas and Lengewin, and so, there being no other way to save themselves, they turned to the Christians."²⁰ This episode, can be interpreted as the first written evidence on Mindaugas' attempts to subordinate Lithuanian lands under his rule. Already having power over the minor Lithuanian duchy in 1235, Mindaugas started occupying and subjecting the neighbouring territories. The story, told in the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle*, indicates that the subjecting in this case was carried out with the help of Lengvenis, to whom Mindaugas was a maternal uncle. Moreover, as an ally of Mindaugas, Lengvenis became an important person as it is seen from the description of his imprisonment in Riga²¹: he was considered one of the "best men of the heathen,"²² "The Master accepted the prisoner Lengewin, as was proper,"²³ and he was not kept in prison, as he "sat at the table eating with the Brothers."²⁴ Lengvenis is also highly valued by his friends (Mindaugas ?) who had ransomed him by "paying five hundred coins."²⁵ Ransomed Lengvenis is again an ally of Mindaugas: he renews wars against the order and avenges his brother's murder,²⁶ later he is mentioned at war in the Black Ruthenia,²⁷ and is included in the list of witnesses of a document issued in the name of Mindaugas.²⁸

However, several years later, Mindaugas rule over the Lithuanian duchy was endangered by the claims of his nephews, Tautvila and Eidivydas.²⁹ According to the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, Mindaugas expelled Tautvila and

¹³ *Po tom zhe lete Danil zhe vozvede na Kondrata litvu Mindoga*, *ibid.*, 288. The parallel Russian translation reads "Mindaugas' lithuanians," *ibid.*, 289. And this interpretation is very probable; however, it also indicates Mindaugas' authority over some part of Lithuanians.

¹⁴ Zenonas Ivinskis, *Lietuvos istorija. Iki Vytauto Didžiojo mirties* (The history of Lithuania: until the death of Vytautas the Great) (Rome: Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademija, 1978; reprint commented by Edvardas Gudavičius, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1991), 155.

¹⁵ Gudavičius had pointed that if there was a need to note the Lithuania of Mindaugas, there must have existed the non-Mindaugas' Lithuania, *id.*, "1219 metų sutarties dalyviai ir jų vaidmuo suvienijant Lietuvą" (The participants of the 1219 Treaty and their role in the consolidation of Lithuania), *Lietuvos TSR Aukštųjų mokyklų mokslo darbai: Istorija* [henceforth *Istorija*] 22 (1982): 35-6.

¹⁶ There could be a confusion about the term "Lithuania," because being a general name for both principal parts of the country, Aukštaitija (Upland) and Žemaitija/Samogitia (Lowland), it also refers to the Lithuanian minor duchy, or Lithuania in the strict sense, Mindaugas' patrimony. However, used in a sense of the state, it also refers to the Black Ruthenia, under Mindaugas rule. The term Grand Duchy of Lithuania is used to denote the state after Mindaugas' death in 1263.

¹⁷ *Amboten* in German. Hereafter, the dating of battles and other military events is based on "Chronologinė lentelė" (The chronological table), appended to Edvardas Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai Pabaltijyje ir Lietuva XIII amžiuje* (The Baltic Crusade and Lithuania in the thirteenth century) (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989), 177-82, 179. The palcenames having no commonly accepted English version, henceforth are used in the Lithuanian transcription, indicating the other versions in a footnote.

¹⁸ *LRCh*, 36.

¹⁹ *Lengewin* in German; *Languinus* in Latin; *Lonkogveni* in Old Slavonic.

¹⁷ *Languinus sororius noster*, *Preussisches Urkundenbuch. Politische Abtheilung*. Vol. 1, *Die Bildung des Ordenstaats*, ed. Philippi (Königsberg, 1882) [henceforth *PUB*], 1.2: no. 106, 93.

¹⁸ *Tusche, Milgerin, Gineike* in German.

¹⁹ *LRCh*, 38.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 39.

²¹ For the full story about the war against Lengvenis and his capture, see *LRCh*, 40.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, 41.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 42. The record of scapulimancy is scrutinised in William Sayers, "Scapulimancy in the Medieval Baltic," *Journal of Baltic Studies* 23.1 (1992): 57-62.

²⁵ *LRCh*, 43.

²⁶ On the murdered brother, see *ibid.*, 42. Lengvenis avenged his brother by sacrifice of a captive Livonian Brother, *ibid.*, 43.

²⁷ *PLDR*, 306-7.

²⁸ *PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 93. According to Karol Maleczyński's this charter is a forgery, *id.*, "W sprawie autentyczności dokumentów Mendoga z lat 1253-1261" (About the issue of the authenticity of Mindaugas' documents from the years 1253-1261), *Ateneum Wileńskie* 11 (1936): 33. As his article on Mindaugas' documents is the most thorough and best argued investigation on the issue, hereafter it is considered reliable.

²⁹ *Tevtvil* (also *Tautvilas* in Lithuanian) and *Edivid* in Old Slavonic.

Eidivydas sending them together with their uncle Vykintas³⁰ to war in the area of Smolensk and ordering to possess those lands that they were to conquer. Moreover, Mindaugas sent his warriors after the nephews, aiming to kill them. As the latter realised this manoeuvre, they ran to the Romanovych Dukes of Galicia-Volhynia, Danylo and Vasyl'ko. Mindaugas also sent his envoys to Danylo asking not to show mercy towards them, however, due to the fact that the sister of Tautvila and Eidivydas was married to Danylo, the Galician-Volhynian dukes rejected Mindaugas' request.³¹ This extremely important story provides a possible explanation to the earlier notion of "Lithuania of Mindaugas." There is no evidence to prove that Tautvila and Eidivydas were the sons of Dausprungas, however, it is a scholarly accepted guess³²: Dausprungas disappeared from the sources after the 1219 Treaty; if this disappearance is equated with death, probably Mindaugas started ruling also over his brother's lands, thus, became the ruler of the whole Lithuanian duchy; the conflicts between Tautvila, Eidivydas and Mindaugas suggest that they were no longer minors, therefore claimed their father's lands. Their sister's marriage with Danylo Romanovych, indicates the high status of the nephews and Mindaugas' brother. Besides that, one more detail from the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* requires attention: it is said that after the expulsion of the nephews Mindaugas seized the whole Lithuanian land, his nephews' estates and their wealth.³³ This passage demonstrates that the ruler of Lithuania of 1235, actually, did not possess the wealth and estates of the whole Lithuania. As for the other person, uncle Vykintas, mentioned in the context of the expulsion, he most probably is the brother of Tautvila's and Eidivydas' mother, meaning their maternal uncle and an ally.³⁴

Concluding the argument, it can be stated that the aforescribed events show that Mindaugas was only a temporary "ruler of Lithuania" in 1235 and was urged to pass the lands to his nephews as they became adults. Only then did Mindaugas become a possessor of the Lithuanian duchy when the nephews were physically expelled from their lands.

³⁰ *Vykint* in Old Slavonic, first appeared in the list of the Samogitian dukes in 1219 Treaty.

³¹ *PLDR*, 320-1.

³² Ivinskis was the first to interpret thus, Gudavičius, "1219 metų," 37.

³³ *Vražboju bo za vorozh'stvo s nimi litvu zaja, pojmana bie vsia zemlia Litovskaja i beshchislenoje imenije ikh pritrano bogatstvo ikh*, *PLDR*, 320.

³⁴ Assuming that Tautvila and Eidivydas most probably were Dausprungas' sons, the facts that Dausprungas married sister of one of the most powerful Samogitian Dukes Vykintas, and that his daughter was married to Danylo of Galicia, once more demonstrate Dausprungas' superior position in comparison to that of Mindaugas, Gudavičius, "1219 metų," 35.

The conflict between Mindaugas and Tautvila, Eidivydas, Vykintas, with the support of the Galician-Volhynian Dukes Danylo and Vasyl'ko, developed into an internal war of 1248-1252.³⁵ Vykintas became an envoy of the anti-Mindaugas alliance, he bribed the Yatvigiens³⁶ and half of Samogitia and made the agreement on Danylo's behalf with the German Knights of Riga to support Tautvila.³⁷ The alliance with the help of the Germans started long wars against Mindaugas.³⁸ Finally, Tautvila arrived to Riga with Danylo's captives, was received there with great honour and baptised.³⁹ When Mindaugas realised that the bishop and the Lord's Knights⁴⁰ and all warriors of Riga, were on the side of Tautvila, he sent costly presents to Master Andreas,⁴¹ asking him either to kill or to expel Tautvila. The master suggested that the only way to defeat the enemy is to send envoys to the pope and to be baptised, adding that he is friendly to Mindaugas.⁴² Mindaugas acted according to the master's advice and was baptised.⁴³

Tautvila was supported by the Bishop of Riga, Albert Suerbeer.⁴⁴ Later he fled to Samogitia to his uncle Vykintas and together with Yatvigiens, Samogitians and Danylo's help raided against Mindaugas.⁴⁵ They besieged Mindaugas' castle of Voruta, Mindaugas with the help of his unidentified brother in law attempted to ruin their plans, but failed; there was an open-field battle during which Mindaugas was supported by the Germans, obviously the Livonian Knights. After this battle Tautvila returned to Samogitia to Vykintas' castle in Tverai⁴⁶ and there was another open-field battle in which Mindaugas was wounded and had to leave for his own land.⁴⁷

³⁵ For a map of the both sides and principle military activities, see map "Lietuva per 1248-1252 m. vidaus karą" (Lithuania during the inner war of 1242-1252), in Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 98-9.

³⁶ Yatvigiens, sometimes Jatvigiens or Yatvygiens in English, *Jotvingiai* in Lithuanian, *Jaćwięgi* in Polish, *Jatviaz'* in Old Slavonic. The extinct south-eastern Baltic tribe.

³⁷ *PLDR*, 320.

³⁸ ... *i mnogoe voevanie byst' mezhi imi*, *PLDR*, 322.

³⁹ *Ibid*.

⁴⁰ *Bozhii dvorianie*, *ibid*.

⁴¹ Andreas von Stierland is sometimes also referred as von Felben.

⁴² *Nie mozheshi izbavlen byti ashche ne posleshi k papie priimeshi kreshchenija, ne odoleshi vragu. Druzhu imju k tebe*, *PLDR*, 322.

⁴³ *Ibid*.

⁴⁴ Albert Suerbeer (end of 12th c., Cologne - November, 1272 / March 1273, Riga). According to the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, the bishop supported Tautvila because he knew that if Tautvila had not been expelled the Lithuanian land would have been theirs and would have been forced to accept Christianity, *PLDR*, 322.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*.

⁴⁶ *Tvirement* in Old Slavonic.

⁴⁷ ... *zastrieli koch polovchin Mindogova v stegno* (*PLDR*, 322) in the parallel Russian translation: *polovchin popal streloj v bedro Mindogova konia* (*ibid.*, 323), although it is hard to believe that because of a wounded horse Mindaugas left the battle.

The records about Lengvenis in the *Rhymed Chronicle* and those about internal wars in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, are the only facts corresponding to Mindaugas' obituary presented in the latter chronicle. According to the Galician chronicler/s, Mindaugas started killing and expelling his brothers and their sons in order to rule alone.⁴⁸ Though, it remains unclear who exactly were these "brothers and their sons,"⁴⁹ both examples and the description of Mindaugas' way towards the power, indicating its technical means, expulsion and assassination, does not refer to a hereditary right of such a rule, moreover these means demonstrate the shortcoming of this right.⁵⁰

The way Mindaugas comes into the power could prove that he reaches the state of a sovereign from the position of a powerful outsider among those to rule. However, relying on his kinsmen, the closest known of whom is his sister's son, Lengvenis, and probably other further relatives as well as on Livonian military resources he establishes a sovereign rule over Lithuania.

THE BAPTISM

Most probably at the beginning of the year 1251 Mindaugas was baptised a Catholic.⁵¹ As already mentioned, the main stimulus for this was his rivalry with Tautvila, and the fact that the latter was supported by the Archbishop of Riga Albert Suerbeer. Both chronicles suggest that initiator of this baptism was Master Andreas of Stierland.⁵² As it appears from the subsequent events, the baptism was the precondition of the negotiations between Mindaugas and the Livonian Order. Interpreting the records of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*,⁵³ Gudavičius argued that Mindaugas

was baptised in order to be recognised as the ruler of Lithuania and thus, officially start negotiations.⁵⁴

Mindaugas' step was successful: he received Livonian military help in the battle of Voruta; his embassy,⁵⁵ under the leadership of Parbus⁵⁶ was received by Pope Innocent IV. The papal letter issued on 17 July 1251 reads that Mindaugas was baptised *cum numerosa multitudine paganorum* and through *speciales nuncios* was asking to be admitted *in filium specialem sancte Romane ecclesie*.⁵⁷ The pope satisfied the request and subordinated Lithuania together with all the lands Mindaugas was to acquire in the future *in ius et proprietatem beati Petri*,⁵⁸ meaning that the country became a juridically recognised state with a Christian ruler.

Although papal documents refer to a high number of heathens who received baptism together with Mindaugas,⁵⁹ the protections of the papacy concerned only Mindaugas and his family.⁶⁰ Thus, in contrast to early medieval practice when a baptism of a ruler meant Christianisation of the country, the baptism of Mindaugas meant an interna-

⁴⁸ *Byst' kniazishchy emu v zemli Litovskoj, u nacha izbivati brat'ju i synovsje svoi, a drugija vygna i zemlie, i nacha kniazhti odin vo vsej zemlie Litov'skoj*, PLDR, 356.

⁴⁹ Gudavičius, concluding that Mindaugas did not murder Dausprungas (Gudavičius, "1219 metų," 37), proposed that Mindaugas' characterisation as a fratricide was the result of the the 1290-1293 editing of the *Chronicle*, i.e., inserted by the people who were not the contemporaries of the events of the past and recorded a commonly known characteristic of Mindaugas (ibid., 45); however, it should be noted that the word "brother" can also mean kinsman, id., "Ar Treniota žemaičių kunigaikštis?" (Was Treniota a Samogitian duke?), *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademijos darbai: Serija A* [henceforth *MADA*] 4 (1982): 63.

⁵⁰ Although, the later sources mention his father Ringaudas, despite that the father is not mentioned or referred to in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, Michał Giedroyc tries to prove him to have been a Grand Duke, id., "The Rulers of the Thirteenth-Century Lithuania: a Search for the Origin of Traidenis and his Kin," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 17 (1984): 5-6, the author's argumentation is not convincing exactly because it neglects the way that Mindaugas gained the power.

⁵¹ Ivinskis, *Lietuvos istorija*, 170.

⁵² *LRCh*, 47-8; *PLDR*, 322-3.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ At that time, Lithuania was quite a big and powerful territory in comparison to those inhabited by the other Baltic tribes, and rather distant from Livonia, to maintain constant wars with. Even a secondary Lithuanian leader such as Lengvenis, and a political outsider such as Tautvila, were treated with respect in Riga, meaning that generally Lithuania was an enemy deserving of respect. That is why Mindaugas' initiatives for the alliance were taken seriously, Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 100.

⁵⁵ The papal letter reads: . . . *per solemnes ac speciales nuncios nobis humiliter supplicasti, Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lituaniae: gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta collecta ac serie chronologica disposita*, ed. Augustin Theiner [henceforth *VMPL*], vol. 1, *Ab Honorio PP. III usque ad Gregorium PP. XII, 1217-1409* (Rome, 1860 reprint, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1969), no. 102, 49.

⁵⁶ In the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* the envoy's name is spelled Parnus: "Parnus, a man who was a wise counsellor" (*LRCh*, 48); however, he probably is the same person mentioned as a witness in a Mindaugas land grant as *Parbs: Parbsen, fideli nostro (Liv-, Esth- and Curländisches Urkundenbuch nebst Regesten*, ed. Friedrich Georg von Bunge [henceforth *LUB*], vol 1, *1093-1300* (Reval, 1853), no. 263, 345); and later as *Parbusse* together with *Parbusse iunior (PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 93). The two characterisations seem similar, therefore it is assumed that the *Chronicle* and the documents mention the same person. As Parbus should be an original Lithuanian name, so it is used in modern Lithuanian scholarship.

⁵⁷ *VMPL*, 1: no. 102, 49.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ E.g., . . . *numerosa paganorum multitudo sibi subdita christiane professionis titulo decoretur*, *VMPL*, 1: no. 101, 49; . . . *cum numerosa multitudine paganorum ad gloriam divini nominis regenerari se fecit per unde gratiam baptismalis*, *ibid.*, no. 105, 50; . . . *cum numerosa infidelium multitudine*, *ibid.*, no. 106, 50.

⁶⁰ . . . *ea [Mindaugas] cum ... uxore, filiis et familia tuis sub protectione ac devotione sedis apostolice permanere sancimus*, *ibid.*, no. 102, 49.

tional legalisation of Lithuania as a heathen country under Christian rule.⁶¹

The most important function of this baptism was that it directly lead to Mindaugas' coronation. The papal bull addressed to Bishop Heidenreich⁶² of Culm, entitling him to crown Mindaugas is dated with the same day 17 July 1251.

THE CORONATION OF KING MINDAUGAS, 6 JULY 1253⁶³

THE CONTEXT

The coronation of King Mindaugas was the *de iure* foundation of Lithuanian state and the certification of its international recognition. Implicitly, together with the crown, Lithuania received the framework of a Western-Christian-type statehood. The political aspects of the coronation are widely scrutinised by Lithuanian and other scholars, but the act of coronation, the first recorded Western royal ceremony held in Lithuania, has not received sufficient attention.

For the study of such a ritual, the following aspects are relevant: (1) the *coronatus/a*, the future king and/or queen; (2) the *coronator*, an authorised high ecclesiastic, representative of pope or emperor; (3) royal insignia, the signs of the coronation; all three bound together by (4) the *ordines*, the script for the ceremony, being held at (5) the sacred space, usually a cathedral. During a coronation, as Jacques LeGoff noted, a king passes from one state of already being a king to another.⁶⁴ The ceremony is meant to transform the *electus* or *haeres* into the *Dei gratia rex*. Regarding the case of King Mindaugas, the primary sources do not supply evidence for several of these aspects. Moreover, his coronation is only an episode in history which neither stemmed from, nor resulted into tradition. Nevertheless, an attempt to make a scholarly construction based on a comparative study of what this coronation might have been like, is possible and perhaps useful.

First of all, both Mindaugas' baptism and coronation were political events aimed above all at foreign policy, combined with the reception of Western models of royal ceremony and insignia. It was a response to different interests: on the one hand, Innocent IV sought to expand the Catholic commonwealth and strengthen it in the face of the Tartar threat⁶⁵; on the other hand, Mindaugas attempted to secure his lands from the Teutonic Order taking root in Livonia and Prussia. At the same time, the papal legate Opizo⁶⁶ crowned Danylo Romanovych, an originally Orthodox⁶⁷ duke, king of Galicia for rather similar reasons. This coronation took place between 1253 and 1255⁶⁸ and is the closest parallel to that of Mindaugas. Unfortunately, there is even less evidence on Danylo's royal inauguration to allow a meaningful comparison of the two events.

The primary sources contain no evidence about the details of the ceremony. Formally, a coronation is a part of the liturgy, usually a Mass, during which a royal person is crowned. It consists of verbal actions and gestures. The records about Mindaugas' coronation do not include any information about the verbal, that means the longer, part

⁶¹ Actually, Innocent IV did not deny that a Christian ruler could possess a *dominium* inhabited by heathens, James Muldoon, *Popes Lawyers and Infidels: The Church and the Non-Christian World, 1250-1550* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979), 45-7.

⁶² Dominican friar, Bishop Heidenreich (d. 29 June 1263, Culm, Chelmo in Poland). In the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* he is referred to as Henry of Prussia, *LRCh*, 48.

⁶³ July 6 (less probable July 13) as the most probable date of the coronation was established in Gudavičius, "Polityczny problem królestwa litewskiego w połowie XIII w." (The political problem of the Lithuanian Kingdom in the middle of the thirteenth century), in *Ekspansja niemieckich zakonów rycerskich w strefie Bałtyku od XIII do połowy XIV wieku. Materiały konferencji historyków radzieckich i polskich w Toruniu z r. 1988* (The expansion of German military orders in the Baltics from the thirteenth to the mid fourteenth century. Materials of the conference of Soviet and Polish historians, Toruń, 1988), ed. Marian Biskup (Toruń: Instytut Historii PAN, Zakład Historii Pomorza, 1990), 69. Therefore, the dating of the coronation to 1252, as proposed in Jan Powierski, "Świętopek gdański i Kazimierz kujawsko-łęczycki w rywalizacji z Zakonem Krzyżackim o ziemie bałtyjskie w latach 1250 - połowa 1252" (Świętopek of Gdansk and Kazimierz of Kujawy-Łęczycza in their antagonism with the Teutonic Order concerning the lands of the Balts, 1250-1252), *Rocznik Gdański* 41/1 (1981): 80-1, and repeated in Krzysztof Stopka, "Próby christianizacji Litwy w latach 1248-1263" (The attempts to Christianise Lithuania during the years 1248-1263), *Analecta Cracoviensia* 19 (1987): 23, *passim*, is considered misleading.

⁶⁴ Jacques LeGoff, "A Coronation Program to the Age of Saint Louis: The Ordo of 1250," in *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, ed. János M. Bak [henceforth *Coronations*] (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 48.

⁶⁵ The Tatar cause of the coronations is widely discussed in Antoni Prochaska, "Dwie koronacje" (The two coronations), *Przegląd Historyczny* 1 (1905): 185-93, *passim*.

⁶⁶ Opizo (Oppiso), the abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St Paul in Mezzano was nominated a papal legate for Prussia ca. 1245 (first mention in papal letter dating from 7 October 1245, August Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab a. post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad a. MCCCIV*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1875), no. 11925, 1012. He was active in the state of the Teutonic Knights during the first Prussian uprising. Opizo's mission was finished in autumn 1246, *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, ed. Joan Ptaśnik [henceforth *MPV*], vol. 3, *Analecta Vaticana 1202-1366* (Cracow, 1914), no. 48, 28. However, the pope nominated him legate in the bull *Contra tartaros et alios Paganos* dating from 17 May 1253 (Potthast, 2: no. 14975, 1233) and addressed to all Christians of Poland and also of Bohemia, Moravia, *Sarbia* [*sic*], Pomerania, and the Prussian lands; the same bull was repeated on 9 June 1253, *VMPL*, 1: no. 107, 51-2. He appears to be in Poland in November 1253 (*MPV*, 3: no. 70, 38) and in 1254 during the canonisation of St Stanislas in Cracow, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, ed. Augustin Bielowski [henceforth *MPH*] (Lwów, 1878), 3:22.

of the ceremony. One may add that *verba volant, gestus manent* style of records also holds true in Danylo's case. The only evidence of *verba* is in a bull of Alexander IV blaming the Galician ruler of breaking his oath to the Church. It is assumed that this refers to his coronation oath, a typical part of every *ordo*.⁶⁹ The direct records on the coronations provide the information only on the royal insignia (in Mindaugas' case the crown), the anointing with sacred oil, and the oath. Of the persons involved, the records for Lithuania name only the crowned and the coronators: Heidenreich,⁷⁰ Bishop of Culm, and Andreas von Stierland, Master of the Livonian Order.⁷¹ As for the other participants of the ceremony there is no direct evi-

dence,⁷² although, there is one document of Mindaugas⁷³ which might provide some information. In July 1253 Mindaugas donated land to the Livonian Order. At the beginning of the document he names himself *Mindowe, Dei gratia rex Lettowiae*, thus indicating that the document, most probably, was issued after the coronation. Bishop Heidenreich and Master Andreas are named among the witnesses of the donation. As they were the coronators and there is no other evidence except the coronation for them both to be present in Lithuania at Mindaugas' court,⁷⁴ there is basis to relate the two events. The author of the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* also confirms the fact saying that after the coronation "the king rejoiced and gave / the Master documents, generously conferring upon him rich and / fertile lands in his kingdom."⁷⁵ On the basis of this background it might be argued that all the witnesses enumerated in the land grant, namely *dominus Culmensis episcopus, magister Andreas fratrum praedictorum et fratres sui Andreas, Iohannes pincerna, Sittherus dapifer et Theodoricus de Hassendorp, de fratribus praedicatoribus Sinderamus, de fratribus minoribus frater Adolfus et sui socii et alii quam plures*,⁷⁶ were guests and possibly the assistants of the coronation.

This hypothetical list of the witnesses/coronators/guests may offer an explanation for one obscure aspect of the event: Mindaugas' coronation is recorded in Lithuanian, Teutonic, and papal sources, whereas Ruthenian ones, despite their relatively informative story concerning Mindaugas' baptism,⁷⁷ are silent about the coronation. Rather accurate when dealing with Lithuanian events, author/s of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* never named Mindaugas king, only duke, grand duke, and sovereign⁷⁸ of Lithuania. The aforementioned facts suggest that Mindaugas' coronation was arranged between Lithuania, the papacy, and the Teutonic Order, and was not a widely heard event, as the Ruthenian neighbours did not record it. The evidence about the Lithuanian coronation in Polish sources testifies to the spread of the news into the Catholic neighbourhood (through the mendicant orders?). It should be admitted however that Mindaugas was crowned most presumably due to the coincidence of quite opposite motives, that of the Livonian Order to expand its influence and that of Mindaugas to secure his lands from the strengthening crusade.

⁶⁹ Danylo was probably baptised a Catholic in 1246 as is seen from the letter of Pope Innocent IV, dating from 7 September 1247, *LUB*, 1: no. 145, 254.

⁶⁸ *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* ascribes the event to 1255 (*PLDR*, 330-1), though it is proved that the dating in the chronicle is not accurate and some dates are indicated with an error up to five years (*ibid.*, 567). Moreover, the year 1255 is already the pontificate of Alexander IV. The Polish *Rocznik Krasieński* (The Krasieński annals) dates the event to the year 1253 (*MPH*, 3:132) and the period between the end of 1253 to sometime in 1254 is the limit of Danylo's coronation. Mykhajlo Hrushevs'kij, basing his conclusions on the document of the partition of the lands of the Yatvigiens dating from 24 November 1254, where Danylo is named *Primus Rex Ruthenorum* (*Codex diplomaticus Poloniae* . . . , ed. Julian Bartoszewicz (Warsaw, 1858), 3: no. 30, 63) assumes that the coronation must have been performed before the issuing of this document. It is probable that Danylo was crowned at the end of the year 1253, as there were no wars with the Tatars, Danylo could have started war against Yatvigiens and Opizo's itinerary does not contradict such possibility, M. Hrushevs'kij, *Istoriya Ukrainy - Rusi* (The history of Ukraine - Rus'), vol. 3, *Do roku 1340* (To the year 1340) (Lwów, 1905), 72-3.

⁶⁹ Nicolas D. Chubaty attributes this oath to the period before the coronation, i.e., to 1247, the year of the union between the Churches in Galicia-Volhynia, *id.*, *The History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine*, vol. 1, *The Ancient Period - to 1353* (Rome, New York: Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1965), 626. However, it is more probable that the passage *prestiti iuramenti religione contempta, id quod circa obidientiam eiusdem Ecclesie ac predictae observationem fidei promisse dinosceris* (*Monumenta Ucrainae historica*, ed. Andreas Šeptyckij [henceforth *MUH*], vol. 9-10, (1075-1632) (Rome: Editiones Universitatis Catholicae Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae, 1971) no. 2, 3) refers to the oath during the coronation, as also does the whole paragraph of the bull.

⁷⁰ Bishop Heidenreich was nominated the coronator by the pope... *auctoritate nostra coronas in Regem*, in a letter dating from 17 July 1251, *VMPL*, 1: no. 104, 50.

⁷¹ The only evidence that Andreas von Stierland crowned Mindaugas is recorded in *LRCh*, 48, 81, 88.

⁷² Ivinskis assumed that the bishops of Curland (*Kurzeme* in Latvian, *Kuršas* in Lithuanian) and Oesil, who were to protect papal privileges of Mindaugas (*LUB*, 1: no. 225, 284-5), might have assisted Bishop Heidenreich at the coronation, Zenonas Ivinskis, "Mindaugas ir jo karūna. Kritiškos pastabos septynių šimtmečių (1253-1953) perspektyvoje" (Mindaugas and his crown: critical remarks from the perspective of seven hundred years (1253-1953)), *Aidai* 1, 2 (1954): 56.

⁷³ *LUB*, 1: no. 152, 333-4.

⁷⁴ Both cocoronators appear as witnesses of Mindaugas' forged document dating from July 1260, *PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 91-3.

⁷⁵ *LRCh*, 48.

⁷⁶ *LUB*, 1: no. 152, 334.

⁷⁷ *PLDR*, 322-3.

⁷⁸ *Samoderzhec* in Old Slavonic. It should be remembered here that after the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* mentions Danylo's coronation it consistently uses the title king, *PLDR*, 330, ff.

An enlightening parallel for a coronation oriented towards foreign policy and aiming at security for the state, can be found in the case of Serbian ruler Stefan Prvovenchany (i.e., the First-crowned) who received the crown under similar circumstances. Pressured by Hungary and crusaders and influenced by Venicians, Stefan was crowned king of Serbia by Pope Honorius III in 1217, thus gaining international recognition for his country and securing it from the Latin interference.⁷⁹

The Galician example points into a related, though slightly different example: Duke Danylo had been inaugurated three times before he received the crown from the pope. The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* tells how he was recognised duke of Galicia being seated on his father's throne in the Orthodox church of Our Lady in Halych,⁸⁰ later he became a vassal of the Golden Horde by drinking *kumis* with the khan,⁸¹ and then confirmed the alliance with the Hungarian king being dressed with the latter's clothes.⁸² In this sense, receiving a papal crown was for Danylo and, probably, for Mindaugas a certification of an alliance with foreign powers achieved by the participation in an appropriate ritual of inauguration/confirmation.⁸³

The question is, how this ritual was performed in the Lithuanian case. The coronation came from the side of the papacy and was authorised by the pope in 1251, after he had been informed by Parbus that Mindaugas was baptised. In the letter written on 17 July 1251, Innocent IV nominated Bishop Heidenreich to be the coronator saying *auctoritate nostra corones in Regem*.⁸⁴ This phrase and the sentence *in die igitur, qua per ministerium venerabilis patris domini H., Culmensi episcopi, auctoritate sanctissimi patris nostri et domini Innocentii, summi pontificis, in regem Lettowie oleo sacratio peruncti, regni suscepimus diadema*, from Mindaugas' privilege to the merchants of Riga and Livonia dating from July 1253,⁸⁵ are the only direct references to the ceremony. It is unknown if any *ordo* or instructions of crowning were sent to the executors of the ceremony. On the other hand, the story in the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* tells that there were papal bulls sent to Master Andreas out of which it was read that the master had to crown the Lithuanian ruler.⁸⁶ The reliability of the *Rhymed Chronicle* could be questioned here because the story of crowning is joined into one event with the baptism,⁸⁷ but the land donation document⁸⁸ proves that Master Andreas was present in the/se ceremony/ies. The only doubtful place in the *Chronicle* is that introduces the master to be the principal coronator nominated by the pope who invites Bishop Henry from Prussia to join him,⁸⁹ while the papal letter authorises the bishop of Culm to crown the ruler.⁹⁰

To conclude: the circumstances in which Mindaugas' coronation occurred suggest that it was caused by the po-

litical realities, among which the coincidence of Mindaugas claim for sovereignty and security in Lithuania with papal and Teutonic aspirations for Christian commonwealth were decisive.

THE CEREMONY

Mindaugas' coronation belongs to the whole range of papal coronations which started in the early thirteenth century with the pontificate of Pope Innocent III.⁹¹ One of the best documented case is the crowning of the Bulgarian Tsar Kaloyan⁹² king of Bulgaria and Wallachia in 1204.⁹³ On 23 February 1203 Innocent IV sent a letter to the Bulgarian ruler with the instructions for crowning.⁹⁴ He nominated Leo, cardinal presbyter, to be papal legate and to award Kaloyan the sceptre and the crown on behalf of the pope⁹⁵; the archbishop of Turnovo⁹⁶ was authorized to receive the royal oath and to crown, thus becoming a *primus* in the realm and gaining the right for him and his successors to crown the heir to the throne.⁹⁷ At the end the pope proposes that in such a way, the realm of Kaloyan becomes subordinated to the papacy.⁹⁸

Even in this well documented case there is no evidence on the *ordo*. It seems that the *ordo* of crowning was well known to the high clergy and it was no need to send it. On

⁷⁹ On Stefan's coronation, see Božidar Ferjančič, "Obrana Neman'inog nasledja - Srbja postraje kral'evina" (Taking of the Neman'in heritage: Serbia becomes a kingdom), in *Istorija srpskog naroda* (The history of the Serbian people), vol. 1, *Od najstarijih vremena do Marichke bitke (1371)* (From the earliest times to the Marichka Battle (1371)), ed. Sima Čirković (Belgrade: Srpska Knizheva Zadruga, 1981), 127-314, on the coronation proper see *ibid.*, 300.

⁸⁰ *Prinial stol svoego otca, PLDR*, 288.

⁸¹ *Kumis*, fermented mare's milk, *ibid.*, 314-5.

⁸² *On zhe ja i za ruku i vede ego v polatu svoju, i sam sovolochashet' ego, i oblachashet' i vo porty svoie, i taku chest' tvoriashet' emu*, *ibid.*, 320.

⁸³ Heathens used to perform also a ritual of the other party when confirming agreements with the Christians, e.g., Stephen C. Rowell, "A pagan's word: Lithuanian diplomatic procedure 1200-1385," *Journal of Medieval History* 18 (1992): 147.

⁸⁴ *VMPL*, 1: no. 104, 50.

⁸⁵ *LUB*, 1: no. 243, 312-13.

⁸⁶ *LRCh*, 48.

⁸⁷ The baptism and the coronation are joint into one also in the "Rocznik Krašinski" (The Krašinski source) which dates the both to 1252, *MPH*, 3:132.

⁸⁸ *LUB*, 1: no. 152, 334.

⁸⁹ *LRCh*, 48.

⁹⁰ *VMPL*, 1: no. 104, 50.

⁹¹ Ivinskis, "Mindaugas," 54. In general, Innocent IV regarded himself as a new Melchizedek and claimed the Christian commonwealth to be a successor and an heir of the Roman Empire, thus considering himself as an authority "less than God but greater than man." Consequently such papal *plenitudo potestas* was assumed to give them power over the secular rulers, Robert Folz, *The Concept of Empire in Western Europe from the Fifth to the Fourteenth Century* (London: Edvard Arnold, 1969), 82-3.

the other hand, the new papal coronations of the thirteenth century were the result of the conflict between the papacy and the Holy Roman emperors. The popes were assumed to be the coronators of the emperors and the emperors crowned the kings; that was a kind of theoretical hierarchy despite the fact that few kings were crowned by emperor. As the emperors ceased to be reliable partners of the Roman Curia, the popes sought to expand their influence through subordination of the kingdoms to the Apostolic Throne. Unfortunately, there are not enough records about the papal coronations of the new kings in the thirteenth century and it is not clear what *ordo* the papacy used. Michael Andrieu, after surveying the Roman pontificals, concluded that throughout the thirteenth century different churches in Western Europe possessed different pontificals which appeared to be a mixture of local Liturgical books and pontificals of the Roman Curia.⁹⁹ Moreover, according to Andrieu the pontifical of the Curia had no *ordo* for royal coronation; to prove the statement the author quotes words of Cardinal Jacques Stefanesci dating from the coronation of Robert of Anjou on 3 August 1309: *nihil inveniebatur litteris traditum, qualiter reges et reginae debent inungi et coronari, eo quod in Pontificali Romano non habetur nisi de unctione et coronatione imperatoris et imperatricis*.¹⁰⁰

Ivinskis presumed that Mindaugas' coronation was performed according to the imperial minor *ordo*¹⁰¹ and as a possible parallel proposed the coronation of Rudolph of Habsburg in 1273.¹⁰² The main argument for the imperial

minor *ordo* was the Teutonic origin of Mindaugas' coronators.¹⁰³ On the other hand, the pope was the authority that gave the crown and empowered the coronators to act on behalf of the Roman Curia. These two assumptions of the *ordo* seem to be of equal probability, although, due to the active role the German knights had played in the Baltic Crusade, the assumption in favour of the imperial minor *ordo* dominates in the scholarship.¹⁰⁴

Papal and imperial *ordines* predominantly differ in verbal part, though, coincide in the sequence of phases and in the roles of the performers, both clergy and laity. The central events of a royal sacring are the anointment and the crowning. According to the papal *ordo* the anointer is a bishop¹⁰⁵ and the coronator is a metropolitan,¹⁰⁶ as in the imperial ritual both actions are executed by one person a metropolitan.¹⁰⁷

The records of Mindaugas' and Kaloyan's coronations bear evidence to the two coronators in each case: Legate Leo, who awarded the insignia, and the archbishop of Turnovo, who crowned; and Master Andreas, who had the crown, and Bishop Heidenreich, who crowned. Both pieces of evidence record a kind of double crowning, which could be interpreted as a result of Innocent III's activities to establish a difference between episcopal anointment and royal unction in order to lower the status of a ruler in the liturgy.¹⁰⁸ The same hypothesis was suggested by Johannes Voigt and corroborated by Ivinskis, although he concluded that the divided roles of anointer and coronator meant papal corrections to the imperial *ordo*.¹⁰⁹ Considering that firstly, the Teutonic Order theoretically was under the rule of the papacy; secondly, the years 1250 - 1268 is the period of interregnum and rather a chaotic situation in the Holy Roman Empire¹¹⁰; and thirdly, the pontificate of Innocent IV is predominantly distinguished for the activities to establish the supreme papal authority over secular monarchs.¹¹¹ Therefore this rather inertial conclusion should be corrected in favour of the papal *ordo* as there is no basis to relate Mindaugas' coronation with imperial politics.

⁹⁹ The English version of Bulgarian name and placenames hereafter is used as in *Documents and Materials on the History of Bulgarian People*, ed. V. Voynov and L. Panayotov (Sofia: Publishing house of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1969), 55-6.

¹⁰⁰ The negotiations started in 1200 with the pope's letter and resulted in the coronation four years later. The correspondence is published in "Innocentius III papa - Caloiohannes rex / Papa Inokentij III - tsar Kalojan," in *Latinski izvori za balgarskata istorija / Fontes Latini historiae Bulgariae* [henceforth *LIBI*], vol. 3, ed. Ivan Dujčev, Stašimir Lišev, Borislav Primov, and Michail Vojnov, vol. 12 of *Izvori za Balgarskata istorija / Fontes Historiae Bulgariae* (Sofia: Balgarskata Akademija na Naukite, 1965), 307-8.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 323-7.

¹⁰² "... *sceptrum regni ac regium tibi mittimus diadema*, *ibid.*, 326.

¹⁰³ *Trinovitanus* in Latin.

¹⁰⁴ "... *arciepiscopo Trinovitano in terris, quibus imperas, universis privilegium concedimus primatie, qui et successores ipsius tuos in posterum successores, simili ab eis iuramento recepto, apostolice sedis auctoritate coronet et in terra primatus obtineat dignitatem*, *ibid.*, 326.

¹⁰⁵ "... *sic regnum tuum in apostolice sedis subiectione ac devotione confirmes*, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Michael Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romaine du Moyen-Age*, vol. 2, *Le Pontifical de la Curie Romaine au XIIIe siècle* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1940), 315.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 288.

¹⁰⁸ *I.e.*, *ordo* for kings and queens.

¹⁰² Ivinskis, "Mindaugas," 55.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ E.g., A. Juška, "Karaliaus Mindaugo krikštas" (The baptism of King Mindaugas), *Aidai* 9 (1951): 388.

¹⁰⁵ Text "R" of the texts "R" and "D" as published parallelly in Eduard Eichmann, "Die sog. Römische Königskrönungformel," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 45 (1925): 531. The text is used according to the reference in Andrieu, 2: 69.

¹⁰⁶ Eichmann, "R," 535.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, "D," 531, 535.

¹⁰⁸ The pope made this distinction in the decretal *On Holy Unction*. The interpretation is based on Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), 319.

¹⁰⁹ Ivinskis, "Mindaugas," 56.

¹¹⁰ On the interregnum, see Folz, 121-2, *passim*.

Though executed as a liturgical event, a coronation actually is a legal act of empowerment legislation of a future ruler. The crowned must correspond to several conditions of an *ordo*, and one of the principles is to be a legitimate heir of the throne. This inheritance is confirmed during the last phase of the ceremony, the enthronement,¹¹² after the words *Sta et retine*.¹¹³ The importance of the succession of the crowned person was stressed in Kaloyan's case, even becoming a kind of guarantee for this coronation.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, there were rulers awarded the crown for the first time, and the Church did solve the case of kings of non-royal origin. Reinhard Elze presents an example of an *ordo* abbreviated in order to crown Roger, the person of non royal descent, king of Sicily in 1130. During his consecration, the words concerning inheritance of the throne after *Sta et retine* and being a potentate of the country prior the coronation were cut out of the *ordo*.¹¹⁵

From the former examples it is possible to assume that the first-time crowned kings did not have to be inaugurated according to both *hereditario iure* and *auctoritate Dei*: only the latter was enough. Logically, the heir of the first king should have no abbreviations to his *ordo*. Although, there is no direct statement about the succession in the text, it is evident from the passage referred to earlier that coronation assumes the inheritance of the royal throne by the newly-crowned ruler.

Heredity was indirectly confirmed in Kaloyan's coronation: *archiepiscopo Trinovitano . . . concedimus primatie, qui et successores ipsius tuos in posterum successores, simili ab eis iuramento recepto, apostolice sedis auctoritate coronet*.¹¹⁶ Papal authorisation to crown Mindaugas mentions his successors, but does not highlight their relation to an inheritable throne: *Epo Culmensi . . . auctoritate nostra corones in Regem, . . . , ita tamen,*

quod ipse ac successores sui Regnum predictum, ac prefatas terras, que ad suarum precum instantiam in ius et proprietatem beati Petri suscepimus, se ab apostolice sede tenere perpetuo recognoscant.¹¹⁷

This feature of a royal inauguration must have been obvious for Mindaugas, as he indicated so in the earlier introduced land grant issued with *auxilio et consilio nobis ac regni nostri legitimis successoribus*,¹¹⁸ and for the contemporaries, as an anonymous Irish witness of the Lithuanian coronation who had recorded that the first king of Lithuania Mindaugas¹¹⁹ received the royal power from the Roman pope, leaving it to his descendants so that they carefully could preserve it.¹²⁰

In conclusion, it is more credible that Mindaugas was crowned according to an abbreviated version of the papal *ordo* and thus only by *auctoritate Dei*, which corresponded in its main points of anointing and crowning and provided the usual authority of sovereign kingship. Nevertheless, other *ordo* was also possible, though the political circumstances are less favourable for this argument.

POST SCRIPTUM

In such a context, it seems strange that two years after the coronation Mindaugas asked papal permission to crown his male heir. This demand was satisfied in the bull of Alexander IV, dating from 6 March 1255.¹²¹

Its text states: *dilectum filium Nobilem virum...natum tuum ad honorem dei et sancte Romane ecclesie in Regem Lectovie auctoritate nostra coronet*.¹²² This issue demands an explanation, or more precisely, an interpretation. A possible answer to the question why Mindaugas asked for the right to crown his son as king of Lithuania while he himself was king and knew that the throne is inheritable.

¹¹¹ For a concise summary on the Innocent IV's doctrine of authority, see Marcel David, *La souveraineté et les limites juridiques du pouvoir monarchique du IXe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Librairie Dalloz, 1954), 198-99. For a more explicit presentation, see ch. "Innocent IV Theorist as Practitioner," in Muldoon, 29-48.

¹¹² The phases of coronation are defined as in Janet L. Nelson, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London and Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press, 1986), 362.

¹¹³ *Sta et retine locum amodo, quem hucusque paterna successione tenuisti, haereditario iure tibi delegatum per auctoritatem Dei omnipotentis et praesentem traditionem nostram*, Eichmann, "R," 536.

¹¹⁴ . . . *registra nostra perlegi fecimus diligenter, ex quibus evidenter comperimus, quod in terra tibi subiecta multi reges fuerant coronati. Preterea continebatur in eis, quod tempore bone memoria Nicolai pape predecessoris nostri rex Bulgarorum, . . . , cum toto regno sibi commisso ad predicationem eius fuerat baptizatus, et rex ipse ab eo archiepiscopum postulara Legatus quoque Michaelis regis bulgarici cum donis regalibus Adriano pape predecessori nostro regias litteras presentarat et postularat ab eo, . . . , quem post approbationem eorum ad sedem apostolicam remeantem ipse postmodum consecraret*, *LIBI*, 3:312.

¹¹⁵ In Roger's case the text was *Sta et retine amodo locum tibi delegatum per auctoritate dei, and ut sis benedictus et constitutus rex in regno tuo* were changed into *sis benedictus et constitutus rex*, Reinhard Elze, "The Ordo for the Coronation of King Roger II of Sicily: An Example of Dating from Internal Evidence," in *Coronations*, 167.

¹¹⁶ *LIBI*, 3:326.

¹¹⁷ *VMPL*, 1: no. 104, 50.

¹¹⁸ *LUB*, 1: no. 252, 333.

¹¹⁹ *Mendogus* in original Latin text. The name written in such a way is used in the Western Slavonic languages; because of this aspect Gudavičius hypothesised that if the anonymous author used such a name, and there were possibly participants of Western Slavic origin at the coronation, id., *Kryžiaus karai*, 108.

¹²⁰ [11] *Hec habet . . . terram Lectauie. Cuius rex primus Mendogus baptizatus est et in coronacione sua me ibidem existente regnum suum a sede Romana recipiens hoc idem reliquid suis posteris faciendum dummodo eandem ad huiusmodi factum curam adibeant diligentem*, "Incipiunt Descripciones Terrarum," appended to Marvin L. Colker, "America Rediscovered in the Thirteenth Century?" *Speculum* 54.4 (1979): 722.

¹²¹ *VMPL*, 1: no. 123, 60-1.

¹²² *Ibid.*

It should be remembered here that the case of *rex iuvenis* is not without precedence in the Middle Ages: best known example being the coronation of Louis the Pious by Charlemagne. Moreover, cases of a coronation or nomination of a successor *vivente rege* did occur and especially in cases of disputed throne inheritance.

The similar events occurred later: the *Hungarian Chronicle* compiled in the fourteenth century records the coronation of Salomon during his father Andrew's lifetime.¹²³ The reason for this could have been derived from the record about reaction of Salomon's brothers;¹²⁴ probably, by choosing and crowning one heir, King Andrew aimed to avoid succession conflicts in the future. According to Z. J. Kosztolnyik, the practice was that the crowned heir became empowered in a certain part of the kingdom.¹²⁵ Moreover, this instance seems to become of increasing importance for the internal policy of the country in the thirteenth century.¹²⁶

Erich Hoffmann had demonstrated that in Medieval Scandinavia in the case of unclear succession or in absence of evident paramount claimant, the successor was chosen and had to pass through a kind of consecration during the predecessors reign.¹²⁷ So, for example: in Norway Magnus, the successor through the female line, was inaugurated and swore an oath in 1163/64¹²⁸; King Haakon's son Haakon, "already chosen as coregent," carried the crown during his father's coronation ceremony on 28 July 1247¹²⁹; Haakon's son Magnus Lagaböter was "elected as a coregent and also crowned" on 14 September 1261.¹³⁰ In Denmark King Waldemar I (1154/57-1182) "designated his son Knut as coregent in order to avoid future succession struggles."¹³¹ In Sweden Birger Jarl placed "his son Waldemar on the throne as an heir."¹³²

To conclude the comparisons, it can be stated that, in the cases when royal succession was not clearly settled by custom or law, what was the case in Lithuania, it was logical that an heir was chosen and his rights to the throne were publically manifested. However, to establish a more thoroughly elaborated parallel leading to a possible interpretation, Mindaugas' family must be introduced.

Four of Mindaugas' sons are named in the sources: Vaišelga,¹³³ Ruklys, Rupeikis, and Gerstukas.¹³⁴ Besides them, there is mention of one daughter married to Shvarno Danylovych¹³⁵ and of children who were still minors in 1263.¹³⁶ Probably, any of the four enumerated sons could have been inaugurated king. However, there is practically no information about the last three sons; and the only possible explanation of the crowning permission could be searched for in Vaišelga's activities, albeit bearing in mind the reservation that his example does not imply Vaišelga to be meant in this permission, since by that time he was already a monk. As for the other sons, the only hypothesis can be derived from Gudavičius' assumption based on toponymical evidence: there are territories in Lithuania that might have been connected with the name of Ruklys, consequently, they could have been under his rule,¹³⁷ and thus Ruklys could be seen an heir.

Duke Vaišelga seems to be the oldest son who was at an early age involved in politics. At the beginning of the 1250s, he started to rule (as a coregent ? of Mindaugas) in Black Ruthenia with a residence in Novohrudok and was baptised an Orthodox.¹³⁸ Vaišelga closely collaborated with the Galician-Volhynian rulers: he arranged his sister's marriage with Shvarno, authorised Roman Danylovych to rule over Slonim and Volkovyjsk on his behalf and over Novgorudek on behalf of Mindaugas as he became a monk and decided to visit Mount Athos.¹³⁹ This information leads to the assumption that Mindaugas established some kind of a rule over the Ruthenian lands, and his son was in charge there. The speculation that Mindaugas intended to found a kind of sub-Lithuanian Kingdom in the Slavonic territo-

¹²³ See, sections 91-2. *De coronatione Salomonis patre suo Andrea rege adhuc vivente* of "Chronici hungarici compositio saeculi XIV," ed. Alexander Domanovszky, in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* . . . , vol. 1, ed. Emericus Szentpétery (Budapest: Academia Litter. Hungarica, 1937), 351-5.

¹²⁴ *Dicunt alii, quod Bela duce et filiis eius, Geycha scilicet et Ladizlao cunctisque regni optimatibus consentientibus Salomon unctus esset in regem postmodum seminorium discordie instigantibus ortum est inter eos*, *ibid.*, 353.

¹²⁵ Z.J. Kosztolnyik, *From Colomon the Learned to Béla III (1095-1196): Hungarian Domestic Policies and Their Impact upon Foreign Affairs* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1987), 248.

¹²⁶ *Id.*, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1996), 49-50, *passim*; 207-10.

¹²⁷ See Erich Hofmann, "Coronations and Coronation Ordines in Medieval Scandinavia," in *Coronations*, 125-5.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 125-6.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 127.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 128.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 131.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 137.

¹³³ Vaišelga or Vaišvilkas Lithuanian, *Voishelk* in Old Slavonic, *Voyselk*, *Woysalk* in Polish, *Woischleg* in German.

¹³⁴ Ruklys, *Rukl'* in Old Slavonic; Repeikis, *Repek* in Old Slavonic, *Replen* in Latin; Gerstukas or Girstutis in Lithuanian, *Gerstuchen*, *Gerstutten* in Latin.

¹³⁵ Shvarno Danylovych (*Švarnas* in Lithuanian), the son of Danylo Romanovych, and his wife Mindaugas' daughter, *PLDR*, 334-5.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 358-9. The cause of Mindaugas' murder was that he, after the death of his wife Martha, abducted her sister, the wife of Daumantas, claiming that such was Martha's wish that a stranger should not look after her children; Gudavičius convincingly argued that the fact of the minor children could be true, *id.*, "1219 metų," 41.

¹³⁷ *Id.*, *Kryžiaus karai*, 107.

¹³⁸ *PLDR*, 356-7.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 334-5.

ries is hardly provable; however, it is not totally without a basis. The aforementioned bull of Alexander IV has an attachment encouraging Mindaugas to start war *contra Regnum Russie* and promising that the Apostolic Throne would confirm Lithuanian rule over the occupied lands.¹⁴⁰

Returning back to the comparison with Hungarian and Scandinavian examples, the Lithuanian instance could be interpreted as efforts to establish a new royal authority in the part of the lands under Lithuanian rule empowering there one of king's sons, and probably, thus strengthening the newly established royal dynasty.

One more obscure fact concerning the heredity of the Lithuanian throne is document issued by Mindaugas in June 1261 designating the Livonian Order to inherit the Lithuanian Kingdom if Mindaugas dies heirless.¹⁴¹ However, on the basis of Karol Maleczyński's research this document is a probable forgery.¹⁴²

Concluding this fragmentary evidence the hypothesis that Mindaugas attempted to nominate one of his sons the *rex iuvenis* or tried to prevent the disputes of inheritance by nominating heir at his lifetime, and thus ensuring direct succession, can be proposed.

PLACE AND INSIGNIA

To complete the hypothetical construction of Mindaugas' coronation the examination of its possible place is necessary. However, none of the sources mentions a place more concrete than Lithuania. The search for Voruta, a word used in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*¹⁴³ as a name of Mindaugas' castle and identified by Kazys Būga as a general name for a stronghold,¹⁴⁴ is still a matter of scholarly concern,¹⁴⁵ nevertheless even if the castle-place could be identified there would still be no basis to relate this castle to the coronation. Therefore, the principal possible places are to be discussed.

Ivinskis, basing on Danylo's parallel, argued for Maciej Strykowski's statement, assuming that Mindaugas could

be crowned in Novgorudok, the principle town of the recently seized Ruthenian lands, as Danylo was crowned in Dorohychyn¹⁴⁶ in the lands of Yatvigiens that he sought to possess. The place of Danylo's coronation was interpreted as indication of authority demonstrated to new subjects and seemed relating to the situation of Mindaugas.¹⁴⁷ However, the absence of information about the Lithuanian coronation in the Ruthenian sources, makes such a hypothesis doubtful.

Although a coronation as a liturgical event can be performed in the open air,¹⁴⁸ it is less probable to have happened so,¹⁴⁹ thus logically, one should search for a church. This idea was expanded by A. Juška, who presumed that the delay in the coronation was due to the building of a cathedral.¹⁵⁰ There are several letters of Innocent IV certifying Mindaugas' initiatives to erect a cathedral: the letter dating from 17 July 1251 addressed to the bishop of Culm records the inceptions,¹⁵¹ and that from 24 June 1253 sent to the archbishop of Livonia and Prussia bears evidence of the cathedral which Mindaugas is going to build at his own expense,¹⁵² the same phrase is repeated later in the letters from 3 and 20 September 1254.¹⁵³ This means that contemporaneous written sources¹⁵⁴ do not prove that any cathedral was actually built even after the coronation. Nevertheless, the foundations from the thirteenth century of the church-shaped building found beneath the present cathedral¹⁵⁵ of Vilnius are worth mentioning. These foundations cannot be related to any other building than a

¹⁴⁶ Drohyczyn in Poland.

¹⁴⁷ Ivinskis, "Mindaugas," 57.

¹⁴⁸ This is how Albert Wiviłk-Koiałowicz explained Mindaugas' coronation, arguing that there were no enough spacious churches in Novgorudok, Albertas Vijukas Kojelavičius, *Lietuvos istorija* (The History of Lithuania), Lituanistinė biblioteka 26 (Vilnius: Vaga, 1989), 103.

¹⁴⁹ Though not contradicting the Liturgy an outdoor coronation would have been an extraordinary event, and as extraordinarity it has greater probability to be recorded in the sources.

¹⁵⁰ Juška, 388.

¹⁵¹ . . . *sibi munus consecrationis impendas, prius tamen a predicto Rege optimo terre solo pro fundata cathedrali ecclesia, VMPL, 1: no. 105, 50.*

¹⁵² *Illustris Rex Lethovie . . . cathedralem ecclesiam in expensa suis de novo erigere sit paratus, ibid., no. 111, 53.*

¹⁵³ *Ibid., nos. 120-1, 58-9.*

¹⁵⁴ The 14th and 15th century Teutonic sources bear evidence that Mindaugas had built a cathedral in his capital, Vilnius, and had founded a bishopric there. E.g., at the Council of Constance the Procurator-General of the Teutonic Order, Petrus von Wormditt, stated that a cathedral in Vilnius was built by King Mindaugas and thus Vilnius became the official seat of a bishop, *Codex epistolaris Vitoldi, magni ducis Lithuaniae (1376 - 1430)*, ed. Antoni Prochaska (Cracow, 1882), 996-9; however, considering the Teutonic claims for Christianisation of Lithuania, scholars up till now did not rely on these arguments, Napoleonas Kitkauskas, *Vilniaus pilys. Statyba ir architektūra* (The castles of Vilnius: building and architecture) (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989), 13.

¹⁴⁰ *VMPL*, 1: no. 123, 61.

¹⁴¹ *LUB*, 1: no. 636, 461-4.

¹⁴² Maleczyński, 33.

¹⁴³ *PLDR*, 322-3.

¹⁴⁴ Ivinskis, *Lietuvos istorija*, 177.

¹⁴⁵ Recently several theories about the place of Voruta were presented: Romas Batura identified it with Vilnius, Batūra, "Lietuvos sostinės klausimu" (To the question about the capital of Lithuania), *MADA* 1 (1966): 141-63; Zabiela tried to locate it in the place of the Šeimyniškeliai mound (3 km eastwards from Anykščiai), Gintautas Zabiela, "Kur stovėjo Vorutos pilis?" (Where was the Voruta castle standing?), *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* (1991): 5-21; Gudavičius supports the opinion that this rather important castle must have been built in Mindaugas' patrimonial domaine in the southern part of modern Lithuania, id., "Dėl Lietuvos valstybės kūrimosi centro ir laiko" (About the center and the time of formation of the Lithuanian state), *MADA* 3 (1984): 61-9.

church,¹⁵⁶ and Vilnius did belong to the territory of the Lithuanian Kingdom.¹⁵⁷ The aforesaid facts increase the probability that it could be a church in the territory of the Lithuanian Kingdom in which Mindaugas was crowned. However, there is one strange aspect connected with the place of the coronation: the land donation document was probably prepared in the chancellery of the Livonian Order, that is why there is no exact date on it but only the month on it. The possible explanations can be proposed: either the scribes did not know when it was going to be sealed, the place of sealing is in *Lettowia in curia nostra*, what means that it was not initially known to which castle the participants are going to move after the coronation, or then there was the only one castle of Mindaugas and the term *curia nostra* was absolutely clear for the contemporaries and did not require explication.

The evidence on the possible royal insignia is doubtful. No more explicit description of the insignia is known than that of the "two crowns, rich in / ornament and artistry," as mentioned in the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle*.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ For a more explicit description, see *ibid.*, 91-114. A survey of the investigations carried out until 1987 is presented in English in Algimantas Kajackas, "History and Recent Investigations of Vilnius Cathedral," in *La Cristianizzazione della Lituania: Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Storia Ecclesiastica in occasione del VI centenario della Lituania Cristiana (1387-1987). Roma 24-26 Giugno 1987*, ed. Paulius Rabikauskas [henceforth *Cristianizzazione*] (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1989), 263-84.

¹⁵⁷ The phases of building of the cathedral can be derived from the chemical analysis of the mortar: there are two kinds of the contemporaneous mortar, the brown and the white, the first was used for the principle part of the building and the second only for the *chevet*. The analysis showed that these are not the changes of colour but originally different colours of the mortar, Napalys Kitkauskas and Elyvra Telksnienė, "Pirmosios Vilniaus katedros liekanų medžiagos ir mūrijimo technika" (Materials and masonry techniques of the first cathedral of Vilnius), *Architektūros paminklai* 10 (1987): 36, 39. Moreover, from the plan of the foundations of the building, two closed segments are clearly discernible. The latter facts inspired a speculation that the church was erected in two phases: first the square-shaped building and later the *chevet* added; this leads to a speculative interpretation, that possibly the builders first constructed a usual edifice, and only later (after someone's guidance?) made a church out of it, meaning a new and alien building, adding the *chevet*; thus, there were two preparations of the mortar, resulting in its colour difference.

¹⁵⁸ On the territory of Lithuania during Mindaugas' reign, see Gudavičius, "Litva Mindovga" (Lithuania of Mindaugas), in *Problemy etnogeneza i etniceskoj istorii baltov. Sbornik statej* (The problems of the ethnogenesis and ethnical culture of the Balts: collected articles) (Vilnius: Mintis, 1985): 219-7. According to the toponymical analysis Vilnius seems not to belong to Mindaugas' patrimonial domain but to the lands of his father inherited by other sons, Mindaugas must have taken over the region of Vilnius around the year 1250 after at end of the inner wars, *id.*, *Kryžiaus karai*, 107.

¹⁵⁸ *LRCh*, 48.

Nevertheless, there are several opinions about the origin of the Lithuanian coronational insignia proposed: Vladimir Pashuto, on the basis of the *Rhymed Chronicle's* record that Master Andreas had the crowns, concluded that the crowns were executed in Riga.¹⁵⁹ Mychajlo Hocij tried to reconstruct the crown that might have been Mindaugas', assumed that it could have been probably taken to Riga from Cologne, and suggested that the diadem of the reliquary of St Sigismund in the cathedral of Płock (Poland) may be the closest parallel to it.¹⁶⁰ Comparing Mindaugas' case with the contemporaneous papal coronations, some evidence could be derived. According to the documents, in 1204 Kaloyan received the crown from Innocent III. The pope sent royal insignia through the papal legate Leo, who was nominated the coronator¹⁶¹; before crowning Colomon king of Galicia, King Andrew II of Hungary addressed Pope Innocent III asking him to send a crown for this coronation¹⁶²; in 1217 Pope Honorius III's legate brought the crown to the Serbian ruler Stefan Prvovenchany and Serbian sources bear evidence of the Western, Roman, shape of that crown¹⁶³; Legate Opizo also had the crown for Danylo's royal inauguration.¹⁶⁴ Hence, Andreas von Stierland is recorded only in the position of the Master of the Livonian Order, the fact that he promised to "win the crown" and got it (or the permission to crown?),¹⁶⁵ is in favour of Ivinskis' guess that he was the papal legate nominated especially for Mindaugas' coronation¹⁶⁶ thus increasing the probability that the crown to Riga could be sent by the pope,¹⁶⁷ who during the years 1251 - 1253 predominantly resided in Milano and

¹⁵⁹ Pašuta, 276

¹⁶⁰ The diadem dating from the middle of the thirteenth century was donated to the cathedral by the Polish King Casimir the Great, Mychajlo Hocij, "Die Krone des Mindaugas," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 3 (1954): 413-4. Together with the article Hocij published a reconstruction of Danylo's crown (*ibid.*, table 1 after p. 416), which later was erroneously republished as the reconstruction of the one of Mindaugas' in Hieronym Grala, "Między wiarą łacińską i obrządkiem greckim" (Between the Latin faith and the Greek ritual), *Kultura* 12 (23 March 1988): 7.

¹⁶¹ *LIBI*, 3:326, also see James Ross Sweeney, "Innocent III, Hungary and the Bulgarian Coronation: A Study in Medieval Papal Diplomacy," *Church History* 42 (1973) [offprint]: 7.

¹⁶² Hrushevskij, 512.

¹⁶³ Ferjančić, 300.

¹⁶⁴ *PLDR*, 330-1.

¹⁶⁵ *LRCh*, 48.

¹⁶⁶ Ivinskis, "Mindaugas," 56. However, the author was not precise in formulating the hypothesis he says that Master Andreas became legate by having the crown. Most probably he was nominated the legate, and the story of the papal letter (*LRCh*, 48) is true, although the document did not survive.

¹⁶⁷ Though sending of the crown is not determined by the Church regulations it can be supposed that as such a practice occurred in the actions of the popes, who generally are regarded as consistent followers of each other, it can be assumed that there was a certain consistency not only in major polity but in its

Perugia,¹⁶⁸ consequently the insignia for the Lithuanian ruler could have been executed in Northern Italy.

THE SEAL OF KING MINDAUGAS, 1255¹⁶⁹

The chipped yellowish-brown wax-seal-imprint is hanging on blue and light colour cords to the parchment from 1255, certifying the donation of land Sellonia (Fig. 1).¹⁷⁰ The seal is preserved as a distorted oval (Fig. 2, 3), however, the remnants of the border of dots indicate that originally it was nearly round. The must-have-been circular inscription along the circumference is lost, its indication is a probable part of a letter¹⁷¹ preceded by a Greek-cross at 12 o'clock. The background is decorated with a low-relief cross-hatching and there are simple cross/four-ray star marks in the spaces. The central figure represents king in majesty seated on a bench-type throne covered with a tissue. There is a decoration/sign of an undeter-

exercising as well; I am thankful Dr. R. Mažeika for this question, and here I am using a possibility to answer it.

¹⁶⁸ According to the place of sending letters in the period between 17 July 1251, the authorisation of Bishop Heidenreich for the coronation, and 6 July 1253, date of coronation, as indicated in Potthast, 2:1185-237. From May 1253 the letters were sent from Assisi; however as these are the last months before the coronations they can be hardly related with the manufacturing of the royal insignia.

¹⁶⁹ The description of the seal is based on the photographs received from the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin - Dahlem, were presently Mindaugas' parchment is kept. It should be admitted, however, that the drawing of this seal published by Marian Gumowski, although corresponds in type to the original, is inaccurate in details and, therefore, unreliable, cf., fig. 1 and M. Gumowski, "Pieczęcie Książąt Litewskich" (The seals of the Lithuanian dukes), *Ateneum Wileński* 8.3/4 (1930): table IV.28.

Moreover, scholars doubt if the seal really belonged to the Lithuanian ruler as the legend is completely lost, e.g., Edmundas Rimša, "Lietuvos Didžiosios kunigaikštystės antspaudų vaškas XIII - XVIII a." (Seal wax in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the thirteenth - eighteenth centuries), *Lituanistica* 3 (1997): 5, n. 25, 13. Gumowski mentions the attempts to ascribe this seal to Andrew II of Hungary or Magnus of Sweden, Gumowski, 707. Dr. Rimša points out that the closest in shape and size to the seal of Mindaugas are contemporaneous Danish royal seals; I am thankful for this remark.

Nevertheless, it is hard to prove that the seal is a forgery because (1) the document itself is believed to be authentic, Maleczyński, 10; (2) all Mindaugas' charters refer to a royal seal, consequently he used it.; (3) there is no clear reason to forge this seal; and (4) though the *transumpta* describe of the cords as white and yellow, the ones that survived are white and blue, nevertheless, Maleczyński assumes that the seal is authentic and the cords could have been changed, *ibid.*, 8.

¹⁷⁰ *LUB*, 1: no. 286, 371-2; *Selonia* in Latin original, *Sela* in Lithuanian.

¹⁷¹ Looking at the photograph from a certain angle the probable letter can be identified with "R." Gumowski quotes the *transumpta* from 1392 and 1393 according to which the inscription accordingly read: *MYNDOWE DEI GRA REX LETTOWIE* and *MYNDOWE DEI GRA REX LITOWIE*, *ibid.*, 706.

mined type on the left side of/by the throne. The king wears a robe with a V-shape slightly decorated collar and a mantle folding on his lap. There is an open crown of a triangular shape with the trefoils on both sides on his head with semi-long hair in either side of the muddled face. He has a lily-sceptre in his right hand resting on his leg and an orb with a cross of tight dots in his stretched right.

The archaeological data testifies to the seal that can be ascribed to Mindaugas and explained as that used for the internal affairs. This is the lead seal found in Novgorod and according to the Cyrillic inscription *Mengdov'* attributed to Mindaugas.¹⁷² Nevertheless, it is hardly provable that the seal of majesty could have been executed in Lithuania unless following a pattern. The traditional comparison leads to Livonia; however, no royal seals were manufactured there. Therefore, the Livonian sources can be considered searching for parallels in execution as the German material¹⁷³ for the iconographic ones.

In comparison with the seals of the Holy Roman emperors and German kings¹⁷⁴ the seal of King Mindaugas follows the traditional pattern of the contemporary seals of majesty, however, demonstrates a particular difference in details, the most significant are as follows: (1) none of the contemporaneous German seals has a decorated background¹⁷⁵; (2) the crown is of a unique shape¹⁷⁶; and (3) the sceptre-lily is extraordinary huge.¹⁷⁷ Moreover, gestures of the king are very "advanced" for the thirteenth-century Lithuania: the same pattern has been introduced only in the most contemporaneous German examples,¹⁷⁸

¹⁷² Pašuta, 224.

¹⁷³ The German examples are chosen here because of the Holy Roman Empire (despite the fact of interregnum) was considerably more influential in the region than other countries.

¹⁷⁴ This comparison was made on the basis of the seals published in Otto Posse, *Die Siegel der deutschen Kaiser und Könige von 751 bis 1806*, vol. 1, *Von 751 bis 1347, von Pippin bis Ludwig den Bayern*, vol. 2, *1347 - 1493, von Karl IV. bis Friedrich III. Mittelalterliche Fälschungen Landfriedensiegel* (Dresden: Verlag von Wilhelm Baensch, 1909-10; reprint, n.p.: n.p., n.d.).

¹⁷⁵ The decoration of a similar pattern of cross-hatching for the first time appears on the background of the seal of King of Bohemia Wenceslas (1376-1419), *ibid.*, 2: table 9.5 (4/06/1373), the ones of the Emperor Sigismund (1410-37), *ibid.*, table 13.3 (14/01/1420), table 14.1 (4/07/14110), and table 16.3-4 (n.d.).

Such a background appears on Polish seals earlier, e.g., the seal of Duke Kasimir of Kujawie from 1236, Marian Gumowski, *Handbuch der polnischen Siegelkunde* (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt, 1966), table 17.216.

¹⁷⁶ Parallels for such a crown could be the crown as depicted on the seal of Friederich II (1198-1250), Posse, 1: table 27.3 (26/09/1212); and the one on a false seal of Konrad III (1138-1152), *ibid.*, 2: table 49.1-2 (1143). However, the latter is not as exact in shape as the crown on the seal of Mindaugas.

¹⁷⁷ The close parallel is the same false seal of Konrad III, *ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ The examples of the same gesture, the stretched hand with an orb and the hand with the sceptre placed on the leg, appear on the seal of Konradin (d. 1268), *ibid.*, 1: table 33.4 (6/11/1266) and

Mindaugas dei gra Dux Rex Lettowie. Inuisis xpi fidelib' ad quos p'ens scriptu puenit salute in filio dei viui.
 Cum dilecti nobis in xpo mag' et fr'es dom' s'e mag' theuroy in Lyonia sua fidei ac diligencia p'suasion'e de
 nob' genat' nos uocant' ut cu' certis xpi fidelib' uicarijs lumen eo leui agnosce' ual'et' et eor' auxilio mediante d'ni
 ap'ic' nos uenisa fecit per uide' suam baptismalis et de sua solita clemencia nos in regem uocauit Lettowie
 fecit coronari. Cum itaq' uigilante sollicitudine meditarem' quid ad eisdem regi' suadendam et p'ectorem nobis
 ap'inet fide' p'p'et' oculata nobis fore ualde necessarium ac proficuum fidei xpiane q'm' circa memo
 rari' mag' et fr'es de Lyonia donatores regas facerem'. licet tam eor' p'iculis ordo ad huiusmodi
 ecclesie singulare subsidium a d'no sic felix' institutus ut ipi in assistendo nobis eo fore ualeant for
 ces et nos eo liberius ac potencius impugnantib' regni n'ri fidei q' rebellib' resistere ualeam'. et cum eam
 nemo cogitur suis s'p'endijs militare de consensu heredum n'ror' p'cis mag' et fr'ib' in Lyonia terrarum
 que Seley di' uidel' Gedden. Polone. Gallesime. Chorrare cum suis actinencij. ducim' assignandam p'p'uo libe
 possidendam. In cui' itaq' facti p'henem remanet' p'ntem paginam sigilli n'ri manu' fecim' roborare. Dat' anno d'ni
 m. cc. l. v. mense Octobri.



(Fig. 1).¹⁷⁰ Mindaugas' parchment certifying the donation of Sellonia, 1255. GStAPK, XX.HA Hist. Sta Königsberg, Schiebl. LS XI Nr. 9

(Fig. 2) The seal of King Mindaugas. Recto

(Fig. 3) The seal of King Mindaugas. Verso



as the earlier seals of majesty depict rulers symmetrically. Briefly, the seal of the Lithuanian king corresponds to the pattern of the seals of Germanic rulers of the second half of the thirteenth century, however, its shape suggests that it was not executed in that circle.

Considering the Livonian material¹⁷⁹ this seal is closer in its oval shape to the late-thirteenth-century seals of the archbishops of Riga,¹⁸⁰ however there are no hints to relate Mindaugas' seal with any assumed Livonian workshop.

There is an opinion in the scholarship that the closest examples for the seal of Mindaugas, considering its shape and size, are the contemporaneous Danish royal seals.¹⁸¹ However, so far no more precise connection is established.

TEN YEARS OF THE LITHUANIAN KINGDOM, 1253-1263

THE STATE

Formally, a kingdom can be defined as a territory with a population within certain boundaries, legitimately governed and administered by a monarch, a king or a queen, and recognised internationally as a unit of a certain integrity.

Concerning the territory in which early Lithuanian statehood was expressed, it is possible to assert that the source evidence and its scholarly interpretations do testify to the territorial criterium despite the fact that modern scholarship finds exact localisation of the borders difficult. Nevertheless, it can be concluded from Mindaugas' land grants¹⁸² describing donated territories that the Lithuanian Kingdom consisted of internal administrative units with more or less defined boundaries.¹⁸³

In the sense of statehood, the territorial concept is meaningless without any indication of the authority in power there. The implementation of the rule is related to its legitimacy and, consequently, its recognition; the legitimation of authority implies the claim of a ruler of having an established consent with the ruled. In the context of medieval monarchy, such a consent is expressed by the hereditary or elective succession of the rulers, executed according to commonly accepted law or custom and also recognised internationally. As it was mentioned previously, Mindaugas gained the position of sovereign by force, and afterwards he did succeed in expelling and later subjugating his principal rival Tautvila.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, throughout this process a significant role was played by the Livonian Order. As for the legitimacy, or more precisely, the inner recognition of his rule, which occurred gradually, it must be noted that Mindaugas' authority did not stem from his recognition on the national level, but from the approval and support of international powers. In short, it can be concluded that the first Lithuanian monarchy was established

by means of a power of domestic origin in alliance with Teutonic military and diplomatic resources, altogether protected by the papacy.

State authority is above all manifested in its governing activities which are revealed in the established order of the country. One type of these activities, economy, is decisive for the survival of a state, but there is practically no direct evidence to demonstrate the functioning of a tax and tribute system in the Lithuanian Kingdom. However, as the collection of tribute did occur earlier among the Baltic and Ruthenian population¹⁸⁵; it can be assumed that this system survived until Mindaugas' state since no consistent alternative source of income can be found in the records. The consequent assumption that Mindaugas' administration relied upon representatives collecting taxes in the form of tribute seems reasonable, as it is unlikely that his state could have been financed exclusively from the estates of Mindaugas or his kinsmen.¹⁸⁶

Despite the speculative character of the assumptions on the economic functioning of the Lithuanian Kingdom, one more feature demonstrating its internal structure and testifying to certain fiscal resources is the state's military capacity. In spite of the strong and multi-faceted influence of the Livonian Order, those of Mindaugas' troops that raided Ruthenian territories were generally local warriors. This conclusion is derived from the fact that the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, when mentioning Lithuanian warfare in Black Ruthenia, uses the specific word "Lithuanians" but when describing any of the military activities in which the Teutonic Knights participated as allies, the chronicler/s indicate them as "Germans."¹⁸⁷

those of Richard (1257-1272), *ibid.*, table 36.2 (n.d.) and table 37.3 (16/08/1268), and clearly starting with the seals of Rudolf I (1273-1291), *ibid.*, table 40.4-5 (14/07/1274 and 8/12/1268) and table 41.1, 4, and 6 (n.d., n.d., and 27/12/1282).

¹⁷⁹ Joh. Sachssendal, *Siegel und Münzen der weltlichen und geistlichen Gebietiger über Liv-, Est- und Curland bis zum Jahre 1561*, in *Est- und Livländische Brieflade*, ed. Baron Robert von Toll, vol. 4 (Reval: In Commission bei Kluge und Stroem, 1887).

¹⁸⁰ Cf., *ibid.*, table 23, figs. 6, 8, and 9.

¹⁸¹ I am thankful for Dr. Edmundas Rimša for this information.

¹⁸² Maleczyński, tables I - II, 58-60.

¹⁸³ E.g., Mindaugas grants Bishop Christian half of the land of Raseiniai, half of Betygala, and half of Laukuva: *Rassegene mediatem, Bettgallen mediatem, Lokowe mediatem, LUB*, 1: no. 263, 345.

¹⁸⁴ The principal rival of Mindaugas for the supreme authority recognised Mindaugas' superiority after 1255, and was entitled to rule over Polotsk as it appears from the invitation he received from Treniota after Mindaugas' murder, *PLDR*, 348-9, 358-9.

¹⁸⁵ E.g., Semigallians paying taxes for the Livonian Order, *LRCh*, 47.

¹⁸⁶ The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* bears evidence that boyars granted maintenance for the governing duke, *PLDR*, 288-9.

¹⁸⁷ E.g., Order's military help to Tautvila, *ibid.*, 320-1.

Moreover, from the records about the Lithuanian army leaders, it can be deduced that there was a certain military system featuring an established organisation and hierarchy.

The international political orientation of Mindaugas' state was expressed in the following activities: alliance and subsequent peace with the Livonian Order, warfare in order to control Black Ruthenia, and quite unsettled contacts with Galicia-Volhynia. The internal policy was predominantly manifested in the increasing strength of the king's suzerain rights over the minor duchies of Nalšia, Deltuva, Neris, and the land of Šiauliai, and the neglect of Samogitian affairs.¹⁸⁸

Besides these constructive characteristics of the state, a more or less abstract notion as a binding quality must be searched for and discussed. Internationally, Lithuania emerged as a state under Christian rule.¹⁸⁹ A close alliance between secular and sacred powers is believed to have been essential for medieval statehood. Although it remains unclear to what extent this was understood by Mindaugas; it is obvious that he knew it to be some sort of formal requirement for Western-European-type kingship. The creation of the Lithuanian bishopric and Mindaugas' role in its foundation is the best documented case which illustrates his perception of the requirements of statehood.

Briefly, just after Mindaugas' baptism, most probably in connection with the Lithuanian embassy to the pope, Innocent IV became concerned with the establishment of the Church structures in Lithuania. Between the 15 and 17 of March 1251, there were five letters issued in relation to Mindaugas' affairs,¹⁹⁰ four of them concerned ecclesiastical matters in Lithuania. The person chosen to be in charge of these affairs was Bishop Heidenreich: he was authorised to assist in establishing the Lithuanian bishopric, consecrate a bishop for it, and send priests and prelates¹⁹¹ to convert the heathens. Moreover, Innocent IV indicated that the newly-consecrated bishop should swear an oath of direct dependence on the papacy.¹⁹² The bishops of Oesil and Curonia were nominated to guard the papal privileges which the Lithuanian Church province had received.¹⁹³

However, during the following two years no Lithuanian bishop was consecrated. Ivinskis assumed that the delay was due to the ambitions of Albert Suerbeer, who had recently become the archbishop of Livonia and Prussia and wanted to subject the Lithuanian province to his archbishopric.¹⁹⁴ The case of the Lithuanian bishop was renewed after Mindaugas' coronation: on 24 July 1253, on the basis of Mindaugas' request, Innocent IV wrote to Archbishop Albert asking him to consecrate a bishop for Lithuania, chosen according to the ruler's preference.¹⁹⁵ In the subsequent authorisation, dating from 21 August 1253, the pope referred to Brother Presbyter Christian as candidate proposed by Mindaugas.¹⁹⁶ Christian was con-

secrated bishop of Lithuania in the late summer 1253; however, it became clear from Mindaugas' complaints¹⁹⁷ that the procedure neglected the papal order of an independent bishopric. Therefore, an impartial party in the person of the bishop of Nuremberg was chosen to receive the new oath of Christian.¹⁹⁸

¹⁸⁸ Some scholars suppose that Mindaugas was playing a duplicitious game in Samogitia: he donated practically the whole land to the Livonian Order; however, secretly supported Samogitian resistance against the Teutonic rule, Ivinskis, *Lietuvos istorija*, 186.

¹⁸⁹ Christianity of Mindaugas is a separate scholarly issue characterised by the descriptions of Mindaugas as a cunning heathen using Catholic baptism as a political mean, to the opinion that he was a true Christian and his apostasy was only Livonian interpretation. However, modern scholars tend to show the king as a syncretic person, who as a medieval person was essentially religious and united principles of local beliefs with Christian ones, Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 109. Actually, in Lithuania, heathen beliefs and rites were used jointly with Christian ones till the late sixteenth century and even later, Marceli Kosman, "Pogaństwo, Chrześcijaństwo i synkretyzm na Litwie w dobie przedreformacyjnej" (Paganism, Christianity, and syncretism in Lithuania before the Reformation), *Komunikaty Mazursko-Warmieńskie* (1972): 132-5.

¹⁹⁰ Potthast, 2: nos. 14350-4, 1185.

¹⁹¹ *Nos paterno volentes affectu, ut ipsa, . . . , mandamus quatinus . . . Episcopo et prelatibus ac Rectoribus ecclesiarum, qui fuerint in Lithuania constituti, VMPL, 1: no. 101, 49; tibi auctoritate committimus, quatinus virum honestum et providum, ac in spiritualibus et temporalibus circumspectum, qui pontificali conveniat oneri et honori, predictae Lithoviae auctoritate nostra preficias in episcopum et pastorem, ac duobus vel tribus accersitis episcopis, sibi munus consecrationis impendas, ibid., no. 105, 50.*

¹⁹² *. . . postquam de prefato episcopo, quem soli Romano pontifici volumus subiacere, provisum fuerit iuxta mandati nostri tenorem, tu ab ipso fidelitatis iuramentum nostre et ecclesie Romane nomine recipias iuxta formam, quam sub bulla nostra tibi mittimus interclusam, ibid.*

¹⁹³ *Quocirca mandamus, quatinus dictum Regem non permittatis super hiis contra protectionis, constitutionis et inhibitionis nostre tenorem ab aliquibus indebite molestari, ibid., no. 103, 49.*

¹⁹⁴ Ivinskis, *Lietuvos istorija*, 174.

¹⁹⁵ *. . . personam providam et honestam, ac in spiritualibus et temporalibus circumspectam, que sit accepta dicto Regi, cum super hoc ab ipso requisitus extiteris, eidem ecclesie auctoritate nostra preficias in Episcopum et Pastorem, et associatis duobus vel tribus convicinis episcopis, ei munus consecrationis impendas, faciens sibi a subditis obedientiam et reverentiam debitam exhiberi, contra recepturam ab eo postmodum pro nobis et ecclesia Romana fidelitatis solite iuramentum iuxta formam, quam tibi sub bulla nostra mittimus inclusam, VMPL, 1: no. 111, 53.*

¹⁹⁶ *Postmodum autem idem rex per literas, affectione plenas, petivit a nobis, ut de fratre Christiano de domo Theutonicorum in Livonia, viro utique litterato, provido et honesto, quem secum tempore suae conversionis habuit, et iuxta se in futurum habere desiderat, praedictae provideri ecclesie faceremus, LUB, 1: no. 254, 337.*

¹⁹⁷ That it was Mindaugas who informed the pope about the unacceptable consecration is clear from the pope's answer informing him about the reconsecration of Bishop Christian, *LUB, 1: no. 272, 354.*

¹⁹⁸ *Volumus tamen, quod ille venerabili fratri nostro, episcopo Nuenburgensi, cui super hoc scripta nostra dirigimus, exhibeat*

Mindaugas' successful efforts to establish a Lithuanian bishopric independent of the archbishop of Riga could be interpreted in two ways: either as a manifestation of his political acumen or as the outcome of the territorial disputes between the Livonian Order and the Archbishop of Riga.¹⁹⁹ From a survey of documents and the circumstantial evidence, the second alternative seems more probable; moreover, since it is known that the Lithuanian bishop was a brother presbyter in the Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order.

From this description Mindaugas' endeavours concerning the Church organisation, it can be deduced that the Lithuanian king did indeed formally correspond to the requirements of a Christian monarch: he succeeded in the establishment a Lithuanian province of the Roman Church responsible only to the pope and received a bishop according to his own preference (using a right ? of a monarch to influence Church affairs), providing him with land and tithe.²⁰⁰ Despite the fact that Mindaugas officially supported the Church, it is hard to trace any practical actions on his part for its benefit. The land grant for Bishop Christian which reads that the bishop himself must take land assigned into his possession,²⁰¹ can be interpreted that no royal assistance was provided, if literary interpretation of this document is assumed valid. The sole evidence about the inner structure of the bishopric can be derived from the document issued by Bishop Christian in which he refuses of the tithe from the lands that Mindaugas had donated to the Livonian Order.²⁰² In conclusion, King Mindaugas officially proved himself as a Christian ruler although he did not endeavour to strengthen the position of the Catholic Church in his realm.²⁰³

pro nobis et ecclesia Romana fidelitatis solitae iuramentum, iuxta formam litterarum, quam super hoc transmissimus archiepiscopo memorato, ibid., 354-5.

¹⁹⁹ On the conflict between the Livonian Order and the Archbishop of Riga, see William L. Urban, *The Baltic Crusade*, 2d ed. revised and enlarged (Chicago, IL: Lithuanian Research and Studies Center, 1994), 237-9 and 291-3.

²⁰⁰ Mindaugas granted lands to Bishop Christian on 12 March 1254, *LUB*, 1: no. 263, 345.

²⁰¹ . . . mittentes ipsum [Christianum] in corporalem possessionem, *ibid.*

²⁰² On 6 April 1254, . . . dimittimus decimam terrarum illarum [fratrum domus sanctae Mariae Theutonicorum] quas ab illustri principe, domino Mindowe, rege Lettowiae, possident, *ibid.*, no. 266, 348-9.

²⁰³ Concerning the issue of the Lithuanian bishopric it should be remembered that in 1253 a Dominican friar Witus was consecrated Bishop of Lithuania by the Archbishop of Gniezno. However, there is no reliable evidence that he ever visited the country, and such a possibility that could be derived from the lost letter *De christianorum in Lithovia conditione deplorabili ad S. et B.P.D. Innocentium pp. IV* that was attributed to him in M. Wiszniewski, *Historia literatury polskiej* (The history of Polish literature), vol. 2 (Cracow, 1840), 158; however, it is be-

lieved to have been forged by Polish Dominicans claiming for old missionary activities in Lithuania, quoted from Kosman, "Poganstwo," 110. Nevertheless, modern Polish Catholic scholars argue for its authenticity, Stopka, "Próby chrystianizacji Litwy w latach 1248 - 1263" (The attempts to Christianise Lithuania during the years 1248 - 1263), *Analecta Cracoviensia* 19 (1987): 52. In 1255 Pope Alexander IV officially permitted him to refuse the bishopric, however, he retained a title of bishop of Lithuania, *MPV*, 3: no. 73, 39.

On the other hand, there are possibilities of tracing Church assistance in Mindaugas' administration. Generally, the medieval Latin Church was that particular institution which provided literate people. In the Lithuanian case one can assume that those brothers and priests that the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* mentions as being left in Lithuania to preach and teach the people²⁰⁴ stayed at the ruler's court and also provided help in establishment of Western contacts of the young kingdom. On the basis of Karol Maleczyński's research²⁰⁵ it is even possible to trace certain connections of Lithuanian administration with the neighbouring Church institutions. Having convincingly argued for the authenticity of five of Mindaugas' documents, Maleczyński analysed their paleography, diplomatics, and dictation style. General paleographic characteristics demonstrate an advanced²⁰⁶ Western-European type of script and on the basis of several examples²⁰⁷ can be related to the script as used in contemporaneous Teutonic documents.²⁰⁸ An examination of the dictation style revealed the influences of the chancellery of Bishop Heinrich of Curonia.²⁰⁹ As for diplomatics, all the documents but one²¹⁰ follow the most popular contemporaneous formular, starting with the *intitulatio* and omitting the *invocatio*.²¹¹

Despite evident influence of the Teutonic Order on Mindaugas' chancellery, the consistent copying of the documents can indicate that the chancellery was more likely functioning at the Lithuanian court,²¹² in contrast to Gudavičius opinion that the documents were written in Livonia.²¹³ Such an assumption can be supported by the following arguments: there were priests and Teutonic Brothers in Lithuania²¹⁴ and at the ruler's court²¹⁵ and it

²⁰⁴ After the coronation Master Andreas "left priests and Brothers in Lithuania and ordered them to teach / the people, so that they would eventually be blest," *LRCh*, 48.

²⁰⁵ Maleczyński, 1-60.

²⁰⁶ Gothic minuscule was not yet used in other parts of the region in the mid-thirteenth century, *ibid.*, 11.

²⁰⁷ E.g., the land grant of 1257, *LUB*, 1: no. 294, 382.

²⁰⁸ Maleczyński, 10.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 10, 12, 40.

²¹⁰ *LUB*, 1: no. 287, 372-3.

²¹¹ Maleczyński, 12-3.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 39.

²¹³ Gudavičius, "Mindaugo karūnavimas," *Voruta* 24 (16-31 December 1991): 2.

²¹⁴ *LRCh*, 48.

²¹⁵ E.g., Siebert of Thuringia, *ibid.*, 80.

was a practice in early medieval monarchies that priests also served as royal scribes²¹⁶; the consistent copying of formulaic structure of the documents²¹⁷ indicates the existence of a primitive chancellery unlike that of the Teutonic Order.

When analysing various aspects in which the Lithuanian Kingdom was manifested, the crucial role of the Livonian Order becomes evident. Although internationally recognised, Mindaugas' monarchy was quite weak and seems to have been incapable of functioning without the Livonian help. In some aspects the Lithuanian Kingdom can be discussed as a kind of a crusader state, like the ones manifested in the Holy Land and later in Prussia. Especially, considering Bernard Ulrich Hucker's assumptions about the plans of foundation of a kingdom that the Lippe family cherished during the 1220s,²¹⁸ a kind of shift in the idea of a crusader state could be observed: if in the case of the Near East the occupied territories were consolidated into kingdom through the coronation of a representative of a European royal family,²¹⁹ the attempts of the bishop of Sengallia, Bernard of Lippe, were directed at the land actually governed, intending to establish a state on the basis of the lands assigned to his bishopric, and authorising his son Hermann to govern there.²²⁰ The persistent and finally successful efforts of the Teutonic Order to found a state in Prussia should also be remembered²²¹; and in such a context the coronation of Mindaugas and the Lithuanian Kingdom could be seen as manifesting Livonian intentions leading to a new type of a crusader state, embodied by the shift from the state as a camp of conquerors, to the one established through alliance with and support of the actual local potentate.

Though highly speculative this idea can be advocated by the interpretation of documentary evidence. Maleczyński had proved to be a forgery the document issued in the name of Mindaugas entitling the Livonian Order to inherit the Lithuanian Kingdom in the case of king's death without heirs,²²² and considering the circumstantial evidence suggested that it could have been forged around 1270 in connection with the death of Shvarno Danylovych.²²³ In such a context the interpretation that the Livonian Swordbrothers utilised a possibility to legitimate their ambitions to the Lithuania state which was created by means of their resources yet not actualised as their possession seems reasonable.

By the same token, it should be noted that the role of having been the initiator of Lithuanian monarchy has been justly attributed to Mindaugas. And the supposition that Mindaugas "commissioned" the Livonian Order to assist in his claims for the supreme power is not without basis. If interpreted formally, a simple commercial pattern in the Lithuanian-Livonian relations can be observed: on the

one hand, the Swordbrothers provided Mindaugas military and diplomatic help and, on the other, he granted them with lands. Thus, longer silence of the sources about such payments, as it appear between the years 1255 and 1259, could partially prove a certain independent development of the monarchy, although the renewed "contracts" stand for its failures. The assumption follows that Mindaugas sought a sovereign monarchy, though probably he could not realise these ambitions without the Livonian help. This could be well illustrated by the situation after which the land donation followed: the renewed donation of Sellonia in 1259 occurred after the Tatar incursion under the leadership of Burundaj in 1258 - 1259 which devastated not only southern, meaning peripheric, parts of Lithuania but also reached Mindaugas' patrimonial domain, or Lithuania in the narrow sense.²²⁴

From the aforepresented instances it can be deduced that after 1255 Mindaugas' rule developed towards a successful establishment of the monarchy, although the state was still incapable to cope with major problems by its own resources, or, to be more precise, by the resources allied to the Lithuanian ruler.

On the other hand besides the already mentioned actions that the Livonian Order performed, it is hard to specify any other aspects of these Livonian-Lithuanian relations: during the period discussed no major military conflicts occurred, Lithuanian foreign policy was quite inactive, thus, there are no particular records illustrating the functioning of this alliance.

In conclusion, despite the initial weakness of Mindaugas' rule over Lithuania, it later developed towards the traditional national state and Mindaugas became a kind of preferred authority on the domestic level and was recognised by the Slavic population in the territories under the Lithuanian rule. Becoming a king of Lithuania, actually being empowered only over a part of the country

²¹⁶ E.g., in the tenth-century England, Stephen C. Rowell, "A pagan's word: Lithuanian diplomatic procedure 1200-1385," *Journal of Medieval History* 18 (1992): 150.

²¹⁷ Cf., documents as presented in tables I - II, Maleczyński, 58-60.

²¹⁸ Bernard Ulrich Hucker, "Liv- und estländische Königspläne?" in *Studien über die Anfänge der Mission in Livland*, ed. Manfred Hellmann, *Vorträge und Forschungen. Sonderband 37* (1989): 63-106.

²¹⁹ For various aspects of Latin monarchy in Jerusalem, see a collection of articles by Hans E. Mayer, as published in Section 1 "The Monarchy," id., *Kings and Lords in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Hampshire: Variorum, 1994).

²²⁰ Hucker, 74-5.

²²¹ On foundation of the state of the Teutonic Knights, see Urban, *The Baltic Crusade*, 157-8.

²²² *PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 91-3.

²²³ Maleczyński, 33.

²²⁴ On Burundaj's incursion, see *PLDR*, 348-9 and Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 124.

(his partimony and the lands allied with it from the period of the land confederation ?) while using military and political support of the Livonian Order and papal protections, Mindaugas, by the end of his rule managed to establish an essentially primitive monarchy, yet formally corresponding to its traditional characteristics.

MINDAUGAS' COURT

In the discussions of the Lithuanian monarchy, the immediate surroundings of Mindaugas have been left aside. Therefore, the evidence for the "court" life of the Lithuanian king will now be defined and examined.

For the persons in the proximity of Mindaugas, those who appear in the documents and narrative sources, their position, relationship with the ruler, and their characterisation should be analysed. The first hint of these persons is the reference to the "royal council" which can be assumed from the following land grants of: July 1253 made with *auxilio et consilio nobis ac regni nostri legitimis successoribus*²²⁵; October 1255 made *de consensu heredum nostrorum*²²⁶; and the one issued *praesentibus et consentientibus filiis nostris Replen et Gerstuchen* on 12 March 1254.²²⁷ It can be suggested that in the first two grants, Mindaugas' sons were meant as heirs and successors, a highly probable assumption with no evidence to contradict it. Thus, the activities of Mindaugas' four sons should be once more summarised: it is known that Vaišelga was Mindaugas' "coregent" in Black Ruthenia and on the basis of toponymical evidence it is possible to assume that Ruklys also had possessions in Lithuania²²⁸; apparently, Repeikis and Gerstukas were at the court in 1254 and agreed with these royal donations. Therefore, it can be concluded that the most significant matters of state and rule were decided among the male representatives of Mindaugas' family.

In the previous inquiry into the Lithuanian royal family also the role of Mindaugas' spouse, Queen Martha,²²⁹ was ignored. Although the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* quite frequently refers to the queen, her one-sided portrayal suggests that Martha, as she appears in the *Chronicle*, is more a poetic construction than a real person. Still, her image as a truly Christian queen could be real since she is the only person at the Lithuanian court bearing a Christian name. Ivinskis' hypothesis that she received it when she was baptised together with Mindaugas²³⁰ cannot be proved by the source evidence; hence, Gudavičius' assumption that Mindaugas' wife at the baptism in 1251 and the one at the coronation in 1253 were not the same person.²³¹ This view leads to the presupposition that Queen Martha was not a convert but possibly originally a Christian. Moreover, the fact mentioned by the anonymous Irish missionary that Lithuanians, Nalsens, and Yatvigians were raised by Chris-

tian nurses²³² testifies to the possibility that Christians were not rare among the *familiae* of local potentates. Queen Martha's influence on Mindaugas' decisions is most probably a reality and should thus be considered. When describing Mindaugas' apostasy, the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* recounts the story about the queen's confessor, Siebert of Thuringia, who, upon Martha's request, was allowed to leave freely for Riga before the king "had all the Christians / in his lands seized and some slain."²³³ In the description of the following events, the Lithuanian queen embodies the Christian wife reproaching her ungrateful husband.²³⁴

It can be concluded that Mindaugas' family members formed the closest circle around the Lithuanian ruler: his adult sons were performing political roles having a kind of official status, and the queen had a certain influence on the king's decisions, though not the major ones.

However, a specific investigation of the family members does not provide a full picture about the people at Mindaugas' court. Therefore, the lists of witnesses that appear in Mindaugas' documents need to be examined. The principal problem occurring in connection to this inquiry is that the only list of non-Teutonic²³⁵ witnesses is included in the forged document of 1260.²³⁶ Yet, as the forged grants were created from the originals,²³⁷ the persons named as witnesses most probably were real. Among the witnesses listed which are important for this inquiry are the following persons: Mindaugas' brother-in-law Lengvenis and his *barones et consanguinei* Lygeikis, Štabe, Biksebune (probably Bikšys and Bunius), the dukes Gerdenis of Nalšia and Parbus of Neris, together with

²²⁵ *LUB*, 1: no. 252, 333.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 286, 371.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 263, 345.

²²⁸ Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 107.

²²⁹ *Morta* in Lithuanian.

²³⁰ Ivinskis, *Lietuvos istorija*, 171.

²³¹ Gudavičius, "1219 metų," 41.

²³² [12] *Dicti Lectaui Ietuesi et Nalsani de facili baptizantur eo quod a Christianis nutricibus ab ipsis cunabulis sunt enutrici*, Colker, 723.

²³³ *LRCh*, 80.

²³⁴ "I tell you, if you had followed me, you / would be happier now. The Master honoured you and your people / and also myself in all manner of ways. He had ornaments / befitting a king made for you, and he instructed his priests to / teach you true justice. Now you follow that ape, Traniate, who / has betrayed you. Change your mind and follow me, for your / own good," *LRCh*, 81.

²³⁵ The Teutonic witnesses are not under consideration here, because they are enumerated only in the land grant made after the coronation (*LUB*, 1: no. 252, 334) and their role at the court was episodic. For the second time the Teutonic witnesses appear in the forgery of 1260 (*PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 92-3) and it is just a repetition of the names mentioned in June 1253, Maleczyński, 31.

²³⁶ *PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 91-3.

Parbus junior, and Vege and Vesegele.²³⁸ Unfortunately, only three of these witnesses, namely Lengvenis, Gerdenis, and Parbus, are better documented persons. Lengvenis²³⁹ is also known to be valued ally of Mindaugas and Gerdenis, duke of Nalšia and Polotsk, was a vassal of Vaišelga.²⁴⁰ Parbus seems to have made his "career" at Mindaugas' court: from a faithful servant²⁴¹ to a wise chancellor,²⁴² becoming the duke of Neris who in later years appeared together with his son, Parbus junior. Based on the examples of Lengvenis and Parbus, it can be assumed that at Mindaugas' court there were persons not of high origin, probably relatives (*consanguinei*) and kismen or other allies (*barones*).

However, from the narrative sources a portrait of Treniota as the person closest to the king, a kind of "favorite," can be constructed. Treniota, a son of Mindaugas' sister,²⁴³ is first recorded in the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle*.²⁴⁴ From his characterisation it can be derived that Treniota appears in the environment of Mindaugas in the late 1250s, beginning his career as a military leader,²⁴⁵ and in the early 1260s he is noted as the person closest to the king in political affairs. The *Rhymed Chronicle*, when describing the Samogitian address to Mindaugas, reads: "the Samogitians / sent messengers into Lithuania to King Mindaugas and to / Traniate. They took the latter aside and asked him to lend his / support to their cause and insure its success. Traniate said to / them, 'Tell me your business'."²⁴⁶ This passage reveals that Treniota was already known to be an influential person at the court and the one known to risk influencing the king. However, it is hard to find an exact reason for such a behaviour: one

example is not enough to demonstrate that addressing the king through a mediator was the usual procedure at the Lithuanian court; moreover, it could simply be the case that the Samogitians looked for the influential person who was personally interested in the hostile relations with the Livonian Order.²⁴⁷

Sources mention the following military leaders of Mindaugas: his unidentified son,²⁴⁸ nephew Treniota,²⁴⁹ Khval, Sirvydas Ruškaitis,²⁵⁰ and an ally Ostafij Konstantinovich, a refugee from Riazan'.²⁵¹ Concerning the persons who are not Mindaugas' kinsmen, the latter three are worth attention. Nothing else except the fact that Khval is a Slavic name²⁵² and that he was killed in the area of Lutsk by the Galician-Volhynian troops can be derived from the sources.²⁵³ However, Sirvydas, mentioned only once, is an important figure because he belongs to the Ruškaitis family. The Ruškaitis appear in the 1219 Peace Treaty in the list of the Samogitian dukes²⁵⁴; thus, the participation of Sirvydas in the events of 1259 prove that Mindaugas had allies of Samogitian origin. As far as Ostafij Konsatntinovich, is concerned, an interpretation that "noble" refugees from the neighbouring lands could make political careers at the Lithuanian court is possible.

To conclude, Mindaugas was surrounded by persons who formed his circle, among which his sons had the highest official positions although there were also other relatives and probably unrelated people, from both Lithuanian and Ruthenian lands.

Concerning the diplomatic procedure at the Lithuanian court, little can be said based on the sources, despite the fact that there are records mentioning Lithuanian-Ruthenian²⁵⁵ or Lithuanian-Livonian agreements.²⁵⁶ Scholars note that Baltic heathen agreements were usually reinforced through oath-taking²⁵⁷; moreover, when making treaties with the Christians, they also performed the customary ritual of the other party.²⁵⁸ However, the records,

²³⁷ Maleczynski, 26-8.

²³⁸ The full list of witnesses is as follows: . . . *venerabilis dominus Culmensis episcopus et magister Andreas fratrum predicatorum ac fratres sui, Languinus sororius noster, Lygeyke, Sthabbe, Bixebune nostri barones et consanguinei, Parbusse de Nere, Gerdine de Naals, Vege, Vesegele ibidem et Parbusse iunior; de fratribus predicatoribus frater Sindaramus, de fratribus minoribus frater Adolphus et sui socii et alii quam plures*, *PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 92-3.

²³⁹ The indication of Lengvenis in the forgery is a valuable argument for the reality of the persons of other witnesses because, when starting his story dating ca. 1248, the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* written in 1290s introduces him saying 'his / name is well-known to many of you from old' (*LRCh*, 38) since Lengvenis was remembered later, it is probable that the enumeration of other persons was based on actual knowledge of the forgers.

²⁴⁰ Paçuta, 284, Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 156

²⁴¹ *LUB*, 1: no. 263, 345.

²⁴² *LRCh*, 48.

²⁴³ Treniota (*Traniate* in German, *Treniata* in Old Slavonic, *Trojnati Strojnat* in Polish); *i znaide sobie Treniatu, sestrichicha Mindovgova*, *PLDR*, 358.

²⁴⁴ *LRCh*, 79, *passim*.

²⁴⁵ On Treniota as military leader, see *ibid.*, 80, 84-6.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 79.

²⁴⁷ Gudavičius has demonstrated that in the record in the "Book of Depts of Riga" telling about a relative of Mindaugas whose wealth was seized by the Livonian Brothers and thus the conflict between them later developed into a war, most probably Treniota is meant, Gudavičius, "Ar Treniota," 64-5.

²⁴⁸ *PLDR*, 324-5.

²⁴⁹ *LRCh*, 80, 85-6

²⁵⁰ *Khval i Sirvid Rjushkovich*, *PLDR*, 342.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 354-5.

²⁵² Gudavičius, "Dėl lietuvių žemių konfederacijos susidarymo laiko" (On the time of formation of the confederation of Lithuanian lands), *Istorija* 24 (1984): 27.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 27-8.

²⁵⁴ *A zhemot'skyi kniazi: Erdvil, Vykynt, a Rush'kovichev - Kintibut', Vonibut, Vizhek, i syn ego Vishlij*, *PLDR*, 252.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 324-5, 334-5; *LRCh*, 80.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 47-8; the Livonian-Samogitian alliance, *ibid.*, 59-60.

²⁵⁷ Rowell, "A pagan's word," 148.

as Rowell puts it, "are largely chronographical descriptions of treaty making rather than the original diplomatic acts."²⁵⁹ As far as Mindaugas is concerned, the evidence of political gestures made by him or on his behalf records that the first step was sending messengers, frequently with gifts, to make a proposal²⁶⁰; the final ratification, in addition to the oath and, most probably, a writ, then included various consolidating gestures such as the following: the marriage of Mindaugas' daughter to Shvarno Danylovych²⁶¹; a gift-exchange between Mindaugas and the Livonian master²⁶²; the escorting as described in Mindaugas' farewell to Master Andreas.²⁶³

The *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* is the only source testifying to the reception of guests at the Lithuanian court; it is the description of the reception of the Livonian master at Mindaugas' residence.²⁶⁴ The author of the *Chronicle* stresses the great honour showed by the Lithuanian ruler and his wife to their guests. Of course, this record, as the whole *Rhymed Chronicle* in general, is intended to demonstrate the honour demonstrated to the Livonian Order; however, the fact that there is a favourable description of the reception, increases the probability that the heathen court of Lithuania followed a kind of commonly accepted etiquette.

The first evidence of Mindaugas' friendly contact with the Livonian Order is the record of Livonian military help at the battle of Voruta. The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* describes the course of the battle saying that Germans, on the one side, and Galicians, Polovtsians, and Yatviginas, on the other, were chasing each other as if in a game.²⁶⁵ The interesting fact is that the same description was included into the *Bykhovec Chronicle*, and translators of the *Chronicle* into Lithuanian, most probably following

Pashuto's interpretation,²⁶⁶ reflected this "game" as a tournament.²⁶⁷ Though it is hard to prove his interpretation, the fact is that the battle of Voruta must have been a peculiar military event and thus caused such an unusual description. Moreover, the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* attests a game/tournament held by Duke Rostislav in front of the town Jaroslavl',²⁶⁸ and hence a tournament could in fact have been a reality among the knightly orders. In conclusion, the description of the battle of Voruta proves that the Livonian troops not only supported Mindaugas but also introduced a new type of fight, but hardly a tournament.

A complete picture of court life cannot be created without a description of a royal residence. That Mindaugas possessed castles is evident from the sources: his land grants were issued *in curia*,²⁶⁹ and he hid in castles from the sieges.²⁷⁰ Unfortunately, the only place-name more concrete than Lithuania which is mentioned in the sources is Voruta castle.²⁷¹ Thus, the concrete localisation of any of Mindaugas' residence is impossible on the basis of present evidence yet some general assumptions can be proposed. Mindaugas' lands inherited from his father were in the south-eastern part of modern Lithuania²⁷²; consequently, the castles located there can be associated with him. There are several mounds bearing evidence of a residential-type castles excavated in the area. All the buildings were of timber and the living-quarters were located in one of the towers.²⁷³ Consequently, there is a possibility that Mindaugas resided in a similarly constructed castle. Besides this, excavations in the territory of the Lower Castle of Vilnius provided data of timber-houses and the remains of masonry buildings in the place of the later grand ducal palace.²⁷⁴ Moreover, considering the fact that the church was also erected here, it is possible to relate these data to a probable residence of Mindaugas.

To conclude, during the ten years of existence of the Lithuanian Kingdom, the particular events that are recorded in the sources fit the common practice of a ruling court, albeit in primitive and undeveloped form.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 147-8.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 148.

²⁶⁰ *PLDR*, 320-1, 322-3, 324-5; *LRCh*, 47, 80, 88.

²⁶¹ *PLDR*, 334-5.

²⁶² Master Burckhart von Hornhausen "sent a gift to King Mindaugas of Lithuania, and this / pleased him greatly. / Nor did Mindaugas forget the Master. In return he gave him a / fine gift and greeted him in writing, and there was a great / friendship between the two," *LRCh*, 58.

²⁶³ "Brother Andreas took / leave of his Brothers and rode to Lithuania to his friend / Mindaugas and the Queen. . . . / The king rode with Brother Andreas for a part of his journey and / then the Master took leave of Mindaugas in a worthy manner and / continued to Germany," *ibid.*, 49.

²⁶⁴ Master "was received by him (Mindaugas) as / befitting a lord. The Queen also went up to him and lovingly / welcomed him and all the Brothers who had come with / him. Afterward when it was time to eat, nothing proper to such / an occasion was omitted. They treated their guests well. After / they had eaten the meal and had been sitting around the table a / short time, the King thanked the Master of Livonia for coming / there to him," *ibid.*, 47.

²⁶⁵ . . . *gonishasia na poli podobnoj igrie*, *PLDR*, 322.

²⁶⁶ Pašuta, 277.

²⁶⁷ *Lietuvos metraštinė. Bychovco kronika* (The Lithuanian annals: the Bykhoviec Chronicle), ed. Rimantas Jastas [henceforth *BK*], Lituaništinė biblioteka 10 (Vilnius: Vaga, 1968), 56.

²⁶⁸ Original text: *Gordiaschchu zhe sia emu, i sotvori igru pered gradom*, *PLDR*, 308; cf., Russian translation: *Krasujas', on ustroil turnir pered gorodom*, *ibid.*, 309.

²⁶⁹ E.g., *datum in Lettowia in curia nostra*, *LUB*, 1: no. 252, 334.

²⁷⁰ *PLDR*, 322-3; *LRCh*, 46.

²⁷¹ *PLDR*, 322-3.

²⁷² Gudavičius, "Litva," 226.

²⁷³ *Lietuvos architektūros istorija* (The history of Lithuanian Architecture), vol. 1, *Nuo seniausių laikų iki XVII a. vidurio* (From the ancient times to the mid-seventeenth century), ed. Jonas Minkevičius (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987), 27-32.

THE SUCCESSORS OF MINDAUGAS

TRENIOTA (1263-1264)

The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* summarising the events following Mindaugas' murder tells that Treniota started to rule over the whole land of Lithuania and Samogitia. Then he is said to have invited Tautvila²⁷⁵ from Pinsk to share Mindaugas' inheritance and to have killed him. Thereafter, Treniota was killed by Mindaugas' stablemen.²⁷⁶

Treniota's episodic rule has become a frequent topic of inquiry in Lithuanian scholarship.²⁷⁷ However, the one aspect, the legitimacy of his succession, is of principal interest for the inquiry of this thesis. Gudavičius pointed out that there is a contradiction between Treniota's participation in the anti-Mindaugas plot and his successful claims to the throne inheritance; hence, concluding that the succession was arranged only among Mindaugas' kinsmen and that the most powerful of them won,²⁷⁸ since the only direct heir, Vaišelga, fled for Pinsk.²⁷⁹

In conclusion, in the immediate succession after Mindaugas' death the actual power of the candidate was decisive; however, the family relation leading to the proximity to the king during his life-time recognised his claim for succession legitimate. This conclusion contributes a possible explanation to the earlier described attempts of Mindaugas to establish the direct hereditary succession in Lithuania, apparently demonstrating that it had to be introduced and was not a custom of the country.

VAIŠELGA (1264-1267)

The *Galician-Volhynian* and the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* present nearly identical accounts of Vaišelga's return to Lithuania after Treniota's murder; however, only the Livonian author, although slightly mixing up the facts,²⁸⁰ indicated that a messenger was sent to invite him from the refuge.²⁸¹ The Galician-Volhynian scribes indicate that Vaišelga returned to Lithuania with the troops of Novgorodok, although Lithuanians greeted him happily, as the son of their lord,²⁸² he had to defeat many the enemies in Lithuania and later with the help of Shvarno Danylovych seized Deltuva and Našija.²⁸³ It must have been then the murderer of Mindaugas, Daumantas, fled with his people to Pskov.²⁸⁴

To conclude, the way in which Mindaugas' son established his rule indicates that despite the fact that he was a monk, Vaišelga kept an authoritative position in Black Ruthenia, and was almost immediately recognised in Lithuania (meaning Mindaugas' patrimony), even though he had to reestablish the inherited claim to rule over the Lithuanian minor duchies.

The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* does not mention any of Vaišelga's relations with Livonia, constantly stress-

ing his alliance with Vasyľ'ko and Shvarno; however, the *Rhymed Chronicle* records Vaišelga's immediate contacts with Master Conrad of Mandern.²⁸⁵ Moreover, the manner in which the Lithuanian-Livonian contacts were renewed is worth attention, since the *Chronicle* reads: Vaišelga "sent to the Master and asked / him to bring help, reminding him that he, too, was a Christian."²⁸⁶ The Livonian Order agreed to provide military support, though Vaišelga informed that it was no longer needed, he released the Christians imprisoned from Mindaugas' reign.²⁸⁷ Thus, good Lithuanian-Livonian relations were reestablished.

This evidence can be so interpreted that Vaišelga continued the initial Livonian policy of Mindaugas. He demonstrated himself as a Christian ruler, rectifying his father's mistake, and asked for the Swordbrothers' military support. However, the usual practice of a successive monarchy would assume the confirmation of donations and privileges of the predecessor,²⁸⁸ the silence of the sources about this being true during Vaišelga's reign does not imply that the Lithuanian-Livonian relations reached the status they had been during Mindaugas' reign.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 31.

²⁷⁵ In the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* Treniota calls Tautvila "brother," however this does not reflect their relation in reality. Most probably, they were cousins, or just close relatives, Gudavičius, "Ar Treniota," 63.

²⁷⁶ PLDR, 358-9.

²⁷⁷ The principal focus was the fact that the next Lithuanian ruler was of Samogitian origin. However, Gudavičius demonstrated that the Samogitian origin of Treniota is a creation of Maciej Strykowski and cannot be proved by the source evidence; moreover, the contemporaneous sources provide a single alternative, that Treniota was either Lithuanian or a person of unspecified origin, Gudavičius, "Ar Treniota," 67.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., 65-6.

²⁷⁹ PLDR, 359.

²⁸⁰ According to the *Livonian Rhymed Chronicle* Vaišelga was informed immediately after Mindaugas' murder (LRCh, 88). Gudavičius assumed that unprecise records in the *Chronicle* occurred because there was no Livonian informant at the Lithuanian court after Mindaugas' had expelled all the Christians from the country, Gudavičius, "Ar Treniota," 66.

²⁸¹ "When Mindaugas was murdered, the / best subjects immediately decided to send a messenger to Russia / to make the news known to Mindaugas' son," LRCh, 88.

²⁸² Litva zhe vsia prijasha i s radost'ju, svoego gospodichicha, PLDR, 358.

²⁸³ PLDR, 358-61.

²⁸⁴ Daumantas (d. 1299) left Lithuania for Pskov, was elected duke of Pskov, baptised an Orthodox, and recognised the St Timofey of the Russian Orthodox Church. For an elaborated study on Daumantas see S. C. Rowell, "Between Lithuania and Rus': Dovmont-Timofey of Pskov, his Life and Cult," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* (1992): 1-33, and also Artūras Dubonis, "Daumantas: nuodėmė ir šventas gyvenimas" (Daumantas: the sin and the saintly life), *Naujasis Židinys* 5 (1994): 50-8.

²⁸⁵ LRCh, 88.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Ibid.

The Lithuanian-Galician alliance seems to have been much firmer. According to the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* Vaišelga started ruling together with Shvarno. The former in Lithuania, the latter in Black Ruthenia.²⁸⁹ Later Vaišelga refused from the position of the ruler and returned to the monastic life leaving Shvarno in his place.²⁹⁰

Vaišelga was killed quite soon after his abdication by Lev Danylovych, who envied him leaving Lithuania to Shvarno.²⁹¹

SHVARNO DANYLOVYCH (1267-1269)

Very little is known about Shvarno's rule. Actually, the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* tells both events, Vaišelga's murder and the end of Shvarno's rule, in a sequence ending with Shvarno's death.²⁹² Although Shvarno's rule was short and did not cause any significant political changes, its precise dating and interpretation of the circumstances of its end are crucial for reaching conclusions also about Mindaugas' reign.

Gudavičius, comparing Polish and Novgorodian sources and considering the circumstantial evidence, came to the conclusion that Shvarno's death and the end of his rule in Lithuania are not the same event. His arguments are as follows: the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is extremely hostile towards Traidenis²⁹³; Lev inherited Kholm from Shvarno later than Traidenis started ruling over Lithuania²⁹⁴; in February 1270 Lithuanian army invaded Livonia,²⁹⁵ and this does not correspond to the tendencies of Shvarno's rule.²⁹⁶ From this evidence it can be concluded that Vaišelga kept to his oath to rule in Lithuania for three years, then turned the power over to Shvarno, returned to monastic life and was soon killed by Lev Danylovych. The date of Shvarno's expulsion from Lithuania more or less coincides with Vaišelga's death. Although unprovable, this coincidence leads to an interpretation that Vaišelga, if alive, could have been a guarantee for Shvarno's rule; and as soon as he perished, Shvarno's legitimate succession to the throne lost its basis. To strengthen the argument that Shvarno could have been considered as an heir of Mindaugas, one more evidence can be adduced of Mindaugas' heiress death.²⁹⁷ As neither the style nor the script of the forgery is related to any other of Mindaugas' documents, Maleczyński suggested that there is a time gap between the earlier forgeries and this one, hence it can be dated to the 1270s.²⁹⁸ Apparently, Shvarno as a successor was also recognised by the Livonian Order.

MINDAUGAS' LITHUANIA IN THE LATER RECORDS

The expulsion of Shvarno Danylovych from Lithuania marks the end of the rule of Mindaugas' dynasty.²⁹⁹ However, once recognised a kingdom, Lithuania retained this concept in medieval political thought. Moreover, it seems that there

were attempts to keep Lithuania as it was once established by Mindaugas': a heathen country under Christian rule.

On 20 January 1268 Pope Clement IV issued a bull in which Lithuania is treated as the heritage of Christian King Mindaugas, however Přemysl-Ottokar II is authorised to establish there a new Christian Kingdom.³⁰⁰ Bronisław Włodarski had suggested that Přemysl-Ottokar II intended to found a kingdom in Lithuania under the rule of a Polish duke.³⁰¹ These intentions did not result in a new Kingdom of Lithuania; however, Mindaugas' Lithuania survived and was referred to as a state; neither was it completely forgotten by the Grand Dukes of Lithuania.

In the letter to Pope John XXII, Grand Duke Gediminas calls Mindaugas his predecessor and blames the Teutonic Order to be at fault for his apostasy and disappearance of the Christian Kingdom of Lithuania.³⁰² Still it is hard to agree with Pashuto who interpreted word predecessor literally as indicating dynastic succession of the Lithuanian rulers.³⁰³ However, this self-perception of the grand duke as a successor of Mindaugas, was probably meant to indicate him in the same position of a ruler of legally the same country. Gediminas uses the same term *praedecessor* when referring to other grand dukes of Lithuania³⁰⁴ and his actual predecessor and brother Vytenis.³⁰⁵ In conclusion: once introduced, a concept of the Lithuanian state survived in both Western European and Lithuanian political thought.

²⁸⁸ Gudavičius, *Kryžiaus karai*, 149.

²⁸⁹ Actually the *Chronicle* reads that Vaišelga and Shvarno were coruling Lithuania, *kniazhachu Vojshejkovi vo Litvie i Shvarnovi* (PLDR, 362), and the fact that Shvarno was more or less constantly in Novgorudok (ibid.) and Vaišelga returned to his (Mindaugas'?) lands of Lithuania (ibid., 360-61) implies that Vaišelga stayed in Mindaugas' place and Black Ruthenia was under Shvarno's rule.

²⁹⁰ PLDR, 364-5.

²⁹¹ Ibid., 364-7.

²⁹² *Kniazhashchju she po Voishelkovi Shvarnovi v Litovskoj zemli, kniazhiv zhe liet nemnogo i tako priestavisia*, ibid., 366-67.

²⁹³ Traidenis (*Trojdej* in Old Slavonic, *Throiden* in German). The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* introducing the beginning of Traidenis rule reads: *Nacha kniazhiti v Litvie okan'nyj, i bezakon'nyj, prokliaty, nemilostivyy Trojdej, egozhe bezakon'ja ne mogokhom pisati srama rati. Tak bo biashet' bezakon'nik, jako i Antiokh Surskyj, Irod Erusalimskyj i Neron Rimskyj. I ina zliejshe toga bezakon'ja chiniashie*, ibid., 366.

²⁹⁶ *A Lev nacha kniazhiti v Galichie i v Kholmie po bratie svoem' po Sivarnie*, ibid., 366.

²⁹⁷ *LRCh*, 96-967.

²⁹⁸ *Godavičius, Kryžiaus karai*, 157.

²⁹⁹ *PUB*, 1.2: no. 106, 91-93.

³⁰⁰ *Maleczyński*, 33.

³⁰¹ There are two scholarly theories concerning dependance of Traidenis to Mindaugas' kindred: the first proposed by Pashuto and supported by Lithuanian scholars is based on the record in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* which recounts Lev Danylovych's warning of his son Jurij to beware of Lithuanian revenge for Vaišelga's murder (*PLDR*, 384-85), Pašuta, 290, 421. However, the first theory do not consider other record from the same *Chronicle* informing about good relations between Traidenis and Lev: *Trojdenivi zhe eshche kniazhachu v Litovskoj zemlie, zhiviashe so L'vom vo velichie ljubvi, shljuchi mnogy dary mezhi soboju*, *PLDR*, 365. The second theory is suggested by Michał Giedroyc basing on the *Bykhovec Chronicle* and attributes Traidenis to the house of Kentauras, Giedroyc, "The Rulers," 1-22. Though the first theory is derived from a more reliable yet contradicting source, the records about Treniota's rule, demonstrating a definite change of Mindaugas' political trend and convincing Giedroyc's argumentation, leaves the question open for scholarly investigation. Nevertheless, Traidenis' rule is not considered in this thesis as there is no source evidence that he had claimed to be an heir of Mindaugas' Lithuania.

³⁰² *Regi Boemie Illustri, . . . tibi auctoritate concedimus, ut si terram Letowie, de qua predictae sedis auctoritate Regnum extitit constitutum, presidente illi clare memorie Mindota, qui post receptum baptismatis sacramentum auctoritate apostolica coronatus in Regem fuit, tandem a quibusdam perditionis filiis crudeliter interfectus, de manibus inimicorum tuo ministerio eripi, domino prespstante, contigerit, in illa Regni solium, sicut prius, erigere libere valeas, ac illius regimini personam fidelem et ecclesie Romane devotam proficere, prout bono statui fidelium et augmento catholice fidei videris utilius expedire*, *VMPL*, 1: no. 151, 79.

³⁰³ *Godavičius, Kryžiaus karai*, 153.

³⁰⁴ . . . *praedecessor noster, rex Mindowe, cum toto suo regno ad fidem Christi fuit conversus, sed propter atroces iniurias et innumerabiles prodiditiones magistri fratrum de domo Theutonica omnes a fide recesserunt, Gedimino laiskai* (Gediminas' letters), ed. V. Pašuta and I. Štal [henceforth *GL*] (Vilnius: Mintis, 1966), no. 2, 23.

³⁰⁵ Pašuta, 421.

³⁰⁶ . . . *multociens praedecessores nostri nuntios suos dominis archiepiscopis Rigensibus miserunt pro pace facienda*, *GL*, no. 2, 23.

³⁰⁷ *Item praedecessor noster, rex Viten, misit litteras suas*, *GL*, no. 2, 25.

KARALIŠKUMO BRUOŽAI MINDAUGO IR JO ĮPĖDINIŲ DVARE

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama tryliktojo amžiaus šeštojo-septintojo dešimtmečio Lietuva, jos pirmasis valdovas karalius Mindaugas ir jo aplinka. Grįžtama prie temos, turinčios gausią istoriografiją, bei nevienąsyk cituotų šaltinių, tačiau ta pati medžiaga apibūdinama kitu aspektu. Pagrindinis darbo tikslas - panagrinti Lietuvos karalystės „karališkumą“. Karališkumas aptariamas bandant atsakyti į du klausimus: 1) ką reiškė būti karūnuotam to meto Lietuvoje ir 2) kokios buvo vainikavimo pasekmės krašto politikai ir kultūrai. Negausūs šaltiniai riboja tiesioginių atsakymų galimumą, todėl pirmojo Lietuvos valdovo karališkumas nagrinėjamas platesniame, valstybingumo kontekste. Dažnai šaltinių informacijos nepakanka, todėl siekiant aiškumo ir norint atverti didesnes galimybes diskutuoti, pasitelkiama lyginamoji medžiaga ir mokslinė literatūra.

Nepaisant daugelio valstybingumo charakteristikų, darbu aktualiausia valdžia ir valdymas. Valstybingumo primityvumas neleidžia konstruoti išsamesnio Lietuvos karalystės vaizdo, todėl įvardijami tik karališkosios valdžios bruožai, t.y. būdingiausias ir istoriografijoje priimtos tradicinės viduramžių karalystės charakteristikos. Svarbiausi karališkumo bruožai yra šie: sosto paveldėjimas tėviškąja linija, valdžios įtvirtinimas karūnavimo apeigomis, dvaro sukūrimas ir dinastinė įpėdinių politika. Reikia pabrėžti, kad šie bruožai suprantami siaurai, ir jų įvardijimas nereiškia to meto Lietuvos ir kitų kraštų kultūrinės terpės sulyginimo.

Siekiant platesnio konteksto bei hipotetinių paralelių pasitelkiama lyginamoji medžiaga, atrinkta remiantis šiais kriterijais: 1) laikotarpiu (trylikto amžius (taikytas su išlygomis, nes ne visi įvykiai buvo vienalaikiai Lietuvoje ir svetur), 2) politinė padėtimi (nesaugi valstybė lotyniškosios Europos pakaraštyje), 3) išoriniu veiksniu (popiežius ir priemonės - kryžiaus žygiai). Lietuvą lyginant su kitais kraštais reikia atminti, kad, skirtingai nuo jų, tryliktojo amžiaus Lietuva neturėjo ankstesnės krikščioniškosios bei valstybingumo tradicijos.

Daugelis Mindaugo epochos faktų, ypač tų, kurie aktualūs straipsnio temai, yra migloti ir daugiaprasmiai; todėl įvardijant karališkumo bruožus taikytas kiek dirbtinis metodas: remiantis medievistine literatūra, apibrėžti patys bruožai, o tik tada ieškota juos atitinkančių šaltinių. Tačiau tokia „atvirkštinė“ metodika pateisinama Lietuvos karalystės epizodiškumu: žvelgiant iš toliau, reikia pripažinti, kad pirmojo valdovo karališkumas nebuvo pratęstas, nepaisant to, kad karalystės sukūrimas tapo krašto valstybingumo priežlaida.