

<https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2491.2024.2211>  
UDC 80:94(477)"085/134":82-94

## GIFT OF THE HUNGARIAN QUEEN FROM KYIV: SWORD AS A METAPHOR

**Radvan D.V.**

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4227-3878>  
[radvandana@gmail.com](mailto:radvandana@gmail.com)



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

*The article will analyze records in chronicles about usage of sword in medieval Rus' in metaphorical context. Facts provided in the Tale of Bygone Years and the Radziwill Chronicle will be interpreted in connection with the record of Lampert of Hersfeld about the gift of the Attila's sword, made by the Hungarian Queen Anastasia to Otto, Duke of Bavaria, in the second half of the 11th century, in order to interpret metaphorical meanings conveyed with the help of sword and explain the unusual ceremonial choice of the Hungarian Queen in view of her origin from Kyiv.*

**Key words:** *medieval, symbol, Rus', sword, Hungarian Queen Anastasia, Holy Roman Emperor Heinrich IV*

**Радван Д.В. Дар угорської королеви з Києва: меч як метафора.** У статті проаналізовано записи хронік про використання меча у середньовічній Русі в метафоричному контексті. Факти, наведені у Повісті врем'яних літ і Радзивілівському літописі, будуть розглянуті у зв'язку із записом Ламперта з Херсфельду про дар угорської королеви Анастасії герцогу Баварії Отто у другій половині 11 ст., меч Аттилі, що дозволить інтерпретувати метафоричні повідомлення, які передавалися за допомогою меча, і пояснити незвичний церемоніальний вибір угорської королеви київського походження.

**Ключові слова:** *середньовічний, символ, Русь, меч, угорська королева Анастасія, імператор Священної Римської Імперії Генріх IV*

**Introduction.** Lampert of Hersfeld (1025 – ca. 1088) wrote in “Annales Hersveldenses” about the Hungarian Queen’s gift of the Attila’s sword to Duke Otto of Bavaria (Lamperti Annales, 1894, p. 130 10-16). The Queen expressed in this way her gratitude for Duke’s role in convincing King Heinrich IV of Germany

(1050-1106) to restore her son Salomon (1053–1087) to the Hungarian throne. The chronicler informed that Heinrich helped Salomon return to Hungary in 1063 (Lamperti Annales, 1894, p. 88 1–13).

Why did Queen Anastasia decide to give the Duke the precious sword as a sign of gratitude?

**Theoretical Background.** I.S. Robinson (2004) analyzed political circumstances leading to Anastasia's gift of sword. Ch. Mielke (2017) made a reconstruction of Anastasia's legacy in capacity of the Hungarian Queen based on preserved artefacts and primary and secondary sources, L.Zemplényi (2023) highlighted Queen Anastasia's role in developments in Hungary.

Christopher Mielke (2017) defined Anastasia's present as a diplomatic gift and outlined its extraordinary character: the gifts of sword were rare in the Middle Ages, and this particular case was even more specific because the gift had been made by a woman (Mielke, 2017, p.286). While Attila's alleged ownership of sword told for its exceptional value, the Queen's Kyivan background can provide additional insights into her choice of the sword as the gift.

**Methods.** The article will analyse records on symbolic usage of swords and interpretations of sword as metaphor in the primary sources (Historia of Priscus of Panions, Annales Lamperti, the Tale of Bygone Years, the Radziwiłł Chronicle) as well as the supporting evidence in the secondary sources.

**Results and Discussion.** Anastasia (d.1096?) was the daughter of King of the Rus' Yaroslav the Wise (r. 1016–1054) and his wife Ingegerd, the Swedish Princess (d.1050). Andreas Árpád, future King of Hungary (r. 1046–1060) spent some years in Rus' in exile. He returned to Hungary with the aid of his Kyivan host Yaroslav and gained the throne in 1046 (Hrushevsky, 1992; Nikodem, nd). The earliest extant Hungarian chronicle, Gesta Hungarorum, written by the Anonymous notary of King Béla III in the 12th century, recorded that King Andreas acquired for his wife, "filia ducis Ruthenorum" (Anonymus, 2010, pp. 43-44), the forest of Patak (Mielke, 2017, p. 223): "King Andrew exchanged that land with the descendants of Ketel for two reasons: first, because it was suitable to kings for hunting; secondly, because his wife liked to dwell in those parts because they were closer to her native soil, as she was the daughter of the prince of Rus'" (Anonymus, 2010, pp. 43-44). The motivation statement, written down in Gesta Hungarorum, tells for kings' respect for queen's habits and feelings. After the tragic death of King András on the battlefield and the victory of his rival brother Duke Béla, who usurped the Hungarian throne, the widowed Queen, together with

Salomon and Judith (b.1047), the daughter of Empress Agnes (ca.1024–1077) and Emperor Heinrich III (1017–1056) and sister of King Heinrich IV (she had been betrothed to Salomon in 1058 according to arrangement between Empress Agnes and King Andreas with approval of the German princes), found refuge at the German court (Robinson, 2004). The Queen requested military assistance from the neighbours and allies, the Bavarians and the Germans, to ensure return and succession of the throne for Salomon, whom Andreas declared King back in 1057, and whose rights were contested by uncle Béla (r. 1060-1063).

The successful military campaign to Hungary led by the thirteen-years-old Heinrich on Anastasia's request in 1063, was his first military expedition in the capacity of King of Germany. He was supported by Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, who participated in the campaign as his military advisor (Ward, 2019). Death of Béla and flight of his son Geisa led to bloodless transition of the throne to Salomon, who soon afterwards married Judith.

Empress Agnes (regent for her son Heinrich until spring 1062) conferred the Duchy of Bavaria to the Saxon noble Otto of Northeim in early 1061 (Robinson, 2004). Frutolf of Michelsberg (d.1103) in his "Chronica" characterised him as "a man of the most exalted nobility, whose prudence in military matters very few could equal and who was held in the highest regard by all the princes" (cited from Robinson, 2004, p. 35).

I.S.Robinson in "Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106" (2004) analyzed in detail the course of bilateral relations that resulted in the King's of Germany first expedition to Hungary. I.S.Robinson reflected on the reasons behind the royal gift to the Duke of Bavaria: "the prince who had been most energetic in promoting this expedition was Otto of Northeim, duke of Bavaria. That at least was the opinion of the Hungarian queen-mother Anastasia. "Since it was on [Otto's] advice and with his support that King [Henry] had restored her son to his father's kingdom", Anastasia conferred on him one of the most precious objects in the Hungarian treasury, the so-called "sword of Attila" (Lampert, *Annales*, 1071). Otto's enthusiasm for this campaign arose from the need, firstly, to secure the frontier of his newly acquired duchy of Bavaria and, secondly, to establish himself as the leader of the Bavarian nobility by means of a successful and profitable campaign" (Robinson, 2004, pp. 53-54).

The name of Queen Anastasia is connected with yet another royal attribute, the Monomachos crown, one of several extant precious gifts given by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (r. 1042-1055) to his foreign

allies. The crown was made of elaborate enamel plates with portraits of Constantine, his wife Zoe and sister-in-law Theodora, flanked by plates with personifications of Truth and Humility and courtly dancing girls wearing waving dresses. The portraits conveyed the idea of the ceremonial gift. The imperial crown worn by Constantine IX Monomachos himself would not have any imperial portraits (Hunt, 1984, p.139). The inscriptions on enamels are dated between 1042-1050. As Lucy-Anne Hunt noted, “it has been argued that the crown was an imperial gift by Constantine to a suzerain ruler, King Andrew of Hungary, or his wife” (Hunt, 1984, p. 139). Ch. Mielke suggested that the Hungarian Monomachos crown belonged to Queen Anastasia (Mielke, 2017, p. 286). Christa Schug-Wille referred to the role of Kyiv’s princely family in relations Byzantium – Hungary – Rus’ (Schug-Wille, 1988, p. 182). Marriage of Andreas to Anastasia and marriage of Constantine IX Monomachos’ daughter to Vsevolod, Anastasia’s brother, cemented political alliances. If not the imperial gift to Queen Anastasia, the Monomachos crown could have been given to the members of Kyivan dynasty, most probably in course of negotiations leading to Vsevolod’s wedding, and from the Kyivan treasury it could go to Anastasia’s dowry.

The royal patronage of both the Latin and the Greek rite under the reign of King Andreas was aimed at fostering Christianity that still had to face pagan traditions. Foundation of the Benedictine monastery in Tihany in 1055 (its establishing charter, issued by King Andreas in Latin with 58 Hungarian words, is known as the first written document in the Hungarian language) and the Greek St. Andrew monastery in Visegrád might have been connected with the Queen’s influence on King Andreas (Mielke, 2017, p. 223). Coexistence of Greek and Latin rites was practiced by the Kyiv royal family members (Gertruda, wife of Anastasia’s brother Iziaslav, who inherited throne in Kyiv in 1054, observed the Latin rite and consequently wrote “filioque” formula in her prayers (Codex Gertrudianus, nd)). The elaborate monastic caves, discovered at Zebegény near Visegrád and at Óvár near Tihany, most probably were serving as dwellings for monks who came to Hungary from Rus’ in Queens’ entourage (Mielke, 2017, p. 223). Indeed, the Tale of Bygone Years recorded that Presbyter Ilarion, before his promotion to the Metropolitan in 1051, dug the cave in a forest on the hills above the Dnipro river and spent there time in prayers. The Kyiv Cave monastery was founded in connection with that cave, and this particular model of monastic dwelling was found suitable for practicing Hesychastic contemplation, to which eremite monks adhered. Given the role of Ilarion at Yaroslav’s court in Kyiv, and

the Kyiv Cave monastery's rapid rise to fame in the second half of the 11th century, the clergy countrymen, who would support Anastasia in her new role abroad, may well be connected with the net of monastic caves found in Hungary.

The Benedictine monastery in Tihany, according to the establishing charter, was supposed to become a burial place for King Andreas and his family (Andreas was buried there in 1060, his and Anastasia's second son David in 1090, and the Royal Crypt at the Abbey may still contain bones of Andreas or his close relative (Carbon, 2021)).

Queen's decisiveness to ensure return of her family to Hungary in their royal status resulted in reestablishment of the dynasty. She might referred to the legends on Attila the Hun in her rhetoric, with its most expressive and memorable final accord, the gift of Attila's sword to reward the achievements of Duke Otto.

Priscus of Panion, whom Attila the Hun hosted at a banquet as a member of the diplomatic mission of Eastern Roman Emperor Theodosius II in 449, and who left description of Attila and his court, known as "History", recorded that Attila (the name itself literally means "a little father") received a prophecy that his nation would fall after his death, however it would rise again under the rule of his youngest son (Carolla, 2019). The Greek historian also remarked that sword, that Attila wore, lacked adornments, in contrast to the gem and gold decorations favoured by his subjects. Priscus mentioned even another Attila's weapon, the Sword of Ares (or Mars in respective Latin texts on the matter). The Romans reportedly referred to it connection with Attila's intention to force them acknowledge his status as king: "God made it plain, /.../ by revealing Sword of Ares, an object holy and honoured among royal Scythians because it was dedicated to the overseer of wars, which had disappeared long ago but was discovered with a bull's help" (cited from Carolla, 2019, p. 233). Jordanes who cited Priscus in his Latin-language "Getica" (completed 551) added that "although it was in his /Attila's/ nature always to be confident in his greatness, when the sword of Mars was discovered, an object always held sacred among Scythian kings, it nevertheless gave him additional confidence. Priscus the historian reports that it was found under the following circumstances, saying: When a certain shepherd saw a cow from his flock limping and could find no cause of such a wound, he anxiously followed the traces of blood and finally came to a sword which the cow had accidentally stepped on while grazing. The shepherd dug it up and immediately brought it to Attila. Attila rejoiced at the gift, and since he was majestic, he thought he had been appointed ruler of the whole world and the sword

of Mars granted him omnipotence in war” (The Fragmentary History of Priscus, 2014, pp. 70-71).

Attila the Hun trusted in the divine weapon, unsurprisingly suffering a single military defeat in Gaul in 450. His murder three years later was interpreted by Priscus and Jordanes as intervention of gods to protect the rulers from that fierce enemy. As Pia Carolla pointed out, “although proud of his fortune, Attila fell because the same god in which he had trusted turned his back and abandoned him” (Carolla, 2019, p. 233).

“Waltharius” (“Waltharilied”), the oldest preserved heroic epic of the Nibelungen cycle, written after lost German prototypes by a monk of St. Gall (Switzerland) in Latin in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, provided description of the Hunnish way of wearing arms (“pro ritu Pannoniarum): the Huns wore a double-edged long sword (spatha) at the left side and a single-edged half-sword (semispatha) at the right side (Nickel, 1973, p. 138). According to a legend, a certain sword belonging to Attila the Hun came into possession of Charlemagne (Mielke, 2017). German Emperor Otto III supposedly found it in the Charlemagne’s grave in 1000. A double-edged weapon displayed in the Imperial Treasury in Vienna together with other objects, discovered in the grave of Charlemagne, is however attributed as the “Sabre of Charlemagne” with provenance from Eastern Europe (Hungary?) and dated 900-950.

Even with Lampert’s own restriction that it was unknown whether the sword given by Queen Anastasia belonged to Attila (Lamperti Annales, 1894, p.130 10-13), the reference to “the most famous king of the Huns” (Lamperti Annales, 1894, p.130 10-13), whose land Queen Anastasia represented, signified the importance that the Queen attached to Duke Otto’s support to the son of the deceased Hungarian ruler, who himself according to medieval tradition could be considered as the royal descendant of Attila the Hun.

Why the woman chose a valuable male weapon to express her gratitude? According to Ch.Mielke (2017), no other medieval Queen in Hungary was known to make a similar royal present. Are there any records on sword-giving ceremonial practice in the Tale of Bygone Years, written in the Queen’s native Kyiv, which can be regarded as a precedent for her deliberate choice of sword as a gift?

The Tale of Bygone Years was completed ca 1117 and informed about four cases of symbolic giving and receiving the swords in Rus’ from the beginning of recorded events to 1060s. The first episode about the symbolic usage of weapon by the Polyanians (Polyany), the autochthonous tribe living in Kyiv and its

surroundings, was recorded after information about death of Prince Kyi and his siblings (according to tradition, they were the earliest known ruling family in Kyiv), and before 852, the first dated historical event in the chronicle. Forced to pay the tribute on demand of the Khazars, Polyanians, after internal consultations, decided to give as a tribute one sword per hearth. The Khazar elders drew conclusions: “Evil is this tribute, prince. We have won it with a one-edged weapon called a sabre, but the weapon of these men is sharp on both edges and is called a sword. These men shall impose tribute upon us and upon other lands.” (translation of Hazzard Cross S. and Scherbowitz-Wetzor O. P., 1953, p. 58). The swords used by the Polyanians were double-edged and, as we can conclude, by that time more advanced compared with the weapon used by their neighbours, the Khazars. The swords used in the Frankish Empire of Charlemagne were double-edged as well (some Carolingian swords were unearthed in Ukraine in connection with the medieval trade routes).

Prince Svyatoslav (d. 972), great-grandfather of Anastasia, “prized and admired” a sword given to him by the Byzantine Emperor Ioannes I Tzimisces in 971, in course of preliminary peaceful negotiations that were launched by the Byzantines to prevent further advance to Constantinople of Sviatoslav’s military expedition. The Greek envoys who were instructed to record Svyatoslav’s manner to receive gifts, reported back to the Byzantine Emperor that he was completely indifferent to gold and silks and ordered servants to keep them. The second delegation brought to him a sword and other accoutrements. “The Prince accepted these gifts, which he praised and admired, and returned his greetings to the Emperor. The envoys went back to the Emperor and reported what had occurred. Then the boyars remarked, “This man must be fierce, since he pays no heed to riches, but accepts arms. Submit to tribute.” The Emperor accordingly requested Svyatoslav to approach no nearer, but to accept tribute instead. <...> So the Greeks paid him tribute” (translation of Hazzard Cross S. and Scherbowitz-Wetzor O. P., 1953, pp. 88-89). The talks eventually led to conclusion of an extensive agreement between Rus’ and Byzantium in July that year.

The episode with sword came as a solution in confrontation between Prince of the Rus’ Volodymyr the Great (ruled ca 980-1015) and his pagan wife Rohnida (d.1000), mother of his four sons and two daughters. In view of baptism and subsequent Christian remarriage of Volodymyr to the Byzantine Porphyrogenita Princess Anna in Kherson (Korsun’) in the Crimea in 988, Rohnida demanded from husband explanations on her own status. She rejected Volodymyr’s

suggestion to remarry to one of his prominent vassals, boyars, and chose to convert to Christianity. The Laurentian edition of the Tale of Bygone Years and the Radziwiłł chronicle retold also the dramatic backstage of the dissolution of this pagan marriage. Rohnida's unsuccessful homicide attempt was followed by Volodymyr's reciprocal attempt to kill Rohnida. The momentous appearance of their sons, Iziaslav, holding a big sword in his little hands and saying "Father, do you think there is nobody else here except you?", and Yaroslav, who was making his first steps ever to help his mother, a miracle because of his inborn problem, one leg being shorter than other, made up Volodymyr's mind and he retreated. Rohnida took habit under the name Anastasis (Yaremenko, 1990, p. 515) and became the first nun in the royal dynasty and the first nun in Rus' ever. Adjusting to the Christian customs upon baptizing, Prince Volodymyr dissolved the settlements in Vyshgorod, Belgorodka and Berestovo, where his 700 concubines inhabited, and practiced chastity so determinately that his contemporary Thietmar of Merseburg (975–1018) considered it worth noting in his Chronicle (1889).

**Conclusions and perspectives.** Anastasia was undoubtedly exceptional queen. Her name is connected with two royal insignia, the Monomachos crown, that she received, and the Attila's sword, that she gave as a gift. Three generations of ancestors of the Hungarian Queen, including her father Yaroslav, participated in events where the sword was used as a visualised metaphorical message. Experience within the Kyivan dynasty could explain the choice of gift made by the Queen in the capacity of the sole senior representative of the Hungarian royal family, while her allusion to Attila the Hun protecting Salomon as the heir of his late father's throne reflected Zietgeist of comparisons to the great and glorious heroes from the past: her foreign allies could find Attila aka King Etzel of the Huns in the epics of the Nibelungen cycle.

Lampert (1894) mentioned that the Attila's sword came eventually in brief possession of King Heinrich IV of Germany, whose experience as a warrior began in the military expedition in 1063 on the request of the Hungarian Queen. In 1089 Heinrich IV, then the Holy Roman Emperor, married in a second marriage Anastasia's niece Adelheid, daughter of the King of the Rus' Vsevolod, Anastasia's brother. Empress Adelheid's alliance with Comitissa Mathilda of Tusciana in the mid-1090s caused Heinrich IV's final military and political defeat.

**Acknowledgements.** *The article presents some results of research conducted by the author in the capacity of Visiting Researcher at the Department of Cultures and Civilisations of the University of Verona, Italy, and finalised in Kyiv, Ukraine. The author extends her deep gratitude to the University of Verona for funding her research project*



*“Diplomacy of Kyiv in the Middle Ages: European security and multiculturalism”. The author wishes to express her sincere gratitude to the libraries of the University of Verona and the University of Padua for providing access to their rich collections.*

## REFERENCES

1. Anonymus and Master Roger. (2010). *Gesta Hungarorum and Epistle to the Sorrowful Lament upon the destruction of the Kingdom of Hungary by the Tatars* (J. Bak & M. Rady, Trans.). Budapest, Central European University Press.
2. *Carbon isotope studies confirm 11th century origin of some of bones excavated in Royal Crypt at Tihany Abbey*. (2021, November 30). Hun-Ren, Hungarian Research Network. Retrieved March 30, 2024, from <https://hun-ren.hu/en/news/carbon-isotope-studies-confirm-11th-century-origin-of-some-of-bones-excavated-in-royal-crypt-at-tihany-abbey>
3. Carolla, P. (2019). “A Universal Narrative of Humanity”. Travelling to the “Other” from Constantinople: Priscus of Panion (5<sup>th</sup> c. CE) and William of Rubruk (13 c. CE). *Medieval Worlds, Monasteries and Sacred Landscapes & Byzantine Connections*, 9, 218-241. DOI 10.1553/medievalworlds\_no9\_2019s218
4. Codex Gertrudianus, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Archivi e Biblioteca, <https://www.librideipatriarchi.it/en/books/egberts-psalter-codex-gertrudianus>
5. Hazzard Cross, S. & Scherbowitz-Wetzor, O. P., Eds. and Trans. (1953). *The Russian Primary Chronicle, Laurentian Text*. Crimson Printing Company. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
6. Hrushevsky, M.S. (1992). *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusy*. V.2. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (in Ukrainian).
7. Hunt, L.-A. (1984). Comnenian aristocratic palace decoration: descriptions and Islamic collections. In Angold, M. (Ed.), *The Byzantine Aristocracy 9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries*. BAR International Series 221, 138-156.
8. Lamperti Annales (O.Holder-Edder, Ed.). (1894) In *Lamperti Monachi Hersfeldensis Opera*. Hannoverae et Lipsiae: impensis bibliopolii Hahniani
9. Mielke, Ch. (2017). Every Hyacinth the Garden wears: the material culture of medieval queens of Hungary (1000-1395) [Doctoral dissertation, Central European University, Budapest]. DOI number: 10.14754/CEU.2017.06
10. Nickel, H. (1973). About a Sword of the Huns and the ‘Urepos’ of the Steppes. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Journal*, 7, 131-142. Retrieved March 27, 2024, from <https://www.metmuseum.org/met-publications/about-sword-of-the-huns-and-urepos-of-the-steppes-the-metropolitan-museum-journal-v-7-1973>
11. Nikodem, J.A. (nd) Andrzej I (król Węgier 1046–1060). In *Twojahistoria.pl Encyklopedia*. Retrieved January 18, 2023, from <https://twojahistoria.pl/encyklopedia/andrzej-i-krol-wegier-1046-1060/>
12. Povist vremyanych lit. (1990). Yaremenko, V.V., Ed. and Trans. Kyiv, Pysmennyk. (in Ukrainian).
13. Radziwilliwskyi litopys, IX-XII st. (nd). Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine. <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0008287> (in Old Ukrainian)
14. Robinson, I.S. (2004). *Henry IV of Germany 1156-1106*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Schug-Wille, Ch. (1988). *Byzanz und seine Welt*. Naturalis Verlag.
16. *The Fragmentary History of Priscus: Attila, the Huns and the Roman Empire, AD 430-476 (Christian Roman Empire Book 11) (2015)*. (J. Given, Trans.). Evolution Publishing.
17. Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon. Wattenbach, W. and Kurze, F. (Eds.) (1889). *MGH Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi* 54. Hannoverae Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani.

18. Yaremenko, V.V. (1990). Komentar do perekladu "Povisti vremyanykh lit". In *Povist vremyanych lit.* (1990). (Yaremenko, V.V., Ed. and Trans.). Kyiv, Pysmennyk, 498-533. (in Ukrainian).
19. Ward, E.J. (2019) Child Kings and Guardianship in North-West Europe, c.1050 - c.1250. pp. In: Woodache, H., Dean, L.H.S., Jones, Ch., Martin, R.E. and Rohr, E., Eds. *The Routledge History of Monarchy.* (pp. 551-565). Routledge Taylor and Francis Group London and New York.
20. Zemplényi, L. (2023, July 26). The fascinating life of Anastasia of Kiev, Queen of Hungary. *Hungarian Conservative.* Retrieved March 29, 2024 from [https://www.hungarianconservative.com/articles/culture\\_society/anastasia\\_of\\_kiev\\_queen\\_of\\_hungary\\_andrew\\_tihany\\_abbey\\_kievan\\_rus/](https://www.hungarianconservative.com/articles/culture_society/anastasia_of_kiev_queen_of_hungary_andrew_tihany_abbey_kievan_rus/)

*Дата надходження статті до редакції: 30.03.2024*  
*Прийнято до друку: 29.04.2024*