

ARTICLES

Donald Ostrowski (Cambridge, Mass.)

The Tatar Campaign of 1252

One of the more cryptic episodes described in Russian chronicles is the Tatar campaign to the Suzdal' land against Alexander Nevskii's brother Andrei in 1252. The problem is compounded by contradictory reporting in the source evidence. The chronicles and the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* treat the Tatar campaign in a variety of ways and are notoriously chary about supplying crucial details. Historians, in contrast, are very good about filling in the gaps with imaginative speculation that fits their own views of things, but not so good about distinguishing between what is source testimony and what are their own conjectures.

S. M. Solov'ev, for example, has tied in the campaign of 1252 with the distribution of towns among the sons of Iaroslav Vsevolodovich (Prince of Kiev 1236–1238, 1246; Prince of Vladimir 1238–1246) upon his death in 1246. Relying on an unspecified genealogical table, Solov'ev cited an argument that Alexander and Andrei supposedly had concerning which one of them should rule in Kiev and which one in Vladimir. Solov'ev wondered why Iaroslav would assign Kiev to the elder son and Vladimir to the younger son. He speculated that perhaps Iaroslav had a special love for Andrei that he did not have for Alexander or perhaps Iaroslav considered Alexander more capable than Andrei of holding on to southern Rus'. After the ouster by a younger brother Mikhail of his uncle, Iaroslav's brother Sviatoslav, as the Prince of Vladimir in 1248, Andrei, according to Solov'ev, managed to convince the khan that Alexander, the eldest brother, should be assigned the senior seat of Kiev, as their father had indicated. Solov'ev conjectured that the khan might have felt more secure assigning a less powerful seat to a prince, Alexander, who he did not want to become more powerful.¹ Solov'ev further conjectured that "Alexander as the elder could not have been content with such a decision, for the throne of Vladimir long enjoyed superior status to that of Kiev as regards seniority..." (Александр, как старший, не мог быть доволен таким решением, ибо давно уже Владимир получил первенство над Киевом относительно старшинства [156]). Alexander was, thus, "able to consider himself justified in being angry with his younger brother and in seeing him as the usurper of his rights ..." (мог считать себя вправе сердиться на младшего брата, видеть в нем хищника прав своих [156]) according to Solov'ev, since "the Kiev princes were dependent on the Vladimir princes for survival" (киевские князья не могли быть без владимирских [156]) and "Kiev was in ruins" (Киев представлял собой одни развалины [156]). Then "in 1252," in Solov'ev's view, "Alexander set off for the Don to lodge a complaint with Sartak, Batu's son, that Andrei deprived him of his seniority rights and was not fulfilling his obligations to the Tatars" (в 1252 году Александр отправился на Дон к сыну Батыеву Сартаку с жалобой на брата, который отнял у него старшинство и не исполняет своих обязанностей относительно татар [157]). This prompted Andrei to state, "Lord, what is all this? As

¹ S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960), 3: 156-157.

long as we are quarrelling among ourselves and directing the Tatar against each other, it would be better for me to flee abroad than be friends with the Tatars and serve them” (что это, Господи! покуда нам между собою ссориться и наводить друг на друга татар; лучше мне бежать в чужую землю, чем дружиться с татарами и служить им [157]). As a result, according to Solov'ev, Nevriui invaded the Suzdal' land and defeated Andrei in battle. After taking Pereiaslav' and the family of Iaroslav (the brother of Andrei and Alexander), they killed Iaroslav's commander, took the people prisoner and returned to the Orda. Andrei fled to Novgorod, but later returned “to Rus” (на Русь) and, according to Solov'ev, was reconciled with the khan by his brother Alexander and was given Suzdal' as his *udel* (157).

George Vernadsky wrote in 1953 that after the death of their father Iaroslav Iziaslavich, Alexander and Andrei “went to Batu's ordu to pledge their allegiance” at which time “Batu instructed both of them to go to Karakorum to pay their respect to the great khan (1247).”² When they arrived at Qaraqorum, Kagan Güyük “made Andrew grand duke of Vladimir and Alexander prince of Kiev” (147). Although he did not cite any argument between Alexander and Andrei as Solov'ev did, Vernadsky's use of the term “grand duke of Vladimir” in contrast to “prince of Kiev” demonstrates that he too thought of Kiev as secondary in relationship to Vladimir. Vernadsky stated that when a new kagan, Möngke, came to the throne, all princely *iarlyki* were up for renewal. Vernadsky speculated that, as a result of Möngke's being close friends with Batu and “the wide powers Mongka had granted to Batu, the Russian princes this time had to go to Saray instead of to Karakorum for confirmation in their office” (148). Vernadsky conjectured that Batu “authorized his son and co-ruler Sartak—a Christian apparently of Nestorian denomination—to handle Russian affairs” (148). Alexander went “without hesitation” to Sarai, according to Vernadsky, whereas Andrei refused. Vernadsky guessed that Andrei may have counted on the support of his father-in-law, Daniil of Galicia, but if so, he was mistaken. Andrei and his army were defeated by the Tatars at Pereiaslav'. Andrei fled with his boyars to Novgorod, then to Kolyvan, and finally to Sweden, while, according to Vernadsky, “[t]he Mongols looted Suzdalia” (148). He surmised that Sartaq granted the throne of Vladimir to Alexander, but that when Alexander returned to Vladimir, although the sources mention the metropolitan, the clergy, and the many townspeople greeting him, no mention is made of boyars. Vernadsky concluded from this that “[a]pparently the Vladimir boyars as a group supported Andrew in his opposition to the Mongols and were, at that time, opposed to Alexander and his policy of loyalty to the khan” (148). Vernadsky explained Alexander's willingness not to oppose the Mongols on the basis that, unlike Daniil of Galicia, Alexander was in close geographical proximity to the Mongols, he did not trust the West to help him against the Mongols, and if he fought the Mongols, he risked having the Teutonic knights split Rus' with the Mongols: “Alexander preferred to remain loyal to the Mongols rather than divide the country” (149). Vernadsky saw Alexander as being “more serious in purpose

² George Vernadsky, *A History of Russia*, 5 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943-1969), vol. 3: *The Mongols and Russia*, 143.

and [as having] a deeper sense of responsibility toward his country and his people” than Daniil, who he saw as being “light-hearted and addicted to the habits and notions of Western chivalry” (149). He did not say what he thought of Andrei’s character or motives.

The evidence for this episode has also been analyzed by John Fennell in an article published in 1973 and in his book *Crisis of Medieval Russia* published ten years later.³ Fennell’s analysis in his 1973 article depends heavily on hypothetical constructs and actions unattested elsewhere to interpret the chronicle evidence; for example, that Andrei, Iaroslav, and Alexander each had a “personal chronicle”⁴ or “private chronicle”⁵ and that Alexander engaged in “censorship” of the chronicles.⁶ In 1983, Fennell accepted the assertion of those chronicles that report Andrei rather than Mikhail ousted Iaroslav from being grand prince. Since there are not any “reasons ... given in any source for this the first breach of the order of lateral succession by seniority since Konstantin Vsevolodovich’s accession to the grand-princely throne of Vladimir in 1216,” Fennell presumed it was “a usurpation” (*Crisis*, 106). He stated that “nothing is known of Andrey’s early life except that he was born sometime after 1220,” but even that is deduced from the later lists of Iaroslav’s children in which he is placed second after Alexander, who was born in that year. Fennell speculated that “[i]t was not to be expected that Aleksandr would take his younger brother’s usurpation of the throne lightly or that Svyatoslav would remain quietly in the background...” but neither of them was “able to do anything about it without the support of the Tatars” (*Crisis*, 106). Fennell speculated that, after Batu sent Alexander and Andrei to Qaraqorum, “[e]vidently there was heated haggling” (107). He accepted Pashuto’s guess that the regent Oghul-Ghaimish granted Kiev to Alexander and Vladimir to Andrei, although we do not have direct evidence concerning who made the determination or granted the *iarlyk* or indeed that any “heated haggling” took place. Only the *Nikon Chronicle* proposes that it may have been the “the sons of the khan” (кановичи) who made the determination.⁷ From the return of Alexander and Andrei in 1249 until 1252, the chronicles do not report any conflict among the brothers, which led Fennell to surmise that “if indeed he [Andrei] was obliged to struggle for the retention of his throne, as was only too likely, his or later chroniclers saw to it that all traces of discord were removed from the record” (*Crisis*, 107). Although the sources do not mention it, “it is clear” to Fennell “that trouble was brewing in the last three years of Andrey’s reign” (*Crisis*, 107). After recounting that Alexander went to the Orda in 1252, the double attack by Batu on Andrei and Daniil of Galicia, the fleeing of Andrei, and the replacement of him with Alexander, Fennell asserted that the motivations behind Alexander’s and Andrei’s actions “can only be arrived at by deduction” (*Crisis*, 107).

³ J. L. I. Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič and the Struggle for Power in 1252: An Investigation of the Sources,” *Russia Medievalis* 1 (1973): 49-63; and idem, *The Crisis of Medieval Russia 1200-1304* (London: Longman, 1983), 106-108.

⁴ Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič,” 51.

⁵ Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič,” 56.

⁶ Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič,” 51.

⁷ *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei (PSRL)*, 43 vols. (St. Petersburg/Petrograd/Leningrad and Moscow, 1841-2004+), 11: 137.

Fennell saw the sources' portrayal of Andrei "merely as the helpless victim of circumstances" to be the result of their "doctor[ing] sometimes clumsily, at a later stage to justify Aleksandr's behaviour" (*Crisis*, 107). Fennell then used what he terms "these garbled and fictitious accounts" to ascertain "hints of Andrei's true motives." He cited the speech from the *Nikon Chronicle* that Solov'ev cited (see above) to suppose that "this surely must be construed as an expression of Andrei's desire to resist Tatar domination, not to cooperate, not to become a vassal of the khans" (108). He speculated that his brother Iaroslav was of the same mind since he too fought at Pereiaslav' against the Tatars. Fennell entertained favorably Gumilev's suggestion that there had been preparation between 1249 and 1252 for an armed uprising, which Alexander connived with the Khan Sartaq to suppress.⁸ Fennell pointed out that none of the chronicles "imputes to him [Alexander] any blame for the defeat of his brothers" but there can be "little doubt as to his complicity" (108). As corroboration of this absence of doubt, he quoted from V. N. Tatischev that Alexander complained to Sartaq about Andrei's "deceiving the khan, taking the grand principality from the senior prince [Aleksandr] and not paying in full the taxes and tributes to the khan" (*Crisis*, 108).⁹ In Fennell's view, Alexander's return to Vladimir "marked the end of a period of conflict of interests among the descendants of Vsevolod III and the beginning of a new era of Russia's subjugation to Tatar overlordship" (*Crisis*, 108). Fennell saw it as "the end of any form of organized resistance to the Tatars by the rulers of Russia for a long time to come" and "the beginning of Russia's real subservience to the Golden Horde...." In other words, in Fennell's opinion, "[t]he so-called 'Tatar Yoke' began not so much with Baty's invasion of Russia as with Aleksandr's betrayal of his brothers" (*Crisis*, 108). Fennell saw the inception of Alexander's reign as "in more ways than one a cataclysmic turning-point in the history of Russia" and his reign itself as following a "policy of appeasement" (*Crisis*, 109).

While all this makes for dramatic reading, one must ask to what extent such conclusions are based on the source testimony or merely on the lively and creative imaginations of the historians themselves. Is one justified in dismissing the sources as "doctored" and, if so, are only notions that may be preconceived, nationalistic, and anachronistic available as alternatives? Or are there other possible ways to look at how and in what direction they were doctored?

Let us take a closer look at the source testimony. The *Novgorod I Chronicle (Older Redaction)* does not mention this episode at all.¹⁰ The *Suzdal' Chronicle* (titled *Continuation of the Suzdal' Chronicle according to the Academy Copy in PSRL*), states that Nevriui (otherwise unidentified as to who he was or who sent him) went against Andrei Iaro-

⁸ L. N. Gumilev, *Poiski vymyshlennogo tsarstva. Legenda o "gosudarstve presvitera Ioanna"* (Moscow: Nauka, 1970), 341.

⁹ See V. N. Tatischev, *Istoriia Rossiiskaia*, 7 vols., ed. S. N. Valk and M. N. Tikhomirov (Moscow and Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1962-1968), 5: 40.

¹⁰ *PSRL*, 3 (2000), 80. For a comparative presentation of the published chronicle testimony, see the Addendum to the present article.

slavich and chased him beyond the sea.¹¹ The *Laurentian Chronicle* (titled *Suzdal' Chronicle according to the Laurentian Copy* in *PSRL*) states that Andrei “with his boyars thought to run rather than serve the khan and he fled to an unknown land with his princess and his boyars.”¹² Without mentioning the name of Nevriui, the chronicle continues that the Tatars chased after Andrei and went to Pereiaslavl' and fought a battle. Then “the Tatars scattered throughout the land” (россунушася по земли), perhaps in search of Andrei. They killed the vovoda Zhidoslav and “the princess” and took the children into captivity.¹³ They also “took numerous people as well as horses and cattle and caused much misery when they left.”¹⁴ Later (post-1448, pre-*Nikon Chronicle*) chronicles state that Nevriui went “against the Suzdal' land” (на землю Суздальскую) as well.¹⁵ To this story, the *Nikon Chronicle* introduces, besides other anti-Tatar elements, an anti-Tatar speech that it puts in the mouth of Andrei Iaroslavich: “O Lord, why do we quarrel among ourselves and lead the Tatars against one another! It would be better for me to flee to a foreign land than to be friends with, and serve, the Tatars.”¹⁶ It is this speech that Solov'ev and Fennell cited. In his article published in 1973, Fennell called this a “pathetic interior monologue.”¹⁷ In his *The Crisis of Medieval Russia* published ten years later, he described it as “a moving little speech” that the Nikon chronicler places “into Andrey’s mouth.”¹⁸ This speech does not appear in earlier chronicles but does represent the further development of an idea that was expressed in the *Laurentian Chronicle* and the *Simeonov Chronicle* s.a. 1252: “Prince Andrei Iaroslavich thought with his boyars that it was better to flee than to serve the khan.”¹⁹ The *Nikon Chronicle* changes the focus from a specific political decision not to serve Batu to a general religious decision not to serve the Tatars. Although Batu was not Muslim, the Rus' Church, during the 15th and 16th centuries, was promoting the idea that a “Russian” was someone who accepted Christianity under the aegis of the head of the Rus' Church, and by that time being Tatar was equated with being Muslim.

We do not have evidence from the 13th century what Andrei was thinking or his motivations. Nor do we have direct evidence of a succession struggle between Andrei and Alexander that occurred upon the death of their father Iaroslav and the ascent to the

¹¹ *PSRL* 1 (1928), col. 524. The *Patriarch of Constantinople Nikifor's Short Chronicle* has the same information but uses the form “Невронъ”. “Nikifora patriarkha Tsesariagrada letopisets' v'skore,” in M. N. Tikhomirov, “Zabytye i neizvestnye proizvedeniia russkoi pis'mennosti,” *Arkheograficheskie ezhegodnik za 1960 g.* (Moscow, 1962), 239 (fol. 575).

¹² *PSRL* 1 (1927): col. 473; cf. *PSRL* 18: 70. Fennell called this a “spurious and totally unconvincing motive.” Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič,” 53.

¹³ Fennell concluded that the children in question were Iaroslav's not Andrei's. Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič,” 53.

¹⁴ *PSRL*, 1 (1927), col. 473.

¹⁵ *PSRL*, 3 (2000), 304; 6.1 (2000), col. 327; 7.1: 159; 15 (1863): 396; 24: 98; 26: 86; 28: 57; 28: 216; 42: 118.

¹⁶ *PSRL*, 10: 138.

¹⁷ Fennell, “Andrej Jaroslavič,” 62, n. 38.

¹⁸ Fennell, *Crisis*, 107.

¹⁹ *PSRL* 1 (1927), col. 473: “здума Андрѣи кнѣзъ Ирославиѣ с своими боары бѣгати нежели царѣмъ служити”.

throne of Vladimir by Iaroslav's brother Sviatoslav in 1246. The *Patriarch of Constantinople Nikifor's Short Chronicle*, which has been dated to the 1280s, and the *Novgorod IV Chronicle* tell, for example, of Andrei's ousting Sviatoslav from power and placing himself on the throne of Vladimir (*Nikifor's Chronicle* adds: "for 5 years").²⁰ The *Abbreviated Chronicle Compilation of 1497* and the *Nikon Chronicle* claim that Mikhail Iaroslavich overthrew Sviatoslav, then was killed by the Lithuanians *s.a.* 1249.²¹ Then Andrei ascended the throne of Vladimir.

Before this, Andrei had been willing to serve the Mongols (he had, for example, according to the *Laurentian Chronicle*, gone in 1249 to Sarai and to Qaraqorum over the succession issue).²² The decision at that time apparently was that Andrei assume the throne of Vladimir while Alexander was given Kiev and all Rus'. Fennell called this an "astonishing fact."²³ In Qaraqorum at the time was an interregnum as Kagan Güyüg had died in 1248. Pashuto speculated that the regent Oghul-Qaimish, widow of Güyüg, considered Alexander to be close to Batu, and, since she was antagonistic to Batu, she approved Andrei.²⁴

A simpler explanation is available. Kiev was seen by the Mongols at the time of the invasion as the capital of Rus'.²⁵ Möngke was chosen khan at a *quriltai* in 1249 or 1250 that was hosted by Batu, and a second *quriltai* had confirmed the choice in July 1251.²⁶ When a new khan was chosen he would routinely review documents granted by his predecessor. This practice was later adopted by the Muscovite grand princes. Batu may have used the occasion to require that all the Rus' princes submit their *iarlyki* to him for confirmation. Andrei refused, perhaps (and here one can only speculate) because he felt he had received his *iarlyk* from the kagan in Qaraqorum, not from the khan in Sarai. Alexander, in contrast, went to Sarai, and was rewarded by being made grand prince of Vladimir in place of Andrei. It may be at this point that Vladimir superceded Kiev as the capital of Rus' in the view of the Mongols. By 1252, Kiev, in great part due to the sack of December 1240, had declined in status and power in relation to the Northeast. Yet, it remained the seat of the metropolitan at least until 1299.²⁷

²⁰ "Nikifora patriarkha Tsesariagrada letopisets' v"skore," 239 (fol. 575); *PSRL*, 4: 38 [adds: хоробри торови; X: хоробри товичь]; 4 (1915), 229 [adds: хорбри торови; variant: хоробри татровѣ]. Fennell says we "know" Andrei was born after 1220 (*Crisis*, 106), but does not say how we know.

²¹ *PSRL*, 10: 136-137; 27: 235.

²² *PSRL*, 1 (1927), col. 471.

²³ Fennell, "Andrej Jaroslavič," 50.

²⁴ V. T. Pashuto, *Ocherki po istorii Galitsko-Volynskoi Rusi* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1950), 271.

²⁵ See my "City Names of the Western Steppe at the Time of the Mongol Invasion," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 61 (1998): 465-475.

²⁶ Thomas T. Allsen, *Mongol Imperialism: The Policies of the Grand Qan Möngke in China, Russia, and the Islamic Lands, 1251-1259* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

²⁷ See my "Why Did the Metropolitan Move from Kiev to Vladimir in the Thirteenth Century," in *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, vol. 1: *Slavic Culture in the Middle Ages*, edited by Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes (Berkeley: University of California Press = *California Slavic Studies*, vol. 16, 1993), 83-101; revised version: "The Move of the Metropolitan from Kiev in 1299,"

<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/>

Batu then sent his general Nevriui to oust Andrei from the throne of Vladimir. The First Redaction of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* implies that Alexander went to see Batu in 1249 and an unnamed khan in 1262/3 just before his death, but does not mention Alexander's trip of 1252. The *Nikon Chronicle* interprets it in a different way by explaining that Alexander left Andrei in charge of Vladimir and the Suzdal' land while he was gone, since he (Alexander) had been grand prince of Vladimir and all Rus', in the view of the chronicler, all along. In neither instance do the authors of these texts stipulate any connection between Alexander's trip and the khan's move against Andrei. None of the extant chronicles has Alexander Nevskii complain to the khan about Andrei. Even if Tatishchev's information about a complaint lodged by Alexander against Andrei existed in a source, that source would have been late, which one can conclude from the prominence given to Sartaq over Batu (see below). Therefore, it may be no more than a conjecture on the part of the source writer or Tatishchev himself. It seems that Andrei thought better of his decision not to "serve the Tatars" or, as I have suggested above, to recognize the legitimacy of the khan of the Jochid Ulus to review the *iarlyk* to the grand prince of Vladimir, for, despite the report in a number of chronicles of Andrei's demise in exile,²⁸ by 1256 he was back in Rus' as the prince of Suzdal'.

The chronicle accounts are most contradictory among themselves in regard to describing Andrei's fate. The Chudov Redaction of *Stepennaia kniga* tells us that, when Andrei was defeated in battle at Pereiaslavl', he fled to Novgorod.²⁹ In their depiction of the Mongol/Tatars the chronicles proceed after 1448 along a path of increasing radicalization. The Iona Dumin Redaction of *Stepennaia kniga* states that Andrei was killed in the town of Kolyvan while in exile.³⁰ This report does not appear in the First Redaction of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*. It is unlikely Iona Dumin obtained this report from the *Novgorod I Chronicle (Younger Redaction)* or from the *Patriarch of Constantinople Nikifor's Short Chronicle* because, although both of them state that Andrei was killed while abroad, neither one provides the name of the town in which that was supposed to have occurred.³¹ In contrast, the *Rogozhskii Letopisets*, *Tverskaia*, *Nikanorovskaia*, *Vologodsko-Permskaia*, and *Kholmogorskaia* chronicles stipulate that he was killed in Kolyvan.

In their depiction of the Mongol/Tatars, the chronicles proceed after 1448 along an increasingly radical trajectory. In the Iona Dumin redaction of *Stepennaia kniga*, Nevriui is referred to as "evil" and as a "murza" but also as a "voevoda" as in the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*, the Chudov version of *Stepennaia kniga*, and Laptev copy of the *Nikon Chronicle*³² but not "tsarevich" as in the *Novgorod IV*, *Karamzin-2*, *Compilation of 1493*, and *Compilation of 1495* chronicles and in the Academy XIV copy of the *Nikon*

²⁸ *PSRL*, 6: 327; 15 (1922): 31; 15 (1863): 396-397; 27: 47; 26; 86; 33: 71.

²⁹ *Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam*, 1: 527: "Сам же къ Новуграду уклонися." Cf. *PSRL* 21: 289.

³⁰ V. Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo (Razbor redaktsii i teksty)* in *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti*, 180 (St. Petersburg, 1913), 91.

³¹ *PSRL*, 3: 304.

³² Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 90-91. *PSRL*, 10: 138.

Chronicle.³³ The Chudov version includes the statement that “the Tatars fought the Suzdal’ land because of our sins.”³⁴ The Iona Dumin version changed “Tatars” to “dishonorable Nevriui”, added that he was “a thoroughly evil [всезлый] thief”, added “and plundered” to “fought”, added the word “all” to “the Suzdal’ land,” and added the “thoroughly evil” to “our sins.”³⁵ These modifications heighten the intensity of the depiction of the cruelty of the Mongol/Tatars and extent of the punishment by intensifying the degree of “our sins.”

Another contradiction in the sources is the name of the khan whom Alexander went to see and who sent the Tatar expedition, whether it was Batu or Sartaq. The account under 1247/8 of the killing of Batu, “the impure khan,” by King Vladislav of Hungary³⁶ helps to explain this contradiction. This story, the *Tale about the Death of Batu* (Повесть об убиении Батыевом), is a fabrication that first appears in chronicles of the second half of the 15th century.³⁷ One also finds a version of it in the Vasilii-Varlaam Redaction of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*³⁸ and in the Iona Dumin version of *Stepennaia kniga*.³⁹ An allusion to it appears in the *Kazanskaia istoriia*.⁴⁰ Halperin referred to it as part of the “fictionalizing” about Batu and the Tatars going on in Muscovite Church writing of the late 15th and 16th centuries.⁴¹ He pointed out that, in contrast, “[t]hirteenth-century sources created an image of Batu which accurately reflected his power and influence over Russian affairs, and which resonated with the reality of Mongol superiority over Russia at the time.”⁴² One of the texts engaged in fictionalizing the account of Batu is the *Life of Merkurii of Smolensk* in which Batu is prevented from taking Smolensk by Merkurii.⁴³ In the *Tale about the Death of Batu*, not only is he defeated in battle when he invades Hungary but he is killed as well. We have no evidence other than the *Life of Merkurii* that Batu was defeated in Rus’ at any time, nor any evidence other than the *Tale about the Death of Batu* that he was killed when he led his army into Hungary. As Halperin characterizes them, both the *Life of Merkurii* and the *Tale about the Death of Batu* are texts that “would nowadays be labelled a work of historical fiction.”⁴⁴

³³ *PSRL*, 4: 38; 10: 138; 27: 235, 321; 42: 11.

³⁴ *Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam*, 1: 527: “Татарове же грѣхъ ради на ради нашихъ землю Суждальскую повоевашя.” Cf. *PSRL* 21: 289.

³⁵ Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 91: “Нечестивый же неврюй повоева и поплени всю землю Суждалскую за всезлыи грѣхи наша.”

³⁶ *PSRL*, 10: 135-136.

³⁷ *PSRL*, 7.1: 157-159; 15 (1863): 394-395; 18: 69; 20: 161; 21: 288; 22: 400-401; 23: 82-83; 24: 96-98; 25: 139-141; 28: 56-57; 33: 71.

³⁸ Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 45.

³⁹ Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 89-90.

⁴⁰ *PSRL*, 19: 10, and *Kazanskaia istoriia*, ed. G. N. Moiseeva (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1954), 46.

⁴¹ Charles J. Halperin, “The Defeat and Death of Batu,” *Russian History/Histoire Russe*, 10 (1983): 50, 60.

⁴² Halperin, “Defeat and Death of Batu,” 51.

⁴³ Cf. I. U. Budovnits, “Ideinaia osnova rannikh narodnykh skazani o tatarskom ige,” *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury*, 14 (1958): 171-175.

⁴⁴ Halperin, “Defeat and Death of Batu,” 62.

Halperin, furthermore, pointed out that since Batu died in 1255, many years after his invasion of Hungary, the chroniclers had a problem of where to insert the *Tale* in their chronicles. A period of 14 years separates Batu's invasion of Hungary from the year of his death. It would have been bad form to describe his death one year, then in subsequent years describe him as still being alive. So, instead of inserting *The Tale about the Death of Batu* under 1241 when Batu was in Hungary, the chroniclers placed it under 1247/8 because they may have had no entry (or few entries) specifically naming him between then and the succession to the throne by his son Sartaq in 1255.⁴⁵ If they did come across a specific reference to Batu for an entry between 1247 and 1255, all they had to do was substitute the name "Sartak" for "Batu", or, as in the case of the *Nikon Chronicle's* account of the uprising of 1262, the formula "after the killing of Batu, so did his son Sartaq" was used (see above).

The chronicles that have the *Tale about the Death of Batu* then add "Sartak" to any reference to "khan" after 1247/8. Thus, they state that the khan who sent Nevriui against Andrei was Sartaq, the son of Batu, although Batu was still khan in 1252. Both the First Redaction and the Vladimir Redaction of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*, in contrast, state that Batu became angry with Andrei.⁴⁶ Neither the First Redaction nor the Vladimir Redaction of the *Life* incorporates *The Tale about the Death of Batu*, and both of them continue to name Batu as the khan who sent Nevriui.⁴⁷ Some historians have made an attempt to reconcile the contradiction by explaining that Batu and Sartaq were co-khans.⁴⁸ While examples of co-rulers appeared in Byzantium, we have no evidence of such a phenomenon among the Mongols.

Examining the *Tale about the Death of Batu* is relevant for our purposes, since the Redaction of Vasilii-Varlaam of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* for Makarii's *Velikie Minei chet'i (VMCh)*, the Chudov version of *Stepennaia kniga*, and the Iona Dumin Re-

⁴⁵ Halperin suggested this rationale for the placement of the *Tale* in the chronicles and proposed: "Further research by specialists in Old Russian chronicle-writing might profitably explore the techniques by which the chronological contradictions generated by the 'Tale' were resolved." Halperin, "Defeat and Death of Batu," 63.

⁴⁶ See "Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo (pervaia redaktsiia)," in Iu. K. Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII veka "Slovo o pogibeli Russkoi zemli"* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 174-175, 192. I date the First Redaction of the *Life* to the second half of the 15th century. See my "Redating the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*," in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom Revisited: Essays in Russian History and Culture in Honor of Robert O. Crummey*, edited by Chester Dunning, Russell E. Martin, and Daniel Rowland (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2008), pp. 23-39. In my reconstructed version of the military *Tale of Alexander Nevskii*, which I date to the 1280s, the story about Nevriui does not appear and the name of the khan that Alexander visits is not given. See "'Dressing a Wolf in Sheep's Clothing': Toward Understanding the Composition of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*," in *Centers and Peripheries in the Christian East: Papers from the Second Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture*, edited by Eugene Clay, Russell E. Martin, and Barbara Skinner, vol. 3 of "Eastern Christian Studies" (Columbus, OH: Center for Slavic and East European Studies, forthcoming).

⁴⁷ Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 24: "Потомъ жь царь Батый разгнѣваясь на брата его меншаго, на князя Андрѣа, и посла нань воеводу своего Неврюя. И повоева землю Суждальскую."

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Vernadsky, *History of Russia*, 3: 148; and *The Nikonian Chronicle*, 5 vols., trans. Serge A. Zenkovsky and Betty Jean Zenkovsky, edited and annotated by Serge A. Zenkovsky (Princeton NJ: Kingston Press, Darwin Press, 1984-1989), 3: 27 fn. 42.

daction of *Stepennaia kniga* incorporate the story of Batu's being killed by Vladislav.⁴⁹ In each of these texts, the khan who sends Nevriui against Andrei and the Suzdal' land is Sartaq rather than Batu. For the compilers of chronicles and *Stepennaia kniga*, the fictional story of the killing of Batu in Hungary in 1247/8 by Vladislav had become established historical fact.⁵⁰ But the redactors of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* continued to consider Batu to be khan in 1252. The Iona Dumin Redaction of the *Life*, however, adapted the stipulation of the Chudov version of *Stepennaia kniga* that Sartaq was khan at the time.

The presentation of the *Tale about the Death of Batu* in the Iona Dumin Redaction is characterized not so much by an increase in the number of formulaic slurs but in their intensity. In the title, instead of "About the Death of Batu Khan" (О убиении Бату хана) or "The Death of the evil-doing Batu in Hungary" (Убьение злочестиваго Батыя в Угрехъ) as in the chronicles,⁵¹ we find "About the Death of the God-Reviled Dog, Batu Khan" (О убиении богомръскаго пса, Батыя царя).⁵² The phrases "accursed Batu" and "Godless Batu" appear frequently: "The accursed Batu went to western Hungary..." (89), "the Godless Batu..." (90).

Whereas the *Nikon Chronicle* represents a culmination of textual modifications and interpolations in the chronicle representations of the Mongols, of Batu, and of Alexander Nevskii, *VMCh* and *Stepennaia kniga* do not draw on the *Nikon Chronicle* accounts about 1252 in particular or the mid 13th century in general. Instead they draw on pre-*Nikon Chronicle* accounts. *VMCh* and *Stepennaia kniga* do, however, represent a further conceptual development of the "cruel Mongols" that is depicted in the *Nikon Chronicle*.

As Mari Isoaho pointed out, in the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* in *Stepennaia kniga*, it is "the Mongol conquest which dominates the narrative..."⁵³ The description of the events connected with Alexander Nevskii follows immediately upon Degree 7 in *Stepennaia kniga* where the Mongols invade the Rus' principalities and Michael of Chernigov is killed by Batu. In earlier chronicles, the Mongol invasion is separated physically from the accounts about Alexander Nevskii, whereas in *Stepennaia kniga* they are juxtaposed. In addition, the encounter of Alexander with Batu is moved closer to the beginning of the text on Alexander than in the First Redaction of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*. All this focus on the Mongols is in contrast to earlier sources, which tend to highlight his

⁴⁹ Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 45, 89-90. *Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam*, 1: 526-527. The Vasilii-Varlaam Redaction changes the name of the land where Batu meets his demise at the hands of Vladislav from *Hungary* to *Bulgaria* (Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 45). This Redaction also appears in the Uvarov no. 1787 (517) (378) copy of *VMCh*.

⁵⁰ One, thus, finds oneself in disagreement with Halperin's statement: "Depicting Batu as defeated in battle lessened his reputation, and apparently did not contribute to desired ideological ends, since it was the standard and historically more accurate image of Batu which was developed in sixteenth-century Muscovite sources." Halperin, "Defeat and Death of Batu," 64.

⁵¹ *PSRL*, 24: 96; 25: 139. See also S. N. Rozanov, "Povest' ob ubienii Batyia," *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti*, 21, pt. 1 (1916): 110.

⁵² Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 89.

⁵³ Mari Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy in Medieval Russia: Warrior and Saint* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 329.

vicotry over the Swedes at the Neva and over the Teutonic knights and their Chud allies at Lake Chud.

In the end, we have to ask the question, how would the sources have looked if Alexander had not betrayed his brothers, as Fennell surmised he did, or if there had been no dispute over succession between Alexander and Andrei, as Solov'ev, Vernadsky, and Fennell surmised? Let us say, for the sake of argument, that Alexander, as I suggested, went to Sarai in 1252 because he was requested to do so by Batu in order to have his *iarlyk* renewed. Let us say further that he did not complain about Andrei, as Tatishchev or his no-longer-extant source says he did, then the extant sources would look exactly as we have them. We would not have to suppose a doctoring of the sources that removed such information or a censuring to prevent that information from being included in the first place. While cognizant that sources can be deceptive, either intentionally or unintentionally, I also recognize that it is not correct methodological procedure to dismiss a source because it does not say what we want it to say. I do not know whether Alexander was upset about not being designated grand prince of Vladimir by his father in 1246 or in Qaraqorum in 1249, or whether he betrayed his brothers Andrei and Iaroslav in 1252, but I suspect, and here is my own speculation, that the reality was more complex and nuanced than the sources indicate or historians have imagined.

Addendum Parallels

I. Tatar Campaign of 1252: Who came?

<i>Суздаль:</i>	Неврюнь (ПСРЛ, 1 [1928]: 524).
<i>Никифор.:</i>	Неврюнь (Тихомиров, 239).
<i>Лаврентьев.:</i>	— (ПСРЛ, 1 [1927]: 473).
<i>Новг. I-мл. ред.:</i>	Неврюи (ПСРЛ 3 [2000]: 304).
<i>Новг. IV:</i>	Неврюи царевичь ратью Татарскою (ПСРЛ, 4: 38).
<i>Карамзин-2:</i>	Неврюи царевичь ратью татарскою (ПСРЛ, 42: 118).
<i>Симеоновск.:</i>	— (ПСРЛ, 18: 70).
<i>Житие АН:</i>	воевода свои Неврюнь (Бегунов, 174).
<i>Ермолин.:</i>	[Не]вруи и Котьяк и Олабуга храбры (ПСРЛ, 23: 83).
<i>Свод 1493 г.:</i>	Неврюи царевичь ратью (ПСРЛ, 27: 235).
<i>Свод 1495 г.:</i>	Неврюи царевичь ратью (ПСРЛ 27: 321).
<i>Свод 1497 г.:</i>	Неврюи и Котьяк и Лабуга храбры (ПСРЛ, 28: 57).
<i>Конец 15-го в.:</i>	Неврюи и Котья и Олабуга храбры ... со многими вои (ПСРЛ, 25: 141).
<i>Свод 1518 г.:</i>	Неврюи Котьяко и Лабоуга храбры (ПСРЛ, 28: 216).
<i>Рогожск.:</i>	Неврюи ... ратью (ПСРЛ, 15 [1922]: 31).
<i>Тверь:</i>	Неврюи и Котьяк и Олабуга храбры (ПСРЛ, 15 [1863]: 396).
<i>Никаноровск.:</i>	Неврюи и Котья и Оалабуха храбры ... со многими воеводами и силою татарскою (ПСРЛ, 27: 47).
<i>Софийск.-I:</i>	Неврюи и Котья и Олабуга храбры ... со многими воеводами и силою татарскою (ПСРЛ, 6: 327).
<i>Типограф.:</i>	Неврюи и Котиа и Олабоуга храбры ... со многими вои (ПСРЛ, 24: 98).

<i>Волог.-Перм.:</i>	Неврюи и Котья, и Олабуга храбры ... со многими воеводами и силою Татарскою (ПСРЛ, 26: 86).
<i>Воскр.:</i>	Неврюи и Котья и Олабуха храбрыи ... со многими вои (ПСРЛ, 7.1: 159-160).
<i>Холмогор.:</i>	Неврюи и Котьяг и Олабуга храбрыи (ПСРЛ, 33: 71).
<i>Львов:</i>	Неврюи, и Котьягъ, и Олабуга храбрыи (ПСРЛ, 20: 163).
<i>Никон. (Акад.):</i>	Неврюи царевичъ, и князь Катіакъ и князь Алыбуга храбрыи ратью (ПСРЛ, 10: 138).
<i>Никон. (Лантев.):</i>	воевода Неврюи, и князь Катіакъ и князь Алыбуга храбрыи и съ прочими Татары ратью (ПСРЛ, 10: 138).
<i>Устюг:</i>	ратью Неврии салтан (ПСРЛ, 37: 30).
<i>Пискаревск.:</i>	Неврюи и Котья и Олабуха храбрыи ... со многими вои (ПСРЛ, 34: 97).
<i>ВМЧ-Влад.:</i>	воевода свои Неврюи (Мансикка, 24).
<i>СК-Чудов.:</i>	воевода свои Неврюи и с прочими Татары (СКЦР, 527).
<i>СК-И. Думин:</i>	воевода свои и злоимянитыи мурза Неврюи и съ прочими Татары (Мансикка, 91).

II. Tatar Campaign of 1252: The Khan

	Khan whom Alexander went to see	Khan who sent the expedition	<i>Tale of the Death of Batu</i>	
<i>Суздаль:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 1 [1928]: 524)
<i>Никифор.:</i>	—	—	—	(Тихомиров, 239).
<i>Лаврентьев.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 1 [1927]: 473)
<i>Новг. I-мл. ред.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 3 [2000]: 304-305)
<i>Новг. IV:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 4: 38)
<i>Карамзин-2:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 42: 118).
<i>Симеоновск.:</i>	—	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 18: 70)
<i>Житие АН:</i>	Бату	Бату	—	(Бегунов, 174)
<i>Ермолин.:</i>	Сартак	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 23: 83)
<i>Свод 1493 г.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 27: 235)
<i>Свод 1495 г.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 27: 321)
<i>Свод 1497 г.:</i>	Сартак	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 28: 57)
<i>Конец 15-го в.:</i>	Сартак	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 25: 141)
<i>Свод 1518 г.:</i>	Сартак	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 28: 216)
<i>Рогожск.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 15 [1922]: 31)
<i>Тверь:</i>	Сартак	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 15 [1863]: 396)
<i>Никаноровск.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 27: 47)
<i>Софийск.-I:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 6: 327)
<i>Типогр.:</i>	—	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 24: 98)
<i>Волог.-Перм.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 26: 86)
<i>АН-Вас.-Вар.:</i>	—	—	+	(Мансикка, 24)
<i>Воскр.:</i>	—	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 7.1: 159-160)
<i>Холмогор.:</i>	Сартак	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 33: 71)
<i>Львов:</i>	Сартак	—	+	(ПСРЛ, 20: 163)
<i>Никон. (Акад.):</i>	царь Сартак Батыев сын	Сартак	—	(ПСРЛ, 10: 138)
<i>Никон. (Лантев.):</i>	новый царь Сартак	Сартак	—	(ПСРЛ, 10: 138)

<i>Устюг:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 37: 30)
<i>Пискаревск.:</i>	—	—	—	(ПСРЛ, 34: 97)
<i>ВМЧ-Влад.:</i>	—	Бату	—	(Мансикка, 24)
<i>СК-Чудов.:</i>	царь Сартак	царь Сартак	+	(СКЦР, 527, 526-527)
<i>СК-И. Думин:</i>	царь Сартак	царь Сартак	+	(Мансикка, 91, 89-90)

III. Tatar Campaign of 1252: Who and/or what they went against

<i>Суздаль:</i>	—			(ПСРЛ, 1 [1928]: 524).
<i>Никифор.:</i>	Андреи			(Тихомиров, 239).
<i>Лаврентьев.:</i>	—			(ПСРЛ, 1 [1927]: 473).
<i>Новг. I-мл. ред.:</i>	на Суздалскую землю, на князя Андрѣя			(ПСРЛ, 3 [2000]: 304).
<i>Новг. IV:</i>	на Суздаль			(ПСРЛ, 4: 38).
<i>Карамзин-2:</i>	на Суждаль			(ПСРЛ, 42: 118).
<i>Симеоновск.:</i>	—			(ПСРЛ, 18: 70).
<i>Житие АН:</i>	на брат его, меньшаго Андрѣя			(Бегунов, 174).
<i>Ермолин.:</i>	на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича и на всю землю Суздальскую			(ПСРЛ, 23: 83-84).
<i>Свод 1493 г.:</i>	на Роусь			(ПСРЛ, 27: 235).
<i>Свод 1495 г.:</i>	на Роусь			(ПСРЛ, 27: 321).
<i>Свод 1497 г.:</i>	на великого князя Андрея Ярославича и на всю землю Русскую			(ПСРЛ, 28: 57).
<i>Конец 15-го в.:</i>	на землю Суждальскую ... на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича			(ПСРЛ, 25: 141).
<i>Свод 1518 г.:</i>	на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича и на всю землю Соуздалскоую			(ПСРЛ, 28: 216).
<i>Рогожск.:</i>	на Суждаль			(ПСРЛ, 15 [1922]: 31).
<i>Тверь:</i>	на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича и на всю землю Суздальскую			(ПСРЛ, 15 [1863]: 396).
<i>Никаноровск.:</i>	на землю Суждальскую ... на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича			(ПСРЛ, 27: 47).
<i>Софийск.-I:</i>	на землю Соуздалскую ... на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича			(ПСРЛ, 6: 327).
<i>Типогр.:</i>	на землю Соуздалскоую ... на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича			(ПСРЛ, 24: 98).
<i>Волог.-Перм.:</i>	на землю Суздальскую ... на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича			(ПСРЛ, 26: 86).
<i>Воскр.:</i>	на землю Суздальскую ... на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича			(ПСРЛ, 7.1: 159-160).
<i>Холмогор.:</i>	на великого князя Андрея Ярославича и на всю землю Суздальскую			(ПСРЛ, 33: 71).
<i>Львов:</i>	на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича и на всю землю Суздальскую			(ПСРЛ, 20: 163).
<i>Никон. (Акад.):</i>	на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича Суздальскаго, внука Всеволожа, правнука Юрья Долгорукаго, и на всю землю Суздальскую			(ПСРЛ, 10: 138).
<i>Никон. (Лаптев.):</i>	на великого князя Андрѣя Ярославича Суздальскаго, внука Всеволожа, правнука Юрья Долгорукаго			(ПСРЛ, 10: 138).
<i>Устюг:</i>	—			(ПСРЛ, 37: 30).
<i>Пискаревск.:</i>	на землю Суздальскую ...			

<i>ВМЧ-Влад.:</i>	на великого князя Андрея Ярославича	(ПСРЛ, 34: 97).
<i>СК-Чудов.:</i>	на брата его меншаго, на князя Андрѣа	(Мансикка, 24).
<i>СК-И. Думин.:</i>	—	(СКЦР, 527).
	—	(Мансикка, 91).

IV. Tatar Campaign of 1252: What happened to Andrei?

<i>Суздаль:</i>	за море (ПСРЛ, 1 [1928]: 524).
<i>Никифор.:</i>	за море(Тихомиров, 239).
<i>Лаврентьев.:</i>	здума Андрѣи кна ³ Ярослави ^ч с своими боары бѣгати нежели цр ^с мъ служити и побѣже на невѣдому землю со кнагынею своею и с боары своими (ПСРЛ, 1 [1927]: 473).
<i>Новг. I-мл. ред.:</i>	и бѣжа князь Андрѣи Ярославичъ за море въ Свиискую землю, и убиша и (ПСРЛ 3 [2000]: 304).
<i>Новг. IV:</i>	за море въ Свѣю, а княжилъ на Руси 3 лѣта, и убиша и Чюдь (ПСРЛ, 4:38).
<i>Карамзин-2:</i>	за море въ Свѣю, а княжилъ на Руси 3 лѣта, и убиша его чюдь (ПСРЛ, 42: 118).
<i>Симеоновск.:</i>	побѣжаша на невѣдому землю съ княгинею своею (ПСРЛ, 18: 70).
<i>Житие АН:</i>	— (Бегунов, 174).
<i>Ермолин.:</i>	и беже въ Новѣгородъ Великой, таже и ко Пскову, и ту дождавъ княгини, иде въ Кольванъ, и отгуду паки въ Свескую землю, и тамо местерь срѣте его и прия его съ честью. Онъ же по княгиню посла въ Колы[ванъ] (ПСРЛ 23: 84).
<i>Свод 1493 г.:</i>	за морѣ (ПСРЛ, 27: 235).
<i>Свод 1495 г.:</i>	за морѣ (ПСРЛ, 27: 321).
<i>Свод 1497 г.:</i>	и бѣже в Новѣгород Великий, та же и ко Пскову, и ту, дождав княгини, иде в Кольванъ, и отгуду паки иде в Свѣньскую землю, и тамо местерь срѣте его и прия его с честью. Он же и по княгиню посла в Кольванъ (ПСРЛ, 28: 57).
<i>Конец 15-го в.:</i>	а князь великий Андрѣи едва убѣжа и приѣха в Великий Новѣгород. Новгородци же его не прияша; он же ѣха ко Пскову и тамо бысть немного, ожидал бо бѣ своее княгини; и он отголе и со княгинею иде в Нѣмецкий град Кольванъ, и оставив ту княгиню, а сам ступи за море во Свѣйскую землю. Местерь же Свѣиски сrete его и прия его со честью, он же посла по княгиню в Кольванъ и бысть ту нѣколко время и со княгинею во Свѣиской земли. Пребывъ же паки ту, и потом приде во свою отчину (ПСРЛ, 25: 141-142).
<i>Свод 1518 г.:</i>	и бѣже в Новгород Великий, та же и ко Пскову, и тоу дождав княгини, иде в Кольванъ, и отгуду паки в Свѣискою землю иде, и тамо местерь срѣте его, и прия его с честью. Он же и по княгиню посла в Кольванъ (ПСРЛ, 28: 216).
<i>Рогожск.:</i>	бѣже князь Андреи Ярославич за море въ Свѣю и оубиша Чюдь (ПСРЛ, 15 [1922]: 31).
<i>Тверь:</i>	И бѣже князь Андрѣи въ Новгородъ Великий, таже и къ Пскову, ту же дождався княгини, иде въ Кольванъ; отгуду паки иде въ Свѣйскую землю, и тамо местерь Свѣиский срѣте его, и прия его съ честью, онъ же посла по княгиню въ Кольванъ, и тамо за моремъ князь Андрѣи въ Свѣиской землѣ убienъ бысть. (ПСРЛ, 15 [1863]: 396-397).
<i>Никаноровск.:</i>	Великий же князь Андрѣи едва оубѣжа; и приеха в Великий Новѣгород. Новгородци же его не прияша. Онъ же ѣхав ко Пскову и тамо бысть немного: ожидал бо бѣ княгини своея; и приѣха же к нему его княгини. Великий же князь Андрѣи приеха в немецкий город Кольванъ и со княгинею; остави же ту княгиню, а самъ ступи за море во Свѣйскую землю. Местерь же Свѣиски срѣте его и прия его с честью. Он же посла по княгиню в Кольванъ; приеха же его

- княиня. И бысть время нѣколко во Свѣиской земли, последи же на рати оуби-
енъ бысть от Нѣмецъ (ПСРЛ, 27: 47).
- Софійск.-I:* великыи же князь Андрѣи едва убѣгоша. И приѣха въ Великыи Новгородъ,
новгородци же его не прияша, он же ѣха къ Пскову и тамо быс(ть) немно-
го, ожидалъ бо бѣ своеи княгини. И приѣха же к нему его княгини, великыи
ж(е) князь Андрѣи приѣха в немецкыи город Колывань и съ княгинею. Оста-
ви же ту княгиню, а самъ ступи за море въ Свѣискую землю, местерь же свѣи-
скы срѣте его и прия его с честию. Онъ же посла по княгиню въ Колывань,
приѣде же его княгини. Быс(ть) время нѣколко въ Свѣиской земли, послѣди
же на рати убьенъ быс(ть) от немѣць (ПСРЛ, 6: 327-328).
- Типограф.:* а князь Андреи и съ кнеинею бѣжа въ Свѣжскую землю (ПСРЛ, 24: 98).
- Волог.-Перм.:* Великыи же князь Ондрѣи едва убежа и приѣха въ Великыи Новгород. Нов-
городци же его не прияша. Онъ же ѣхав ко Пскову и тамо бысть немного,
ожидал бо бѣ княгини своя. И приѣха же к нему его княгини, великыи же
князь Ондрѣи приѣха в Неметцкыи город Колывань и со княгинею, остави же
ту княгиню, а самъ ступи за море во Свѣискую землю. Местерь же Свѣиски
срѣте его и прия его с честию. Он же посла по княгиню в Колывань, приѣха
же его княгини. Бысть время нѣколко во Свѣиской землѣ, последи же на ра-
ти убиенъ бысть от Нѣмецъ (ПСРЛ, 26: 86).
- Воскр.:* А князь великыи Андрѣи едва убѣжа и приѣха въ || Великыи Новгородъ. Нов-
городци же его не прияша, онъ ѣха къ Пскову и тамо бысть немного, ожидалъ
бо бѣ своя княгини; прииде къ нему его княгини, и онъ оттолѣ и со княгинею
иде въ Нѣмецкыи градъ Колывань. И оставивъ ту княгиню, а самъ ступи за мо-
ре во Свѣискую землю, местерь же Свѣискыи срѣте его и прия его съ честию,
онъ же посла по княгиню въ Колывань; и бысть ту нѣколко время и со кня-
гинею во Свѣиской земли. Пребывъ же паки ту, и потомъ прииде во свою от-
чину (ПСРЛ, 7.1: 159-160).
- Холмогор.:* и бежа Андреи в Новгород Великыи, таже и ко Пскову, и в Колывань, и со
княгинею, оттуду паки иде во Свитскую землю, и тамо местерь стрете его, и
прият его с честию. И со княгинею пребыв неколко время в Свѣиской земли,
и убиенъ бысть на рати от немец (ПСРЛ, 33: 71).
- Львов.:* и бежа Андрѣи въ Новгородъ Великыи, таже и ко Пскову; ту же дождавъ кня-
ини, иде х Колываню, и оттуду иде паки во Свитьскую землю, и тамо местерь
стрѣте его, и приятъ его съ честию; онъ же посла по княгиню въ Колывань
(ПСРЛ, 20: 163).
- Никон. (Акад.):* побѣжа князь великыи Андрѣи Суздальскыи, и съ княгинею своею и з бояры сво-
ими, въ Новгородъ Великыи и оттуду иде въ Псковъ, и тамо дождавъ княгиню
свою, иде изо Пскова въ Колывань, и паки изъ Колывани иде въ Свѣискую
землю, и тамо местерь стрѣте его, и приятъ его съ великою честию. Онъ же и
по княгиню свою посла въ Колывань (ПСРЛ, 10: 138).
- Никон. (Лантев.):* а князь великыи Андрѣи едва убѣжа. И приѣхавъ въ Великыи Новгородъ. Нов-
городци же его не прияша; онъ же ѣхав ко Пскову и тамо бысть немного,
ожидалъ бо бѣ своеѣ княгини. Прииде же къ нему его княгини, и онъ оттолѣ и
со княгинею иде въ Нѣмецкыи градъ Колывань, и оставивъ ту княгиню, а самъ
ступи за море во Свѣискую землю; местерь же Свѣискыи срѣте его и прия его
съ честию; онъ же посла по княгиню свою въ Колывань, и бысть ту нѣколко
время и со княгинею во Свѣиской земли пребывъ же паки ту (ПСРЛ, 10: 139).
- Устюг.:* за море (ПСРЛ, 37: 30).
- Пискаревск.:* А князь Андреи и со княгинею бежа въ Связскую землю (ПСРЛ, 34: 97).
- ВМЧ-Влад.:* — (Мансика, 24).
- СК-Чудов.:* Сам же къ Новуграду уклонися (СКЦР, 527).

- Никаноровск.:* Бысть же в канун Боришу дни, безбожнии Татарове под Володимером и бродиша Клязму и поидоша ко граду Переяславлю, таящеся. На утрия же, на Бориш день, срѣте их великий князь Андрѣи со своими полки. И сразишася обои полци, и бысть сѣча велика. Гнѣвом божиим за оумножение грѣхов наших погаными побѣжени быша.... Безбожнии Татарове плениша град Переяславль и оттоле возвратишася в землю свою (ПСРЛ, 27: 47).
- Софийск.-I:* Быс(ть) же в канунъ Боришу дни. Безбожнии татаровѣ подѣ Володимеремъ и бродиша Клязму, и поида къ граду Переяславлю, таящеся. Наутрие же, на Боришь день, стрѣте ихъ великий князь Андрѣи съ своими полкы. И сразишася обои полци, и быс(ть) сѣча велика. Гнѣ||вомъ бо б(о)жиимъ за умножение грѣховъ наших погаными побѣжени быша... Безбожнии же татаровѣ плениша град Переяславль и оттоле възвратишася в землю свою (ПСРЛ, 6: 327-328).
- Типограф.:* И бродиша Клязмоу канонунъ Боришу дни подѣ Володимеремъ. Князь же Андрѣи срѣте ихъ съ своими полкы. И бысть сѣча велика. И победиша поганіи.... Татарове же плениша градъ Переяславль, княиню Ярославлю яша и дѣти изымаша и оубиша ту воеводу Жидислава и кнеиню оубиша, а дѣти Ярославли в полонъ поведоша и людеи много полониша и, много зла створивъ, отъидоша (ПСРЛ, 24: 98).
- Волог.-Перм.:* Бысть же в канун Боришу дни, безбожнии Татарове под Володимерем бродиша Клязму и поидоша ко граду Переславлю, таящеся. На утрия же, на Бориш день, срѣте их великий князь Ондрѣи съ своими полки. И сразишася обои полци, и бысть сѣча велика, гнѣвом божиим за умножение грехов наших погаными побежени быша.... Безбожнии же Татарове плениша град Переславль и оттоле возвратишася в землю свою (ПСРЛ, 26: 86).
- Воскр.:* безбожнии Татарове подѣ Володимеремъ бродишася Клязму, и поидоша ко граду къ Переяславлю таящеся; наутрии же, на Боришь день, срѣте ихъ князь великий Андрѣи со своими полкы, и сразишася обои плѣци, и бысть сѣча велика, гнѣвомъ же Божиимъ, за умножение грѣховъ наших погаными христiane побѣжени быша.... || а тогда безбожнии Татарове плѣниша градъ Переяславль, и княгинию Ярославлю яша, и дѣти изоимаша, и убиша ту воеводу Жидислава, и княгинию убиша, а дѣти Ярославли въ полонъ поведоша, и людеи много плониша, и много зла сотворивъ отъидоша (ПСРЛ, 7.1: 159-160).
- Холмогор.:* И стрете их князь Андреи с полки своими. И победиша их татары (ПСРЛ, 33: 71).
- Львов:* Идоша къ Переславлю, таящеся, и срѣте ихъ князь Андрѣи съ полки своими, и побѣдиша ихъ Татары.... А Татары, Неврюи, взяша Переславль, и яша княгиню Ярославлю, и з дѣтьми, и паки убиша ю, а дѣтеи въ полонъ ведоша, и Жидислава воеводу убиша (ПСРЛ, 20: 163).
- Никон. (Акад.):* А Татарове гнашася за нимъ, и постигоша его у града Переславля, иже на Клещинѣ озерѣ, но Богъ съхрани его и пречиста Богородица; Татарове бо сугнавше его и рассовашася сѣмо и овамо онъ же посреди ихъ избѣжа, седѣвъ на великомъ княженіи три лѣта. Царевичъ же невруи съ Татары своими взяша Переславль, иже на Клещенѣ озерѣ, и яша княгиню Ярославлю и з дѣтми и убиша ея, а уныя Ярославли въ полонъ поведоша, а воеводу Жидислава убиша, и люди вся въ полонъ поведоша, и все имѣніе взяша, и идоша во Орду (ПСРЛ, 10: 139).
- Никон. (Лантев.):* А Татарове гнашася за нимъ, и постигоша его у града Переславля, иже на Клещинѣ озерѣ, но Богъ съхрани его и пречиста Богородица; Татарове бо сугнавше его и рассовашася сѣмо и овамо онъ же посреди ихъ избѣжа, седѣвъ на великомъ княженіи три лѣта. Царевичъ же невруи съ Татары своими взяша Переславль, иже на Клещенѣ озерѣ, и яша княгиню Ярославлю и з дѣтми и

- убиша ея, а уныя Ярославли въ полонъ поведоша, а воеводу Жидислава убиша, и люди вся въ полонъ поведоша, и все имѣніе взяша, и идоша во Орду (ПСРЛ, 10: 139).
- Устюг:* прогна князя Андрея Суздальскаго (ПСРЛ, 37: 30).
- Пискаревск.:* и бродиша Клязму канун Бориса дни под Володимирем. Князь же Андреи сретехе их с своими полки, и бысть сеча велика, и победиша погани... Татарове же плениша град Переславль, княгиню Ярославлю яша и убиша, а дети изымаша и ведоша в полон, и воеводу Жидислава убиша ту, и людеи много полониша, и зла много сотворив, отъидоша (ПСРЛ, 34: 97).
- ВМЧ-Влад.:* И повоева землю Суждальскую (Мансикка, 45).
- СК-Чудов.:* Они же скоро и безвѣстно приидоша къ граду Переяславлю. Князь же Андреи брань сътвори с ними, и Божиимъ гнѣвомъ побѣжени быша плъки его.... Татарове же грѣхъ ради нашихъ землю Суждальскую повоеваша (СКЦР, 527).
- СК-И. Думин:* Неврюи, яко тать всезлыи, и скрадомъ прииде ко граду Переяславлю. Князь же Андреи брань сотвори съ ними, и Божиимъ гнѣвомъ побѣжени быша полки его.... Нечестивыи же Неврюи повоева и поплени всю землю Суждальскую за всезлыя грѣхи наша, яже предъ Богомъ бываемыя. Симъ убо неизреченнымъ промышленіемъ вручаетъ Богъ скипетро великаго княженія Владимирскаго и Новгородскаго сему угоднику своему Александру Невскому, яко отъ многъ лѣтъ бывъ избранъ сосудъ Духу Пресвятому, помазанъ Богомъ. И бысть скипетроносець предивенъ, вся Рускія земли самдръжець. Подаетъ же Богъ при его царствіи тишину велию отъ всѣхъ странъ языческихъ всеи земли Русстей молитвами его святыми и благостроенія церквамъ святымъ (Мансикка, 91).

Abbreviations

- Бегунов: Ю.К. Бегунов, “Житие Александра Невского (первая редакция),” в кн. *Памятник русской литературы XIII века «Слово о погибели Русской земли»* (М., 1965).
- ВМЧ-Влад.:* Великие Минеи Четьи, Владимирский список
- Волог.-Перм.:* Вологодско-Пермская летопись
- Воскр.:* Воскресенская летопись
- Ермолин.:* Ермолинская летопись
- Житие АН:* Житие Александра Невского
- Карамзин-2:* Карамзинская II летопись
- Конец 15-го в.:* Свод конца 15-го века, летопись
- Лаврентьев.:* Лаврентьевская летопись
- Львов.:* Львовская летопись
- Мансикка: В. Мансикка, *Житие Александра Невского (Разбор редакции и текста)*, в *Памятники древней письменности*, т. 180 (СПб., 1913).
- Никаноровск.:* Никаноровская летопись
- Никифор.:* Никифора патриарха Цесаряграда летописецъ въскоре
- Никон. (Акад.):* Никоновская летопись, Академический список
- Никон. (Лаптев.):* Никоновская летопись, Лаптевский список
- Новг. I-мл. ред.:* Новгородская I летопись, младшая редакция
- Новг. IV:* Новгородская IV летопись
- Пискаревск.:* Пискаревский летописец
- ПСРЛ: Полное собрание русских летописей
- Рогожск.:* Рогожская летопись
- Свод 1493 г.:* Свод 1493 г., летопись
- Свод 1495 г.:* Свод 1495 г., летопись

<i>Свод 1497 г.:</i>	Свод 1497 г., летопись
<i>Свод 1518 г.:</i>	Свод 1518 г., летопись
<i>Симеоновск.:</i>	Симеоновская летопись
<i>СКЦР:</i>	<i>Степенная книга царского родословия по древнейшим спискам: Тексты и комментарий</i> / Отв. ред. Н.Н. Покровский, Г.Д. Ленхофф. Т. 1-2 (М., 2007).
<i>Софийск.-I:</i>	Софийская I летопись
<i>СК-Чудов.:</i>	Степенная книга, Чудовская редакция
<i>СК-И. Думин:</i>	Степенная книга, редакция Ионы Думина
<i>Суздаль:</i>	Суздальская летопись
<i>Тверь:</i>	Тверская летопись
<i>Типограф.:</i>	Типографская летопись
<i>Тихомиров:</i>	М.Н Тихомиров, "Забытые и неизвестные произведения русской письменности," <i>Археографический ежегодник за 1960 г.</i> (М., 1962).
<i>Устюг:</i>	Устюжская летопись
<i>Холмогор.:</i>	Холмогорская летопись

Harvard University