
PALAEOSLAVICA

XXV / 2017

NO. 2

Cambridge — “Palaeoslavica” — Massachusetts

Palaeoslavica

*International Journal for the Study of Slavic Medieval Literature,
History, Language and Ethnology*

VOLUME 25, no. 2 - 2017

Editor:

ALEXANDER B. STRAKHOV
Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute

Editorial Board:

SIMON FRANKLIN — *Clare College, University of Cambridge*
MARIA MAVROUDI — *University of California, Berkeley*
HANS ROTHE — *Universität Bonn*
KRASSIMIR STANTCHEV — *Università degli Studi "Roma Tre"*
OLEKSIY TOLOCHKO — *Institute of Ukrainian History, Ukrainian Academy of
Sciences*

*The editors assume no responsibility for
statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.*

Manuscripts, correspondence and subscriptions should be sent to:

PALAEOSLAVICA
P.O.Box 380863
Cambridge, MA 02238-0863
U.S.A

e-mail: palaeoslavica@gmail.com
fax: +781.289.0301

website: www.palaeoslavica.com

ISSN — 1070-5465

Copyright © 2017 by **Palaeoslavica**

TABLE of CONTENTS

Volume XXV, no. 2

ARTICLES / СТАТЬИ

Михаил Казанский (Париж)

Константин Цукерман (Париж)

Улицы 1-37

Mari H. Isoaho (Helsinki)

Battle for Jerusalem in Kievan Rus':

Igor's Campaign (1185) and the Battle of Hattin (1187) 38-62

Татьяна В. Анисимова (Москва)

Фрагменты *Послания митрополита Климента Смолятича*
к пресвитеру Фоме в Тихонравовском хронографе и

библейском Сборнике Троице-Сергиева монастыря 63-79

Nick Mayhew (Cambridge, UK)

Banning 'Spiritual Brotherhoods' and Establishing Marital Chastity

in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Muscovy and Ruthenia 80-108

Ирина Б. Качинская (Москва)

Народная эротика в эвфемизмах

(по материалам архангельских говоров)

Часть 1. Женские половые органы 109-137

PUBLICATIONS / ПУБЛИКАЦИИ

Vesna Badurina Stipčević (Zagreb)

The Apocalypse of John in the 14th century Croatian Glagolitic

Vatican Illirico 5 Breviary 138-165

Ирина Барклай (Boone, North Carolina)
Новгородская винная и пивная книга
текущих счетов и расходов 1612 года 166-177

Геннадий И. Лопатин (Ветка, Белоруссия)
Традиционная культура
деревни Старое Закружье Ветковского района:
И. Прасковья Сергеевна Кужельная 178-228

SPECULUM

Татьяна Л. Вилкул (Киев)
«Преже сихъ 4 лѣтъ» 1096 г.
Бестужева-Рюмина, Шахматова и составителя
Повести временных лет 229-247

Charles J. Halperin (Bloomington, Indiana)
Sergei Soloviev's Ivan IV in Translation 248-263

MISCELLANEA / СМЕСЬ

Василий В. Калугин (Москва)
Поп Упырь Лихой — книгописец
князей Святополка и Владимира Ярославича 264-270

Тимофей Насенник (Минск)
К истории этимологии лексемы *волынка* 271-287

Александр Б. Страхов (Бостон)
О глаголе *волынить(ся)*,
его семантических и словообразовательных связях
(замечания редактора) 288-291

Mari H. Isoaho (Helsinki)

Battle for Jerusalem in Kievan Rus': Igor's Campaign (1185) and the Battle of Hattin (1187)

Introduction

The medieval chronicles of Kiev, the *Primary Chronicle*, and the *Kievan Chronicle*, were closely connected to important phenomena, essential in the medieval European culture of the Crusader Era, for they were deeply affected by eschatological notions, and connected the events taking place in Kiev with those taking place in the Holy Land. The chronicle notion about the role of Polovtsy as Ishmaelites made a significant parallel between the things happening in Kiev with those taking place in the Holy Land, and directed the historical thinking toward a teleological approach, as perceived through the *Revelation of Pseudo-Methodius*.¹

International medieval studies need to aim towards a wider coherence and perspective in its ways of treating the medieval source material. The most obvious lack of coherence is the fact that the research on the Western and Eastern Chronicles is conducted in separate camps, where the eastern traditions are studied under the stamp of "Byzantine" studies. The scholarly tradition for centuries of historians has little by little distorted our thinking about medieval Kievan Rus'. The sum of the different approaches—most importantly Dimitri Obolenskiy's widely accepted view of Rus' as an early state characterized as belonging to a Byzantine Commonwealth—have led to the seclusion of Rus' from what has been defined as European.² It is a widely accepted view that its destiny to become subjugated as part of the Mongol Empire excluded Rus' from the orbit of Europe proper. With the birth of a Eurasianistic intellectual movement in 1917, this seclusion was strengthened even more. All these views have isolated the history of Rus' from the orbit of the history of medieval Europe.³ In 2015, after the publication of Christian Raffensperger's thought provoking book, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World, 988-1146*,⁴ one whole volume of the journal of *Russian History* (Vol. 42, 2015) was dedicated to this discussion and clearly showed how reluctant historians are to abandon familiar perceptions that reflect the ideologies of our own times rather than those of the past.

¹ Mari Isoaho, "The idea of the Last Emperor in the Primary Chronicle," *Past and Present in Medieval Chronicle*, ed. Mari Isoaho, *COLLEGIUM: Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 17 (2014), pp. 43-81; M. Isoaho, "Последний царь и «сынове измаилевъ» (Апокалипсис в «Повести временных лет»).» *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, vol. 66, no. 4 (2016), pp. 5-19.

² Dimitry Obolenskiy, *Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (London, 1971).

³ See Mark Bassin, Sergey Glebov and Marlene Laruelle (eds.), *Between Europe and Asia: The Origins, Theories and Legacies of Russian Eurasianism*, Pitt Series in Russian and East European Studies (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press 2015); Charles J. Halperin, "Russia Faces East: Eurasianism reconsidered," *Russian History*, vol. 43, no. 1 (2016), pp. 69-80.

⁴ Christian A. Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World, 988-1146* (Cambridge, MA, 2012).

The tradition of isolating Kievan Rus' has deep roots in the polarization of Europe into two hostile poles during the Cold War. This polarization has especially affected the notions on the crusades. The Soviet tradition categorically treated the crusades in a negative light as a Western Catholic threat confronted by Orthodox Rus' with its heroic defense by Alexander Nevskiy in the middle of the 13th century. In the Soviet tradition, it thus became unthinkable to consider Rus' as having anything in common with the crusading movement, which came to be stereotypically described only as a monstrous movement showing the corrupt and distorted Catholic tradition and papal decadence.⁵ The polarization worked both ways—Western historians and medievalists also lost interest in the medieval Rurikid state.

Severing the cultural connection of Kievan Rus' to the rest of European history had the additional effect of making it disappear from eschatological studies, which have recently shown a substantial rise in scholarly interest. In 2014, James T. Palmer wrote a valuable monograph describing the most important eschatological ideas of the European Middle Ages, but left the entire area of Eastern Europe out of his book.⁶ This decision feels especially unjustified since Palmer's study paid considerable attention to the influence of the *Revelation of Pseudo-Methodius* in Europe, but not even a single line informed Western readers about the paramount importance of the *Revelation* to the Slavonic tradition. However, the most surprising of the “forgettings” of Kievan Rus' from apocalyptic studies is its exclusion even from Slavonic and Russian studies. In 2011 Tapkova-Zaimova and Miltenova discussed the Eastern Slavonic apocalyptic tradition from a very narrow Bulgarian perspective,⁷ and in 2014 Bessonov seemed to have forgotten the whole Kievan tradition in his history of the apocalyptic in Russia.⁸

Neglecting the religious traditions of Kievan Rus' has led historians to fail to observe the chronicle information, in a religious light, as a history written by monks. Instead, they tend to drown in the historical details.⁹ The present article underlines the nature of the medieval monastic chronicle, and, moreover, highlights Rus' as belonging to a much wider setting than just a narrow Byzantine or Slavic context. I connect these preliminary observations with the larger context of eschatological studies, aiming to show how the sentiments presented in Kiev were part of a wider ideological and religious constraint that was very much actualized in Europe before, during, and after the First Crusade.

The Battle of Hattin and its main sources

From the accounts of the First Crusade onwards, the idea that God was interfering in human history in a unique way in the accidents of the Holy Land took up increasing

⁵ Especially Б.Я. Рамм, *Папство и Русь в X-XV веках* (Москва, 1959); В. Пашуто, *Внешняя политика Древней Руси* (Москва, 1968); М.А. Мазоров, “Известия русских современников о крестовых походах,” *Византийский временник*, no. 31 (1971), pp. 84-107; И.П. Шаскольский, *Борьба Руси против крестоносной агрессии на берегах Балтики в XII-XIII вв.* (Ленинград, 1978).

⁶ James T. Palmer, *The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2014).

⁷ V. Tapkova-Zaimova & A. Miltenova, *Historical and Apocalyptic Literature in Byzantium and Medieval Bulgaria* (Sophia, 2011).

⁸ И.А. Бессонов, *Русская народная эсхатология. История и современность* (Москва, 2014).

⁹ Most recently, Елена Л. Конявская, “Половцы в ранних летописях: оценки и интерпретации летописцев,” *Slověne*, no. 1 (2015), pp. 180-190.

space within these texts.¹⁰ Jonathan Riley-Smith has stated how the impact of the First Crusade, the overwhelming joy of having taken the sacred city into Christian hands in 1099 was considered a sign of God's favor of the Crusading mission, and a vast amount of the reported celestial signs were believed as confirming this. On the other hand, the Battle of Hattin and the loss of Jerusalem that it affected in 1187, was equally regarded as the consequence of the sins of the Christians.¹¹

The catastrophic loss of the Battle of Hattin was no doubt the most fateful battle of the entire history of the Crusades. It took place on July 4, 1187, and its consequences shocked the whole of Europe, for it marked the defeat of the largest army ever assembled in the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The crusader army was totally annihilated by Saladin, which paved the way for the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem three months later. The outcome of this fateful battle was deeply felt throughout Christendom, and was also echoed in Kievan Rus', as I shall demonstrate in this article.

The first surviving stories of the Battle of Hattin are found in the personal letters sent from Palestine to Europe in order to report the catastrophic losses of the Crusader Kingdom. The very first testimony was written by the "Knights from the Latin East to Emperor Fredrick Barbarossa" at the end of July 1187. It gives no details of the battles, just a listing of the most important victims.¹² Sometime between 10 July and 6 August 1187 Terricus, the senior surviving Templar after the battle of Hattin, wrote another letter, which he intended to have as wide a circulation as possible, so that copies were sent to Urban III and Philip of Flandres, and it was addressed to all the Christian faithful. This was a desperate description of the trouble of the Latin East, when few knights remained alive, and Muslims were besieging Tyre. Only a few details from the Battle of Hattin are presented, stating how the Muslims "drove us into a very rocky area where they attacked us so vigorously that they captured the Holy Cross and our King, and wiped out all our host."¹³

At the end of August, the Hospitallers of Jerusalem sent a letter to Archumbald, the Grand Master of Italian Hospitallers.¹⁴ Some researchers have considered this to be one

¹⁰ William J. Purkis, "Rewriting the History Books: The First Crusade and the Past," *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, eds. Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 140-154.

¹¹ Jonathan Riley-Smith, "The Crusading Movement and Historian," *Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 1-12; Jonathan Riley-Smith, "The State of Mind of Crusaders to the East 1095-1300," *ibid.*, pp. 66-90.

¹² *Principes transmarinae ecclesiae ... ad Fridericum I* is published in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum*, tom. 21 (Hannover, 1869), pp. 475-476 [henceforth: *MGH SS*]; for English translation see *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries*, translated by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate i (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010 = *Crusade Texts in Translation*, v. 18), pp. 75-77.

¹³ *Terricus magnus praeceptor Templi Urbano III*; English translation: Barber & Bate, *Letters*, pp. 78-79.

¹⁴ *Fratres Hospitalis ultramarini Archumbaldo* is published in Ansbert, *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuger Kaiser Friedrichs I* (Berlin, 1928), pp. 2-4; for English translation of the letter, see Peter Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998 = *Crusade Texts in Translation*, v. 1), pp. 160-162; G.A. Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa. The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013 = *Crusade Texts in Translation*, v. 19), pp. 34-35.

of the most important sources of the Battle.¹⁵ Around the year 1200 it was inserted in the chronicle describing the Crusade of Fredrick Barbarossa, *Historia de expeditione Fride-rici Imperatoris*, although the chronicle itself has survived only in two fragmented 13th century manuscripts, and one from the 17th century.¹⁶ The information is relatively brief, stating that Saladin attacked King Guy's host on Friday after the Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul. The battle was fierce and continued the whole day, after which "night put an end to the struggle." At around the third hour of the next day the battle was continued, and the letter gives the impression that the bad choice of encampment led to the thirsty Crusaders' loss.¹⁷

At the end of September 1187, a piece of information provided by a Genoese merchant who had been at Acre at the time of the battle was recorded and sent to Pope Urban III.¹⁸ It speaks "of the recent judgment of God in those lands, as if provoked by our sins He conducted the Final Judgment in anticipation, fairly but without mercy," and further recalls how the Saracens, "lit fires all around the Christian army, an army worn out from the long march, affected by the intense heat and with no water to drink."¹⁹ The letter ends with a plea to Pope Urban to "convene the nations, unite the peoples, put heart into the effort to recover the Holy of Holies and the blessed land where the Lord walked, where shine the places of our redemption and the sacraments of Christian faith."²⁰

No doubt, the most important effect that the disaster caused was a rapid awakening of the papacy to enforce another crusade in aid of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. It is said that Pope Urban III died on October 20, 1187, from the shock of the news when hearing about the outcome of the battle. The next selected pope, Gregory VIII, wrote immediately after his election the most impassioned plea for a Crusade ever issued by a pope. This bull, called *Audita tremendi*,²¹ was directed to rouse the spirits of European Lords and Knights to aid in the rescue of the Holy Land. In this bull Gregory briefly summed up the disaster of Hattin, informing European nobles about the bloody battle where the army was butchered, and many knights, bishops, and the king himself were taken

¹⁵ Among others Jean Richard, "An account of the Battle of Hattin referring to the Frankish mercenaries in oriental Moslem states", *Speculum*, vol. 27, no 2 (1952), pp. 162-177.

¹⁶ G.A. Loud, "Introduction" *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 1.

¹⁷ This is speculated in full detail by Sir Steven Runciman in his *History of the Crusades*, vol. 2: *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish east 1100-1187* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 457.

¹⁸ The letter was inserted to *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*. It was also published in K. Hampe, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 22 (1897), pp. 278-80, translated in English in Barber & Bate, *Letters*, pp. 82-83.

¹⁹ Barber & Bate, *Letters*, p. 82.

²⁰ Barber & Bate, *Letters*, p. 83.

²¹ *Audita tremendi*, see *Patrologia Latina [PL]*, ed. J.-P. Migne, vol. 202 (Petit-Montrouge, 1855), cols. 1539-1542. For German translation, see *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I* (Berlin, 1928 = *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores rerum germanicarum*, Nova series, t. 5), 6-10; for English translation, see, e.g., Jessalyn Bird, Edward Peters, and James M. Powell (eds.) *Crusade and Christendom. Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187-1291* (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 5-9; Louise and Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades. Idea and Reality 1095-1274* (London, 1981), pp. 64-67; Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 37-41.

prisoners.²² It was widely circulated in Christian Europe, inspiring a group of military invasions later called the Third Crusade.

Many of the letters presented above, were inserted into the chronicles, describing the crusade aimed at liberating Jerusalem from the infidels. The Battle of Hattin was presented in those chronicles as a sorry prelude to the disaster of losing Jerusalem, where the massive preparations for the so-called Third Crusade began. The Anglo-Norman chronicles at the end of the 12th century, were soon followed by notes in vernacular chronicles circulating around Paris at the beginning of the 13th century.

The Crusades had marked a vast change in the literary production of the whole of Europe and especially the beginning of the 13th century was a period of huge interest in the history of the Holy Land. Already the First Crusade had coincided with a major development in vernacular literature, which was affected by the different practices of oral presentation, and especially songs. For example the *Chanson de Roland* developed around the First Crusade, but it was the 1150s when the songs related to actual Crusading—the events of the Second Crusade—saw the light of day. In the 1160s the number of songs escalated, and also the tradition of the German Minnesang was born.²³

Both King Henry II and his son and successor, King Richard the Lionheart, showed a keen interest in the business of the Holy Land. Richard's personal involvement with the aftermath of Hattin and his dealings with Saladin established him as a hero *par excellence* in several Anglo-Norman Chronicles. The first to appear was the Latin *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, written sometime between August 1191 and September 1192 in the Latin East by an English Crusader, who participated in the Crusade led by his king, Richard the Lionheart.²⁴ *Itinerarium* shared the Angevin king's distrust towards the French king, and regarded the King of Jerusalem, Guy of Lusignan, as a hero and an important ally. The Anglo-Norman Chronicle gave a very negative image of Saladin, depicting him as a sleazy and greedy pagan. In this story, King Guy's chamberlain has a dream, in which he sees "an eagle flying over the Christian army, carrying seven darts and a crossbow in its talons and crying out in a terrible voice: 'Woe to you, Jerusalem!'"²⁵ The chronographer explains that "the seven darts are allegorical representation of the seven deadly sins, from which the unfortunate army was soon to perish."²⁶

Itinerarium was soon followed by the rhymed-verse chronicle *L'Estoire de la guerre sainte*, written in Norman French by a certain Ambrose between 1194 and 1199.²⁷ Since

²² For English translation, see *Crusade and Christendom*, pp. 5-9.

²³ Michael Routledge, "Songs", in *Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 91-94.

²⁴ Helen J. Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade. A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1997 = *Crusade Texts in Translation*, v. 3), p. 10.

²⁵ *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, Book 1, Ch. 5, for English translation, see Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, p. 32.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ Ailes, Marianne, and Malcolm Barber, eds. *The History of the Holy War: Ambrose's Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 1-25.

French was the language of the Norman lords of England, it is notable that it was among the Normans of England, where French first developed as a written language.²⁸

Since the German Emperor Frederick responded to the Third Crusade enthusiastically, we have a series of German sources that report on it. As a rule, these sources mention the tragic defeat at Hattin as a prelude to Frederick's own unsuccessful expedition, which in turn ended in his drowning in the River Saleph in Armenia in 1190. The most important of these sources is the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris*, which was compiled in 1200 at the latest, and which contains important and emotional letters concerning the Battle of Hattin. The first of the inserted documents is a letter from the Hospitallers to Archumbald; it is then followed by a letter from the Provisor of the Hospital, Hermenger, to the Duke of Austria Leopold V; and finally comes Pope Gregory's emotional bull, *Audita tremendi*.²⁹ Several other chronicles containing information about Hattin were written soon after the death of Emperor Frederick, around 1200. Whereas the *Historia de expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* was the most comprehensive of those, others were written from a different standpoint, such as *Historia peregrinorum*, which was also written around 1200.³⁰ Soon after that, around 1210 two monks, Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien wrote their annals which included information about the loss of Jerusalem.³¹

By far the most elaborate description of the Battle of Hattin is an eyewitness account written by a certain Ernoul soon after the incident itself, but which was attached to the French vernacular chronicles in the 1230s. William of Tyre's Latin *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum* had been rendered into the vernacular sometime in the early 1230s, and is known by the name *L'estoire de Eracles empereur et la conquest de la terre d'Outremer*—or shorter—*Eracles*.³² While the original *Historia* of William ended in 1184, the vernacular *Eracles* was produced by different authors and continued in several phases until 1277.³³

²⁸ M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record. England 1066-1307*, 3rd ed. (Chichester, 2013), p. 18.

²⁹ For English translation see G.A. Loud's *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 34-41.

³⁰ Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 1, 7.

³¹ Otto of St Blasien's chronicle, *Otonis de Sancto Blasio Chronica* is published in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (MGH SRG)*, vol. 47 (Hannover, 1912). It was reedited, translated and published as a parallel Latin-German edition in 1998: *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien und die Marbacher Annalen*. Ed. & transl. Franz-Josef Schmale (Darmstadt, 1998). Graham Loud has translated part of the chronicle into English in his *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 173-91. The Chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck, *Arnoldi abbatis Lubecensis Chronica*, is also available at *MGH SS*, vol. 21 (Hannover, 1869), pp. 100-250.

³² John H. Pryor gives the date of this translation roughly between 1205 and 1234. John H. Pryor, "The *Eracles* and William of Tyre: An interim Report", in *The Horns of Hattin*, ed by B.Z. Kedar (London, 1992), pp. 270-293.

³³ For a detailed, but somewhat old and nowadays criticized study of *Eracles* and *Chronicle of Ernoul and Bernard the Treasurer* see M. R. Morgan, *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford, 1973). It seems, however, that Morgan's view of the manuscript transmission was erroneous, as has been pointed out by Peter Edbury, who has done great work on the *Eracle* and *Chronicle of Ernoul*, and who together with Massimiliano Gaggero is at the moment preparing a critical edition of both of these texts.

Originally this continuation was an independent work called *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*—*The Chronicle of Ernoul and Bernard the Treasurer*. The names Ernoul and Bernard derived from the chronicle itself, where these names are used in apparent reference to its writers. Ernoul, mentioned in the text as the writer, was a squire of one of the most distinguished Crusader knights in Jerusalem, Balian d'Ibelin, whose heroic deeds Ernoul follows from a few years before the Battle of Hattin all the way to his master Balian's heroic defense of Jerusalem a few months after Hattin. He is mentioned by name in the *La Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*—in relationship to the incidents that took place in May 1187. There it is mentioned that it was he, Ernoul, who put this story—*conte*—into writing.³⁴

Though it is uncertain how much of the material is directly attributable to him, it is evident that, for the central years, the account is told from the Ibelin standpoint. The surviving manuscripts date from the second half of the 13th century or later and divide into two branches, the second of which extends the narrative to 1232, omits the name of Ernoul, and adds a colophon including the name of Bernard the Treasurer, probably a compiler of this recension.³⁵ This chronicle has survived in eight independent manuscripts, and as thirty-nine French Continuations of *Eracle*. A majority of those manuscripts come from Europe, especially Northern France, but some derive from a manuscript atelier in Acre.³⁶

The French and Anglo-Norman Chronicles were biased; indeed, both told the story of the Third Crusade from their own vantage point. While Anglo-Norman chronicles described Richard and his ally—the king who lost his kingdom through the Hattin catastrophe, Guy of Lusignan—in a positive light, the French chronicles written in the area of Ile de France and Champagne favored their king, Philipp and his supporters in the Latin East. Ernoul's masters, the Ibelin family, were an opponent of King Guy, thus siding with the French king in the so-called Third Crusade which followed. It appears that *Itinerarum* did not use Ernoul's eyewitness account which was only natural; Ernoul and his fellow English crusaders were on different sides, when considering their relationship with the heroes and villains of the Hattin story. Ernoul and his brother were bitter opponents of King Guy of Lusignan, whereas King Richard was his ally, and therefore it is only natural that *Itinerarum* does not repeat Ernoul's account, which gives the image of King Guy as a man who could not distinguish a bad counselor (Master of the Templars Gerard of Ridefort) from a good one (Reynald, Duke of Tripoli). Those

³⁴ *La Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, ed. Louis de Mas Latrie (Paris, 1871), p. 149. See Peter Edbury, "Ernoul, Eracles and the Collapse of the Kingdom of Jerusalem", in the proceeding of the Conference *The French Outremer: Communities and Communications in the Crusading Mediterranean*. 34th Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval Studies of Fordham University. March 29-30, 2014, in print.

³⁵ Margaret Jubb, "Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier," *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, general editor Graeme Dunphy (Leiden, 2010), p. 335.

³⁶ Peter Edbury, "Ernoul, Eracles and the beginning of the Frankish rule in Cyprus, 1191-1232", in *Medieval Cyprus, A Place of Cultural Encounter*, eds. Sabine Rogge and Michael Grünbart (Münster, 2015), pp. 25-51.

chronographers, who sided with King Richard, tended to regard Reynald of Tripoli—a warrior who escaped the Battle of Hattin—as a traitor.³⁷

Although there is no possibility to know exactly what parts of the chronicle are really written by Ernoul, it is easy to suggest by way of its pro-Ibelin emphasis that Ernoul was responsible for the texts covering the years 1185-1187. In those years Balian, together with his brother Baldwin of Ramla, appears in the *Chronicle* in a very positive light, but disappears totally after the description of the surrender of Jerusalem in October 1187. Edbury suggests that Ernoul wrote his account sometime after the surrender of Jerusalem, but before his master Balian died in 1193, since there is no indication that Ernoul's master would have been dead. However, the text indicates that the outcome of the Fourth Crusade in 1204 was already known, which means that either Ernoul wrote his chronicle after that date, or the text as we know it is an outcome of the redactor who was well aware of the those accidents, which took place when the Crusaders attacked Constantinople.³⁸

Ernoul's account was written relatively soon after the incident itself, but only after it was attached to the French vernacular chronicles around the 1230s it really began being disseminated in Europe. This meant that the most detailed written description of the battle of Hattin started its spread in Europe many decades after the actual battle itself. In its content in the various manuscripts, Ernoul's chronicle can be divided into two groupings, the one being a shorter, and the other being a longer version. The originality of these two groupings is under dispute. For example, Marjorie Morgan believes that it is the longer version that is closest to Ernoul's original account.³⁹ Of all the versions of Ernoul's *Chronicle*, the most detailed account is presented in the Lyon manuscript of the French *Eracles*, which was written in Acre in the 1240s,⁴⁰ and it is this version that I use the most in this article.

Igor texts

The story of the Battle of Hattin, especially as it is described in the *Chronicle of Ernoul*, has a striking similarity to the no doubt most argued, most loved, and most elaborately described battle fought by a prince of Rus', the Battle of Prince Igor Sviatoslavich against the Polovtsy in 1185. In this article, my aim is to present how the imagery of the Battle of Hattin was used in these texts. I further argue my point of how the happenings in the Holy Land and especially the loss of Jerusalem was felt in Kievan Rus' by looking closer at the crusader references of the *Kievan Chronicle*.

By looking at the main events of the Battle of Hattin and comparing them to those mentioned in the Igor cycle, it becomes evident that the cycle of Igor narratives borrowed from the crusader stories the topos of the fundamental battle in which God shows

³⁷ The Norman chronicle *L'Estoire de la guerre sainte* written by Ambrose is one of them. See Ambrose, *L'Estoire de la guerre sainte* (Paris, 1897); for English translation see: Ambrose, *The History of the Holy War*, ed. by Marianne Ailes and Malcolm Barber (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

³⁸ Peter J. Edbury, "Thoros of Armenia and the Kingdom of Jerusalem," *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in honor of John France*, ed. by Simon John and Nicholas Morton (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 181-190, esp. 183.

³⁹ Morgan, *The Chronicle of Ernoul*, p. 2.

⁴⁰ Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, pp. 1-7.

his displeasure towards His people. The news of the disastrous battle of Prince Igor Sviatoslavich survived in three medieval texts: the historical narratives presented in the *Kievan Chronicle*, continuation of the *Povest' vremennykh let* (hereafter PVL) in the *Hypatian codex*, and the *Suzdal' Chronicle*, continuation of the PVL in the *Laurentian codex*, and the much disputed *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (the *Lay*, or *Song of Igor's Campaign*). The *Kievan Chronicle* provides a much longer and more detailed description that shares much of the same information and atmosphere as the *Lay* (*Slovo*). The *Laurentian* account is shorter, but it has its own characteristic features, which partly will be discussed below.

The Lay of Igor's Campaign (*Slovo*) is one of the most disputed Russian medieval sources, for the text is unique in its style among the medieval Rus' texts. It has often been compared with the *Chanson de geste* genre;⁴¹ it is artistic, lyrical, poetic, having a romantic atmosphere, where the glory and honor of a warrior is highly elevated. For three centuries already, the skeptics have tried to prove that the *Lay* (*Slovo*) is a falsification. However, in accordance with the archaic features of the text, it must be regarded as an authentic text from around the end of the 12th century.⁴²

From these sources historians have fervently tried to reconstruct the details of what actually happened on Igor's trip to the steppe, and how the information ended up in the chronicles and the *Slovo*. The research on Igor's campaign is abundant. But because there is no possibility to go through its main points here, I refer the reader to the latest updated survey of Igor studies by A.M. Ranchin.⁴³ Suffice it to say, this article does not

⁴¹ Д.С. Лихачев, "Зарождение и развитие жанров древнерусской литературы," *Исследования по древнерусской литературе* (Ленинград, 1986), pp. 79-95; Д.С. Лихачев, "Жанр «Слова о полку Игореве»," *La Poesia epica e la sua formazione* (Roma, 1970), pp. 315-330; А.Н. Робинсон, "Литература Киевской Руси среди европейских средневековых литератур (типология, оригинальность, метод)," *Славянские литературы. VI Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1968), pp. 73-81. See also Н.И. Милютенко, "Эпос западноевропейский и «Слово»," *Энциклопедия «Слова о полку Игореве» в 5 томах*, т. 5 (СПб, 1995), pp. 258-259.

⁴² The most recent debate has been ongoing between Edward L. Keenan, who in his *Josef Dobrovský and the Origins of the Igor' Tale* (Cambridge, MA, 2003), argues that *Slovo* is a product of the late eighteenth century, created by the Bohemian scholar Josef Dobrovský. His arguments were rejected by Olga Strakhov and Andrei Zalizniak, who pointed out to *Slovo*'s compliance with the Old Russian grammatical norms of the 12th-13th centuries that could not have been known by the late 18th-early 19th century linguists; see Olga B. Strakhov, "The Linguistic Practice of the Creator of the *Igor' Tale* and the Linguistic Views of Joseph Dobrovský," *Palaeoslavica* XI (2003), pp. 36-67; "A New Book on the Origin of the *Igor' Tale*: a Backward Step," *Palaeoslavica* XII/1 (2004), pp. 204-238; А.А. Зализняк. *Слово о полку Игореве. Взгляд лингвиста* (Москва, 2004 = *Рукописные памятники древней Руси*), изд. 3-е доп. (Москва, 2008); А.А. Зализняк, "Можно ли создать «Слово о полку Игореве» путем имитации?" *Вопросы языкознания*, no. 5 (2006), pp. 3-21; Robert Mann, *Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 48, no. 2 (2004), pp. 299-302; Simon Franklin, "The *Igor Tale*: A Bohemian Rhapsody?," *Kritika: Explorations and Eurasian History*, vol. 6, no. 4 (2005), pp. 833-844; А.М. Ранчин, "А было ли «Слово...» в начале?: споры о подлинности «Слова о полку Игореве» и книга академика А.А. Зализняка," *Новый мир*, no. 6 (2012), pp. 160-171; see also Ch. Halregin, "Подлинник? Подделка? Опять подделка! Эдвард Кинан, Йозеф Добровский и происхождение «Слова о полку Игореве»," *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, nos. 1-2 (2007), pp. 5-22.

⁴³ А.М. Ранчин, *Путеводитель по «Слову о полку Игореве»*. Учебное пособие (Москва, 2012).

follow the traditional route of trying to find out what really happened. Quite the contrary. This article underlines the importance of the writing traditions of Kievan Rus' which perceived the Polovtsy as Ishmaelites. As such, historical accidents taking place in Rus' were presented as being intertwined with those taking place in the Holy Land.

I do not address the entire scholarly discussion concerning the debates over the *Slovo* or the construction of possible authors of the Kievan and Vladimirian chronicle texts. Suffice it to say that I have found the recent studies challenging the legacy of Alexey Shakhmatov no less intriguing, and I agree that we should aim at eliminating overly complex reconstruction of the hypothetical layers of the chronicle texts. In recent years there has been serious work done to re-evaluate the literary history of Rus', especially in the field of the chronicle studies and the textology of the Kievan chronicles; both *Povest' vremennykh let* and the later Kievan *svod*, presented in the *Hypatian*, *Khlebnikov* and *Pogodin codices*. A.A. Shakhmatov's (1864-1920) complicated theory, which was based on the construction of hypothetical layers, or stages, (*svody*) of the pre-PVL chronicles in Kiev, has dominated the scholarly discussion for a long time.⁴⁴ Although Shakhmatov was challenged already by some of his contemporaries, like V.M. Istrin, S.A. Bugoslavskii and N.K. Nikol'skii, during the Soviet era Shakhmatov's theory became the official one, and was supported by eminent scholars like D.S. Likhachev and his followers.⁴⁵ Today we have seen the textological study to have been newly awakened, and Shakhmatov's theory re-evaluated and challenged by several scholars, such as Aleksey Tolochko, Donald Ostrowski, and Tatiana Vilkul to name just the few leading experts in this field.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Shakhmatov's most influential works were A.A. Шахматов, *Разыскания о древнейших русских летописных сводах* (Санкт Петербург, 1908) and *Повесть временных лет. Вводная часть. Текст. Примечания* (Петроград, 1916); for reprints of his works, see A.A. Шахматов, *История русского летописания*, т. I: *Повесть временных лет и древнейшие русские летописные своды*, кн. 2: *Раннее русское летописание XI-XII вв.* (Санкт Петербург, 2003). See also С.Я. Сендерович, "Метод Шахматова, раннее летописание и проблема начала русской историографии," *Из истории русской культуры*, том I: *Древняя Русь* (Москва, 2000), pp. 461-499.

⁴⁵ See Д.С. Лихачев, *Текстология: на материале русской литературы X-XVII вв.* (Москва, 1962; repr. in 1983 and 2001). For the scholarly history of the textological studies in short, see Donald Ostrowski's review in *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, vol. 9, no. 4 (2008), pp. 939-949.

⁴⁶ Алексей Толочко, "О заглавии Повести временных лет," *Ruthenica*, no. 5 (2006), pp. 248-251; Oleksiy P. Tolochko, "Christian Chronology, Universal History, and the Origin of Chronicle Writing in Rus'," *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery. Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Western Europe (c. 1070-1200)*, edited by Ildar H. Garipzanov (Turnhout, 2011 = *Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe*, vol. 26), pp. 206-207; Donald Ostrowski, "Introduction" to *The Povest' vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, eds. Donald Ostrowski and David J. Birnbaum (Cambridge, MA, 2003 = *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts*, v. 10), pp. lxi-lxiii; Donald Ostrowski, "Scribal Practices and Copying Probabilities in the Transmission of the Text of the *Povest' vremennykh let*," *Palaeoslavica* XIII/2 (2005), pp. 48-77; Donald Ostrowski, "The Nachal'nyj svod theory and the *Povest' vremennykh let*," *Russian Linguistics*, no. 31 (2007), pp. 269-308; Donald Ostrowski, "Pagan past and Christian identity in the Primary Chronicle," *Historical Narratives*, pp. 229-253; Т. Вілкул, *Літопис і хронограф. Студії з текстології домонгольського кийівського літописання* (Київ, 2015).

Emerging from this discussion is a major new contribution from Tatiana Vilkul. For years Vilkul has been publishing careful textological studies concerning the literary relationships among the Old Rus' texts. She has now completed a huge synthesis of her work, and prepared the monograph which ties the lines of her work together.⁴⁷ She points out how Kievan *svod* added large chunks of text to its content. Thus, the work of Tatiana Vilkul can be credited as giving a larger overall picture concerning the mechanisms of the chronicle writing in Kiev, in both in its early stage concerning PVL and its later stage concerning the early 13th-century *svod*. Simon Franklin stated that “in a society where routine record keeping and archival habits were thin, the chronicles were the cumulative written record of the disputes, negotiations, and agreements of the Rus elite.”⁴⁸ But how this was supposed to be done? A series of Soviet, Russian and Ukrainian scholars have suggested that the chronicles really did include princes' archives in the form of the direct speeches.⁴⁹ Vilkul, however, shows in fact how many of the eloquent speeches of the Kievan rulers were borrowings from the literature, mostly from *Alexander Romance*, and thus the idea sometimes presented—that these speeches testify to the preserved documents of a prince's office or chancellery—can be rejected. Vilkul's study points out that what appears to be authentic evidence according to its realistic sentiment is, actually, a well-used literary rhetoric, borrowed from the library of the chronographer.⁵⁰ I am inclined to go with Tatiana Vilkul's study about deserting the old ideas of reducing the *Kievan Chronicle* into pieces of small fractions of the private chronicles of various princes. Recently Petr Tolochko has argued that the Igor narrative in the *Kievan Chronicle* is a coherent text, not showing any particular signs of various “local” chronicles.⁵¹

To present Igor's battle against the Polovtsy in 1185 in the context of the Crusades is no novel idea. Especially some details of the *Slovo* have been widely speculated upon. One such issue is, the request made to Prince Iaroslav Osmomysl of Galich to stand against the Polovtsy chieftain Konchak. Urging Prince Iaroslav to shoot his arrows towards the Konchak, the *Slovo* remembers how “from your father's golden throne you shoot at sultans beyond the lands”.⁵² D.N. Dubenskii proposed already in 1849 that this

⁴⁷ Вілкул, *Літопис і хронограф*, pp. 245-322; See also Алексей Толочко, “О времени создания Киевского свода «1200 г.»,” *Ruthenica*, no. 5 (2006), pp. 73-87.

⁴⁸ Simon Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus', c. 950-1300* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 172.

⁴⁹ See for example Б.А. Рыбаков, *Древняя Русь. Сказания. Былины. Летописи* (Москва, 1963), pp. 316-336; Пашуто, *Внешняя политика*, pp. 40-41; 156-184; 242, 253, 260; А.В. Юрасовский, “Грамоты XI—середины XIV в. в составе русских летописей,” *История СССР*, no. 4 (1982), pp. 141-150; В.Ю. Франчук, *Киевская летопись: Состав и источники в лингвистическом освещении* (Киев, 1986), pp. 109-154; Н.Ф. Котляр, *Дипломатия южной Руси* (Санкт Петербург, 2003), pp. 6-7, 291-297; А.В. Майоров, *Русь, Византия и Западная Европа. Из истории внешнеполитических и культурных связей XII-XIII вв.* (Санкт Петербург, 2011), p. 37.

⁵⁰ Вілкул, *Літопис і хронограф*, pp. 313-314.

⁵¹ Петр Толочко, “Повесть о походе Игоря Святославича в Ипатьевской летописи,” *Ruthenica*, no. 3 (2014), pp. 124-134.

⁵² “...стрѣлявши съ отня злата стола Салтани за землями”, cf. *Слово о полку Игореве. Ироическая пѣснь о походе на половцовъ удѣльнаго князя Новагорода-Сѣверскаго Игоря Святославича* (Москва, 1800), p. 30.

reference bears witness to the idea that the Galician host was taking part in the Third Crusade directed towards Saladin.⁵³ Other scholars have highlighted the role of Galician princes as allies of Byzantium in fighting against the Turkic nomadic nations.⁵⁴ No one has, however, seriously claimed that Rus' princes would have really participated in the Crusading wars in Palestine, simply because we do not have sufficient evidence to make that claim.⁵⁵ They were rather concentrating on confronting their own enemies on their own Steppe border. This, however, does not imply that they would not have contacts to the Crusader kingdom at all. Quite the opposite, as it is well known that Russians from Novgorod, Kiev, and Chernigov, were active travelers and made peaceful pilgrimages to Jerusalem.⁵⁶ Awareness of the things taking place in the Holy Land was strong, and deeply affected the historical consciousness in Kievan Rus'.

Texts describing Igor's campaign give a mixed message: for example, they cannot give a coherent picture of when the campaign actually began: regarding on what date or what year was it. The *Hypatian codex* of the *Kievan Chronicle* gives us the date of Igor's departure from Novgorod-Severskiy as being the 23th of April in year 6693—which happened to be a the Day of Saint George, a convenient day for a grand operation, used also by German Emperor Fredrick Barbarossa, when he set out for his Crusade in 1189.⁵⁷ Late manuscripts of the Hypatian branch—*Khlebnikov* and *Ermolaev* codices—give the date 13th (Ѡ) of April.⁵⁸ The *Laurentian codex* places Igor's campaign to the year of 6694.⁵⁹

I will next go through some of the most distinctive similarities between the Crusader stories of the Battle of Hattin—mostly as they are represented in the *Chronicle of Ernoul*—and the Igor texts. Some of the details presented below are no doubt general literary topoi of the Medieval literature. But some contain very special features that are

⁵³ Д. Дубенский, *Слово о полку Игореве* (Москва, 1849), pp. 158-160. See А.Г. Бобров, "Салтан," *Энциклопедия «Слова о полку Игореве» в 5 томах*, т. 4 (СПб., 1995), p. 263.

⁵⁴ Alexander V. Maiorov, "The Alliance between Byzantium and Rus' before the Conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204", *Russian History*, vol. 42 (2015), pp. 272-303; Майоров, *Русь, Византия и Западная Европа*, pp. 186-190.

⁵⁵ A 13th century crusader source *L'histoire de Jerusalem et d'Antioche* mentions soldiers from Poland, Rus', and Norway (*de Polaine, de Rossie, de Norwege*) as participating the siege of Nicea during the First Crusade in 1097; cf. *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Historiens Occidentaux*, v. V, pt. 2 (Paris, 1895), p. 630; cf. Пашуго, *Внешняя политика*, pp. 140-141; see also М.Н. Тихомиров, *Древняя Русь* (Москва, 1975), pp. 35-36.

⁵⁶ М.А. Заборов, "Известия русских современников о крестовых походах," *Византийский временник*, vol. 31 (1971), pp. 84-107; А.В. Назаренко, *Древняя Русь на международных путях. Междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX-XII веков* (Москва, 2001), pp. 617-649.

⁵⁷ "В то же время Сѣславичъ . Игорь вноукъ Шлговъ . поѣха из Новагорода . мѣа . априла . въ .кѣ . днѣ во вторникъ," *Полное собрание русских летописей* [henceforth: *ПСРЛ*], т. 2: *Ипатьевская летопись*, изд. 2-е (С.-Петербург, 1908), col. 637. Compare Peter Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa. A Study in Medieval Politics* (Ithaca, 1969), p. 386.

⁵⁸ Ранчин, *Путеводитель по «Слову»*, p. 55.

⁵⁹ *ПСРЛ*, т. 1: *Лаврентьевская летопись*, вып. 2: *Суздальская летопись*, изд. 2-е (Ленинград, 1927), cols. 396-397.

attached only to the Battle of Hattin, possibly the most significant single battle known at the turn of the 12th century.

Ernoul's eyewitness account begins a few months before the battle of Hattin, giving us the description of the fatal encounter with a Muslim attachment in the Battle of Cresson, which took place on May 1st of 1187. Ernoul recounts how Balian d'Ibelin, the lord of Ernoul, missed the battle because of his other engagements, arriving too late to participate.⁶⁰ This unfortunate battle, where the Templars suffered heavy losses, was a kind of tragic prelude to the decisive defeat at the Battle of Hattin two months later. Balian's late arrival to the battle, where he was expected to be, matched perfectly with Igor, who was asked to join the battle against the Polovtsy. The *Kievan Chronicle* tells how the Great Prince of Kiev was mustering troops to encounter the Polovtsy, and send a messenger to call Igor for help. Igor's advisers then told him that because of the spring floods it was too late to go to Kiev and catch up with the fight.⁶¹ Thus, the chronicle tells us how, to Igor's immense disappointment, he missed the great battle. The big difference is that, whereas the Battle of Cresson was a total catastrophe for the Christians, the troops of Rus' were successful in their campaign against the Polovtsy in the years between 1183 and May 1185. Both the *Laurentian codex* and the *Slovo* make it seem as if Igor had missed the whole joy, fame, and glory of the victory, which made him all the more eager to prepare for his own separate campaign.⁶²

In presenting the reasons why the battle of Cresson went as badly as it did, Ernoul's *Chronicle* gives the one explaining the defeat of the Christians: the arrogance of the Grand Master of the Templars, Gerard of Ridefort.⁶³ Likewise, Igor's defeat is also explained by Igor's arrogant hastiness which brought his troops into this deadly encounter. Great Prince Sviatoslav points out to Igor's impulsive passion to war in his lament: "о моя сыновчя Игорю и Всеволоде! рано еста начала Половецкую землю мечи цвѣлити, а себѣ славы искати. Нѣ нечестно одолѣсте: нечестно бо кровь поганую пролїясте. Ваю храбрая сердца въ жестоцемъ харалузѣ скована, а въ буети закалена."⁶⁴ About Igor's selfish pursue of fame it states: "Нѣ рекосте му жа имѣся [read

⁶⁰ *Chronicle of Ernoul* according to the Lyon *Eracles* ms, edited by Margareth Ruth Morgan in her *La Continuation de Guollaume de Tyr (1184-1197)* (Paris, 1982), § 27. for the English translation, see Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 34. From all the survived *Chronicles of Ernoul*, the Lyon ms contains the most complete description of the Battle of Hattin. Even though the Lyon ms was composed most probably ca. 1240's, Morgan considered it to be the closest to the original *Chronicle of Ernoul*; this view has been challenged by John Gillingham, "Roger of Howden on Crusade," *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century* (London, 1994), p. 147, and John Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 5, who consider the shorter version being closest to the original.

⁶¹ *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 636.

⁶² Compare "Здумаша Влгови внуци на Половци· занеже баху не ходили· томъ лѣ· со всею князью· но сами поидоша всобѣ· рекуще мы есмь ци не князи же· [поиде] такъже собѣ хвалы добуде"; "... а возме до конца свою славу и чть" (*ПСРЛ*, т. 1, cols. 397-398) with "...ишучи себе чти , а Князю слава..." (*Слово о полку Игореве*, p. 8).

⁶³ *Chronicle of Ernoul*, in Morgan (ed.), *La Continuation*, §§ 25, 28; English translation in Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 32, 34.

⁶⁴ *Слово о полку Игореве*, p. 26.

мужаимся] сами, преднюю славу сами похитимъ, а заднюю ся сами подѣлимъ.»⁶⁵ In the *Hypatian codex* Igor speaks of the shame of leaving without a battle.⁶⁶ The *Laurentian codex* also highlights Igor's hunger for the military glory: “пойдемъ по нѣ за Донъ· и до конца избьемъ ихъ· вже нѣ будѣ ту побѣда· идѣ по нѣ и луку моря· гдѣ же не ходили ни дѣди наши· а возмѣ до конца свою славу и чть·”⁶⁷ The moral disapproval of Igor is similar to the statement of the *Chronicle of Ernoul*, which describes how “The king trusted more in his own power and in his men than in the virtue of Jesus Christ and the Holy Cross, and because of this things went ill for him later.”⁶⁸

Both the *Chronicle of Ernoul* and the Igor cycle share the theme of heroic brothers: Igor and his brother Vsevolod are fully comparable to the heroic Balian of Ibelin and his brother Baldwin in Ernoul's *Chronicle*. Even though Balian's elder brother Baldwin refuses to fight in the army of King Guy, whom he dislikes as an upstart youngster—who gained his position as a king through marriage only—he is represented in Ernoul's *Chronicle* as a mighty warlord with respected values.⁶⁹ Ernoul's *Chronicle* states: “Never did Roland nor Oliver accomplish so many feats of arms at Roncevaux as did the brothers the day of the battle, with the help of God and Saint George, who was in the battle with them.”⁷⁰ Thus the brothers Igor and Vsevolod correspond to this chivalric pattern, highly elevated in the Crusader stories. N.S. Demkova even stated that Igor's brother is one of the central figures in the *Slovo*, for it is his heroic fight, not Igor's, which presents the act of ultimate bravery, and that Igor and Vsevolod represent the ideal of brotherhood, Vsevolod representing the “epic twin” of Igor.⁷¹

The Battle of Hattin was the result of a long chain of events, which brought Saladin to them after a series of smaller raiding campaigns and some diplomatic setbacks to gather his main army to besiege a crusader town called Tiberias. The town was located by Lake Tiberias, and as the crusader army marched to the rescue of the city, Saladin's tactics were aimed at not allowing the Franks to reach adequate water supplies once their army had left their camp. Saladin then staked everything on a major battle before the crusader field army came off the dry plateau to reach the water of Lake Tiberias.⁷²

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶⁶ *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 639; cf. “Игорь же рѣ с братьєю своею· вже ны боудеть не бившеса· возвратитиса· то соромъ ны боудеть поущи смирти.”

⁶⁷ *ПСРЛ*, т. 1, cols. 397-398.

⁶⁸ Morgan (ed.), *La Continuation*, § 31; English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 37.

⁶⁹ Morgan (ed.), *La Continuation*, § 21. English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 28.

⁷⁰ The following appraise comes from a shorter version of the *Chronicle of Ernoul*: “Et si ne demoura mie atant que il d'armes / ne fessissent quankes il porent dusque à le nuit / sour les Sarrasins, c'onques Rollans ne Oliviers ne fissent / tant d'armes en Rainscevaux, con li doi frere fissent / le jour en le bataille, à l'aïue Diu et de monseigneur / Saint Joi'ge, qui en la bataille fu o els,” see L. De Mas-Latrie, *La Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier* (Paris, 1871), p. 44. See Tara Foster, “Reconquering the Holy Land: The Third Crusade in medieval French literature,” *Battle and Bloodshed: The Medieval World at War*, eds. Lorna Bleach and Kendra Borill (Cambridge, 2013), p. 79.

⁷¹ Н.С. Демкова, “Проблемы изучения «Слова о полку Игореве»,” *Чтения по древнерусской литературе* (Ереван, 1989), pp. 85-87. Г.М. Прохоров, “Всеволод Святославич,” *Энциклопедия «Слова о полку Игореве»*, т. 1 (СПб., 1995), pp. 252-253.

⁷² David Nicolle, *Hattin 1187: Saladin's Greatest Victory* (Oxford, 2011), p. 53.

The crusader army was led by King Guy of Lusignan, and the *Chronicle of Ernoul* describes the route of the army and the hardships that it suffered. On their march to rescue the town of Tiberias, the troops had their first contact with the enemy on Friday, July 3, 1187,⁷³ as it was harassed by the archers of the Muslims. This was not a close combat, but the enemy shot arrows from a distance, making the march towards the besieged Tiberias extremely difficult.⁷⁴

When examining the two paramount war stories, that of the Battle of Hattin, and that of Igor's campaign in 1185, one should note that the beginning of Igor's campaign was totally different, since it began with a victory over the Polovtsy, as Igor's troops attacked their camp by surprise and gained great booty.⁷⁵ On the next day Igor's luck turned, and the encounter with the Polovtsy was a many-sided struggle which lasted several days. In Hattin, on the first day, Friday the 3rd of July was the dreadful march under the hot July sun sweltering the knights, being harassed by Muslim archers on a dry plateau. In Igor's case, the Kievan Chronicle relates that the first encounter with the Polovtsy also took place on Friday, but this first encounter was favorable for Igor.

Finally, after a night spent without water in the hills near the village of Hattin, the historic encounter took place. The supply of water, or rather a lack of it, was considered as a main contributor to the outcome of the battle, as the army fought in the sweltering heat of July. The description of the thirsty Crusader army in the heat of July is one of the most striking features of the *Chronicle of Ernoul* that is present in various versions.⁷⁶

This thirst is linked to a long description of the preparations for camping at nightfall, which was immensely important since King Guy had to decide whether to camp where the thirsty men and horses could find water or to continue the march to try to get closer to their destination. Ernoul's *Chronicle* describes the fatal mistake by King Guy in deciding to encamp for the night, instead of charging the enemy straight away.⁷⁷ But for the Crusader Army's bad luck, the well which they supposed to be functioning in their camp, was dried, and not even the night brought relief to their thirst.⁷⁸ As in Hattin,

⁷³ *Chronicle of Ernoul*, in the Colbert-Fontainebleau ms. states that the day when the host of King Guy left their camp, was Friday; cf. "L'Estoire de Eracles empereur et la conquest de la Terre d'Outremer," *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1859), pp. 62-65; for English translation see Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 159. Cf. also a letter sent to Archbald, the Hospitaller master in Italy, that states that Saladin attacked the Christian host on Friday (*ibid.*, p. 160).

⁷⁴ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Lyon ms. describes how "Saladin ordered his skirmishers to harass them [the Christian army of King Guy] from morning to midday. The heat was so great that they could not go on so as to reach water"; see Morgan, *La Continuation*, § 40; English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 45.

⁷⁵ *IICPJI*, T. 2, col. 640.

⁷⁶ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Lyon ms., Morgan, *La Continuation*, §§ 40-41; English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 45; *The Chronicle of Ernoul* in Colbert-Fontainebleau ms. thus summarizes the sufferings of the Christians: "The heat was very great and that was a source of great affliction, and in that valley there was nowhere they could find water"; English translation: *ibid.*, p. 159.

⁷⁷ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Lyon ms.: Morgan, *La Continuation*, § 40; English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 45; *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Colbert-Fontainebleau ms., English translation: *ibid.*, p. 159.

⁷⁸ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Colbert-Fontainebleau ms., English translation: *ibid.*, p. 157.

where King Guy receives different kinds of advice; so too Igor's men advise him both for a swift advance and for encamping.⁷⁹ Although Igor has bad premonitions, he decides to make camp for the night.

The decision to make camp was later criticized as being a major tactical mistake made by King Guy. Ernoul's *Chronicle* repeats the opinion that the reasons for the failure of the battle were not so much that the Christians were underpowered compared to the Muslims, but were due to their bad tactical choices, most of all regarding the encampment.⁸⁰ Similarly, Igor seems to understand that the encampment is a tactical mistake. He agrees to the demands of his men to have a rest for their horses, although he has a bad premonition of this decision.⁸¹

Ernoul provides a vivid description of the Frankish soldiers awakening the next morning and seeing the enormous Muslim force completely surrounding them.⁸² This is exactly what Igor's host experienced. The fatal encounter began the next day, on Saturday, when his encamped host awakened, only to notice that they were completely surrounded by a massive enemy host. The *Hypatian codex* stated that they were approaching "акъ боровѣ [like a forest]."⁸³ Also Ernoul gives a vivid description of the Frankish soldiers awakening the next morning and seeing the enormous Muslim force completely surrounding them so tightly that not even a cat could have been escaped from the Christian camp without the Muslims to have caught it.⁸⁴

After a hopeless battle with the overpowered enemy, in Hattin, one of the Frank detachments broke through enemy lines. Similarly, the *Hypatian codex* tells us how one of Igor's detachments got through the enemy lines and escaped. Igor first hurried after them, trying to get them back, and then returned to the battle scene, seeing the desperate fight of his brother Vsevolod.⁸⁵ Heroic fights of individual knights were fascinatingly represented in the crusader chronicles.⁸⁶ Finally Igor's exhausted troops dismount and fight on foot⁸⁷—as the final stage also unfolded in Hattin. After one of the Frank detachments broke through enemy lines, the rest of the exhausted troops dismounted and fought on foot.⁸⁸

⁷⁹ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 640.

⁸⁰ See footnote 77 above.

⁸¹ See footnote 79 above.

⁸² *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Colbert-Fontainebleau ms., English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 159.

⁸³ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 641.

⁸⁴ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Colbert-Fontainebleau ms., see the English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 159.

⁸⁵ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 642; *Слово о полку Игореве*, p. 13-14.

⁸⁶ See, for example, the Anglo-Norman *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, ch. 2, where there is a great description of one anonymous knight from Tours fighting in the Battle of Cresson on the first of May 1187. The idea was to depict bravery that was admired by one's comrades in arms as well as the by one's enemies. See the English translation in Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, p. 25-26.

⁸⁷ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 641.

⁸⁸ Arab sources written by Imad ed-Din and Ibn al-Athir recount that when the Christian knights began to retire to the Hills of Hattin, they left their horses, and were dismounted and exhausted when they were

In Hattin the thirsty troops attempted to break through the lines to reach the water of Lake Tiberias,⁸⁹ and some anecdotes even describe Saladin teasing the thirsty crusader soldiers with water.⁹⁰ Similarly, in the *Laurentian codex* Igor's thirsty troops made an attempt to break through the lines to reach water.⁹¹ Water scarcity is one of the most curious elements in Igor's battle, especially since the *Hypatian codex* tells that Igor's battle took place by the lake.⁹² This is, perhaps, one of the most intriguing topological elements combining Igor stories with the legend of the Battle of Hattin, where the Crusaders were trying to reach the water of Lake Tiberias especially highlighted in the *Laurentian codex*.

In both Igor's story and that of at Hattin, men and horses were exhausted by the heat, thirst, and arrows, and the inevitable surrender was at hand, while only a handful of men managed to escape. Most of the army was killed or taken into captivity for later ransom. The loss was massive. At Hattin, all of the Templar and Hospitaller knights were beheaded, and most of the noble lords were taken into captivity, including King Guy, who remained imprisoned for a year.⁹³ Like King Guy, Prince Igor also was taken as a hostage. Igor's captivity is the culmination point, as it presents the deep humiliation of a proud warrior. In the case of both Hattin and Igor's battle, the totality of the defeat is highlighted; only a handful of men managed to escape.

Finally, similarly to crusader stories, the shock of the lost battle is intensively highlighted in the Igor cycle. This is expressed in a solemn epic way in the *Slovo*, but the dramatic loss is very much underlined also in both chronicle accounts. The anger of God because of the sins of the people and because of the quarrels between princes are presented as the reason for the defeat.⁹⁴ The quarrels between princes are exceptionally strongly highlighted also in most of our sources telling about the disaster of Hattin.⁹⁵

The devastating shock of the annihilation of the Christian army that spread throughout Europe after Hattin,⁹⁶ lives in the epic statement of the *Slovo* when, after the defeat,

finally taken. Cf. Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 2: *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East 1100-1187* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 489.

⁸⁹ Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 2, p. 458; Nicolle, *Hattin 1187*, pp. 72-73; Christopher Tyerman, *God's War. A New History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 369.

⁹⁰ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Lyon ms., see Morgan, *La Continuation*, § 41; English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 45.

⁹¹ ПСРЛ, т. 1, col. 398: а к водѣ не дадуче имъ ити· и приспѣ к ѿ дружина вса· многое множество· наши же видѣвше ихъ оужасошася· и величаныа своего ѿпадоша· <...> изнемогли бо са баху безводьемь· || и кони и сами в знои· и в тузѣ· и поступиша мало к водѣ· но ·Г· дѣи бо не пустили баху ихъ к водѣ.

⁹² ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 642: и бѣахоу бо са идоуще в кроугъ· при езерѣ.

⁹³ See Edbury 1998, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 2.

⁹⁴ ПСРЛ, т. 1, cols. 398, 400; т. 2, cols. 643, 648.

⁹⁵ *Chronicle of Ernoul* in Lyon ms.; see Morgan, *La Continuation*, § 41; English translation: Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem*, p. 46. For the English translation of the papal bull *Audita tremendi*, see *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 7.

⁹⁶ See, for example, *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, ch. 5, which recounts how "In a single moment, it [the Battle of Hattin] carried away and extinguished all the glory of the kingdom"; see the English translation by Helen Nicholson in *Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, p. 35.

the great prince of Kiev mourns how “the gates were now open to Kiev”.⁹⁷ Because of this humiliation, God forgave Igor and let him escape from Khan Konchak’s camp.

The *Audita tremdi* bull launched immediately after the news of the catastrophe of Hattin had been heard in papal court and presented an especially strong theme of *peccatis exigentibus*, which had been displayed in church rhetoric ever since the failure of the Second Crusade in 1147, as explaining military and other failures. The disaster of Hattin brought out new ideas considering religious devotion and God’s role in history. As the sources telling about the lost battle of Hattin underlined that this took place because of the sins of the whole of Christendom, the morals of each Christian individual reflected onto the faith of God’s land.⁹⁸ The news of the Hattin disaster had dire reflections for the Papal Curia, having a deep impact on the reform of ideas.⁹⁹

The story of the battle of Hattin was a narrative of the punishment of God. The phraseology of the papal letters and crusader sermons state that the calamities and accidents took place as a result of their sins: “peccatibus exigentibus hominum.” This phrase in its different variants was a standard rhetorical phrase used by medieval popes and preachers to explain that people’s sins had terrible consequences. Such phrases explained the collapse of the “negotium pacis et fidei” as a direct result of men’s sins. For Pope Eugenius III (1145-1153) the fall of Edessa was meant as punishment for their sins.¹⁰⁰ All of this must have been well known rhetoric to medieval Christians and to the Crusaders, but it was the catastrophic disaster of Hattin and the loss of Jerusalem, which it resulted in, that served as the incomprehensible punishment for the whole of Christendom, which also echoed in Kiev. Still in 1198, Innocent III stated that the loss of Jerusalem was the outcome of God’s wrath directed at the sins and internecine feuds that had arisen throughout Christendom, and he made a plea for all Christians to be chastised and to repent.¹⁰¹ These claims can easily be found to be the core message of all three existing Igor narratives.¹⁰²

Thus, it becomes evident that in Europe, after the shocking news of the Battle of Hattin, various texts describing this battle were rapidly disseminated. One can only guess the number of oral stories and rumors attached to this fiasco. The story of Hattin became an important constraint on the collective memory of medieval Europe, and it had a deep impact on people’s lives. It directly affected thousands of people, who witnessed the new church liturgy with its sharpened demands for repentance and fasting.

⁹⁷ “твориши ворота на Роусьскоую землю,” *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 645. Cf. the use of the similar expression in the *Igor’s Tale* though in a different context, see *Слово о полку Игореве*, p. 35.

⁹⁸ See Bird & al, *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 5; Christoph T. Maier, “Crisis, liturgy and the Crusade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 48, no. 4 (1997), pp. 628-657.

⁹⁹ Michael Markowski, “Peter of Blois and the conception of the Third Crusade,” *The Horns of Hattin*, pp. 261-269.

¹⁰⁰ Rebecca Rist, *The Papacy and Crusading in Europe, 1198-1245* (New York, 2009), 89. See also Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Imprisonment in the Medieval Religious Imagination, c. 1150-1400* (Houndmills, 2011).

¹⁰¹ Innocent’s letter, *Post miserabile*, was inserted into the *Chronicle of Roger of Howeden*, the English translation of it see in *Crusade and Christendom*, pp. 31-37.

¹⁰² *Слово о полку Игореве*, pp. 19, 35, 37; *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, cols. 643-644, 648; *ПСРЛ*, т. 1, cols. 398, 400.

The Kievan Chronicle Crusade references

Thus, by looking at the main events of the Battle of Hattin and comparing these to those mentioned in the Igor cycle, it seems reasonable to suggest that the cycle of Igor narratives could have borrowed the topos of the fundamental battle from the crusader stories, in which God reveals his displeasure towards His people.

The *Primary Chronicle* was compiled in 1116,¹⁰³ 17 years after the **liberation** of Jerusalem. Interestingly enough this event went unnoticed by the chronographer. Quite on the contrary, the *Chronicle* is full of eschatological motifs borrowed from the *Revelation of Pseudo-Methodius*. The ongoing wars against the Polovtsy were perceived as wars against Ishmaelites.¹⁰⁴ This eschatological interest towards world history was ultimately linked to the fate of Jerusalem, the sacred place where the final events of world history would take place. Both *Laurentian* and *Hypatian* codices often refer to various battles for Jerusalem (Jerusalem's sack by Seleucid King Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167 B.C., its siege and destruction in 70 A.D. and in 636-37) in the context of strange natural phenomena that prognosticate an ill fate.¹⁰⁵ Under the year of 1065 the *Primary Chronicle* provides a long list of contemporary and historical portents of disaster (celestial phenomena, monstrous births, earthquakes, etc.) thus comparing the present-day events with those of 167 B.C., 70 and 636-37 A.D.;¹⁰⁶ Jerusalem's sack of 167 B.C. is invoked again under the year of 1113 after the description of a solar eclipse.¹⁰⁷ The *Kievan Chronicle* continues this tradition.

Aleksey Tolochko has argued that the *Kievan Chronicle* was compiled around the year 1212,¹⁰⁸ 27 years after the **loss** of Jerusalem. Now the chronographer paid close attention to the event.

The *Kievan Chronicle* refers to Jerusalem's recent history in entries for the years of 1187 and 1190. Both references show that Kievans closely followed the events that recently took place in the Holy Land. Describing the solar eclipse of 1187 the *Chronicle* states:

Того же лѣтъ бѣ знамениѣ . мѣа сентабра . ѿ днѣ . тма бѣ по всей землѣ яко же дивитиса всимъ члвкомъ . слнце бо погипе а нбо погорѣ вблакы вгнезарными . таковаа бо знамениа не на добро бѣвають . в тои бо днѣ того мѣа . взать бѣ Ерлмъ безбожными Срацины.¹⁰⁹

The role of the solar eclipse in predicting the fall of Jerusalem is of special interest since it was crucially important in predicting Igor's defeat. As Igor was on his way to the

¹⁰³ The discussion of the different stages of PVL is far from unanimous, but I am willing to go with the line suggested by A. Tolochko, Vilkul, and Ostrowski that we should look at PVL as a text which was compiled by Sylvester in 1116 and avoid the speculation concerning the hypothetical layers of the text.

¹⁰⁴ See footnote 1 above.

¹⁰⁵ See ПСРЛ, т. 1, cols. 164-165; т. 2, cols. 153-155, 274-275.

¹⁰⁶ ПСРЛ, т. 1, cols. 164-165, т. 2, cols. 153-155.

¹⁰⁷ ПСРЛ, т. 2, cols. 274-275.

¹⁰⁸ Толочко, "О времени создания Киевского свода", pp. 73-87.

¹⁰⁹ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 655.

Steppe, a solar eclipse occurred.¹¹⁰ It is noteworthy that while the *Laurentian codex* tells about the solar eclipse at the very beginning of the entry for 1186 and only then begins the story of Igor's battle, the *Hypatian codex* does not pay any specific attention to the eclipse in the entry for 1185 and mentions it within the narrative.¹¹¹ We remember, of course, that the topos of solar and/or lunar eclipses as a sign of calamity and, consequently, of God's wrath and punishment goes back to the Holy Scripture, cf. Is 13:10, Ez 32:7, Joel 2:10, 2:31, 3:15, Mt 24:29, Apoc 6:12, 8:12. Not only the crusaders, but the whole Europe followed the celestial omens very closely and were keen to use them to prove that their actions were in line with the will of God.¹¹² Since the reigning faith of Jerusalem particularly was regarded as implementing the will of God, the omens were even more watchfully observed in the relationship with the Holy Land.

The Kievan compiler connected the events taking place in Jerusalem with those actualizing on Rus' soil, because he looked through the prism of the Pseudo-Methodian apocalyptic context, which modeled the Polovtsy on the Saracens, for they both were seen as Ishmaelites, that is Hagarenes:

намъ же оукоренымъ соушимъ . понось приимающимъ ѿ безаконныхъ тѣхъ Агаранъ . и чающе есмь Бжиа блгѣи . и лика преславна:¹¹³

The passage clearly indicates that the chronographer felt compassion towards the tragedy of the Holy Land and comprehend historical events taking place in both Kiev and Jerusalem as parallel phenomena. Again and again the sons of Ishmael — Hagarenes — form a mutual threat to crusaders and Rus' alike. This feeling of personally witnessing the tragedy in the Holy Land and being a participant of the event is echoed in another *Kievan Chronicle* crusade reference that tells about the death of Emperor Fredrick Barbarossa during the Third Crusade in 1190:

В то же лѣто иде црѣ Немѣцкыи со всею своею землею битиса за гробъ Гнѣ проавиль бо башеть емоу Гѣ англмъ вела емоу ити . и пришедшимъ имъ . и быющимъ крѣпко . с бѣгостоднными тыми Агараны . Бѣу же тако попоустившоу гнѣвъ свои на весь миръ . зане исполниса злобъ нашихъ вса земля . и си вса наведе на ны грѣхъ ради нашихъ .¹¹⁴

It is worth noting that the chronographer emphasizes that Russians too were collectively carrying the burden of the loss of Jerusalem. It was because of our sins that Jerusalem was lost. No trace of the division of Christendom into Orthodoxy and Catholicism is seen here. The chronicle stresses the collective responsibility over and over again:

¹¹⁰ Cf. “Тогда Игорь възрѣ на свѣтлое солнце и видѣ отъ него тьмою вся своя воя прикрыты”; “Солнце ему тьмою путь заступаше,” *Слово о полку Игореве*, pp. 5, 8.

¹¹¹ *ПСРЛ*, т. 1, col. 396: В лѣ · ꙗ · х · ѿ · д · мѣ · ма · вь · а · днѣ · на памѣ · стѣ · прѣ · ка · е · ре · ми · а · В · се · рѣ · на · вѣ · рни · Б · ѣ · зна · мен · ь · вь · слн · ци · и · мо · ро · чно · б · ѣ · вел · ми · ꙗ · ко · и · звѣ · зды · видѣ · ти · члѣ · кмь · вь · ч · чю · ꙗ · ко · зе · ле · но · ба · ше · и · вь · слн · ци · оу · чи · нис · а · ꙗ · ко · мѣ · из · ро · гь · ꙗ · ко · ѡ · гль · жар · овь · ис · хо · жа · ше · стра · шно · б · ѣ · видѣ · ти · члѣ · комь · зна · мен · ь · Б · ж · ь · е [the story of Igor's battle follows]; *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 638: Игорь же възрѣвъ на нѣбо и видѣ слнще · сто · я · ще · ꙗ · ко · мѣ ·

¹¹² Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1: *The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1951), p. 115; Idem, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 2, p. 105.

¹¹³ *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 656.

¹¹⁴ *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 667.

се бо створи Гб̄ за грѣхы наша . казна всь мирь . и пакы вбращаа . яко же сгрѣшихомъ . и безаконьновахомъ . и не шправдохомьса пред нимь .¹¹⁵

The idea of collective responsibility for events taking place in the Holy Land is clear. God let the Hagarenes capture Jerusalem because of *our* sins, because of sins of *all of His people*. Thus, on the spiritual level, the Kievans were participants in the events of the Holy Land; they felt the consequences of God's punishment and were deeply sorry for the loss of Jerusalem, which they perceived as an important historical milestone in the history of humankind. What makes the *Kievan Chronicle* very coherent with the Latin sources after Hattin, is its shock of the loss of Jerusalem and its attitude of collective participation in this event. After Hattin, the repentance and prayers became focused on a mutual Christian cause. It was commonly held in Europe that the success of the Crusades reflected the general state of Christianity, and after Hattin the church liturgy changed remarkably with its fervent call to fasting and repentance, so that every Christian in every corner of Europe had to pray for the liberation of Jerusalem. The repentance became an all-European phenomenon after Hattin.¹¹⁶ It was deeply felt by the Russian chronographer who concluded his story about the death of Emperor Fredrick Barbarossa by an allusion to Irmos of Ode 7th from the *Great Canon of Repentance* by St. Andrew of Crete¹¹⁷: яко же сгрѣшихомъ . и безаконьновахомъ . и не шправдохомьса пред нимь (cf. Ἡμάρτομεν, ἠνομήσαμεν, ἠδικήσαμεν ἐνώπιόν σου, “we have sinned, transgressed, done wrong before Thee”).¹¹⁸ This idea was also emphasized in the story of Igor's battle in the same *Kievan Chronicle*, as it celebrates Igor's freedom from captivity through his repentance and humiliation.¹¹⁹

Moreover, the loss of Jerusalem that revealed God's wrath and His punishment directed to all of Christendom was an actual, concurrent event for the chronographer. The entry for 1187 stated that Jerusalem was lost to the Hagarenes “in our days”—*водни наша*¹²⁰—thus indicating that the event was felt as a recent in the eyes of the compiler.

The importance of topology is crucial to all medieval texts, including the Kievan chronicles. The eschatological topoi of the *Primary Chronicle* are focused on Jerusalem. The loss of Jerusalem links the great universal message and deep questioning of human fate in the eyes of God with the tragedy of Igor's Battle. It was natural for the medieval Kievan chronographer to regard the history of Rus' as a way to salvation with Jerusalem—either real or allegorical¹²¹—as its end. The Crusade period witnessed a renewed conviction throughout Europe that God was now actively interfering in human lives,

¹¹⁵ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 668.

¹¹⁶ Maier, “Crisis, liturgy and the Crusade”, pp. 628-657.

¹¹⁷ He is also known as Andrew of Jerusalem for he spent his youth as a monk of St. Sabas Lavra near Jerusalem and later was enrolled amongst the clerics of Theodore, Bishop of Jerusalem.

¹¹⁸ Words «Ἡμάρτομεν, ἠνομήσαμεν, ἠδικήσαμεν» originally go back to Old Testament; cf. Dan 9:5 (Prophet's prayer of repentance); cf. also Ps 105(106):6: Ἡμάρτομεν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἠνομήσαμεν, ἠδικήσαμεν.

¹¹⁹ ПСРЛ, т. 2, cols. 644, 649, 651.

¹²⁰ ПСРЛ, т. 2, col. 655.

¹²¹ Isoaho, “The Idea of the Last Emperor”, pp. 43-81; Isoaho, “Последний царь”, pp. 5-19.

which became manifested in the battle for Jerusalem, in its both possible outcomes. In this context, the significance of the Battle of Hattin was huge.

Oral Pilgrim legends: Rus' sources for the Battle of Hattin

If indeed the Igor cycle was influenced by the Crusader narratives of the Battle of Hattin, several questions arise. What could have been the source for the Igor cycle? It could not be a French continuation of the *Chronicle of William of Tyre* which the *Chronicle of Ernoul* was attached to, because this source was written in the 1230s; in other words, it was written too late to have ended up in the *Kievan svod* of the beginning of the 13th century. But, of course, there were many other similar stories circulating throughout Europe after Hattin, and some reminiscences of them ended up in the Latin chronicles of Otto of St. Blasien¹²² and Arnold of Lübeck,¹²³ both written ca. 1210 in the German Empire.

We know names and ranks of those monks and members of Rus' princely families who visited Jerusalem before Hattin. But after Hattin, we do not have any concrete names. However, there are many signs suggesting that the pilgrimages to Jerusalem did not stop even after it was lost to the Muslims. The entry for Christians was restricted after Saladin's victory, but has never closed entirely. Thus, for instance, between 1192 and 1220 Latin Catholics had a limited access to Jerusalem, they could enter only certain areas of the city and had to stay overnight in the old donkey stable of the Templars behind the city walls.¹²⁴ Otto of St Blasien in his *Chronica*, mentions that after Jerusalem had surrendered to Saladin, the 'pagans' preserved the Holy Sepulcher in order to earn a profit—"questus gratia."¹²⁵ Otto's description of the events is not overly detailed, but this passing hint indicates that he was aware that the city of Jerusalem remained open to paying visitors, e.g. pilgrims. It is possible that he received information from pilgrims returning from Jerusalem.¹²⁶

For the Orthodox population, access to Jerusalem was even easier than for the Latins, because the Latin priests were expelled from the city and the Orthodox clergy remained to take care of the churches that were left in Christian hands. It appears that there must have been quite a steady flow of pilgrims to Jerusalem after Hattin as well, because the Orthodox priests made their living through the alms and charity of the pilgrims.¹²⁷

¹²² Chapter 30 in his *Otonis de Sancto Blasio Chronica*, pp. 42-44.

¹²³ Arnold's account of the Hattin campaign is in his Book IV, chapters 1-5. Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica Arnoldi Abbatis*, (known also as *Chronica Slavorum*), pp. 112-126.

¹²⁴ Denys Pringle, *Pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Holy Land, 1197-1291*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012 = *Crusade texts in translation*, 23), p. 3.

¹²⁵ *Otonis de Sancto Blasio Chronica*, p. 43.

¹²⁶ Katrine Højgaard's doctoral study will shed some light on how the early 13th century German chronicles received their information from the Holy Land. She suggests that this information must be delivered most of all in oral stories circulated among the people. This for its part indicates that there still existed pilgrims who delivered information from Jerusalem. Katrine Funding Højgaard, Unpublished Master's Thesis *From Battlefield to Memory: The Battle of Hattin and the Fall of Jerusalem in Letters and Chronicles, 1187-1210*. Department of History, Aalborg University (Fall 2016).

¹²⁷ Pringle, *Pilgrimage to Jerusalem*, pp. 1-3.

A strong tradition of Jerusalem pilgrimage by the Rus' has been discussed in details.¹²⁸ George P. Majeska stated that Russians were so enthusiastic about going on pilgrimage to both Jerusalem and Constantinople, that one may speak of the cult of pilgrimage in Rus'.¹²⁹ It is quite probable that Russian pilgrims continued their journeys to Jerusalem after Hattin as well, especially since the pilgrims' entry into Jerusalem was still allowed by Saladin and his son. As a matter of fact, between the 12th and 14th centuries, Rus' clerics frequently blamed people who were too eager to visit the Holy Places, that is both before and after Hattin. Hegumen Daniil, who himself visited Jerusalem in 1106-1108 and wrote a diary of his trip, blamed people who had a habit of constantly traveling to Jerusalem. He thought that his own way was much better, visiting over a long period of time so that he could see all the places, instead of making several trips in order to return to the places that were left unseen on previous trips.¹³⁰

Around 1140-1150 the Novgorodian monk Kirik asked for guidance from Archbishop Nifont on a theological work known as the *Voproshanie Kirika* (Вопрошание Кирика). In his question number 12, Kirik asked if he is right to prevent people from going to Jerusalem, to which Bishop Nifont answered that Kirik is doing the right thing, because people go there in order to eat and drink.¹³¹ All in all, the impression is that the habit of going on pilgrimage to Jerusalem was even too strong, at least in the minds of the some of Rus' clergy. In the question 22, Kirik again was puzzled as to how to deal with those who have vowed to go on pilgrimage. The bishop answered, saying that they should be given the possibility to make penance, because "promises like those are destroying this country."¹³²

Why? What in the habits of the pilgrimages made it such a disturbing habit? In 1301 the Bishop of Sarai asked the Holy Synod of Constantinople how to deal with the pilgrims coming from the holy places. The Holy Synod gave an answer, in which it condemned the singing and storytelling habits of the pilgrims.¹³³ The 14th-century Russian writer Monk Epiphaniï, an author of the *Life of Saint Sergei of Radonezh*, blamed travelling pilgrims, and glorified instead the ascetic monk Sergei who lived in his small

¹²⁸ А.В. Назаренко, *Древняя Русь на международных путях*, pp. 617-648; М.Б. Бибииков, "К истории начала «Русской Палестины»,» *Каптеревские чтения. Сборник статей 8* (Москва, 2010), pp. 238-247; Theofanis G. Stavrou & Peter R. Weisensel, *Russian Travellers to the Christian East from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century* (Columbus, Ohio, 1985), pp. 27-30; Александр Мусин, "Археология древнерусского паломничества в Святую Землю в XII-XV веках", *Богословские труды* 35 (1999), pp. 92-110; Егор Горбатов, "Древнерусское паломничество XI-XV вв.," *Седмица.RU*, Церковно-научный центр «Православная Энциклопедия» (2005) <https://www.sedmitza.ru/text/403137.html> (accessed 23.12.2016)

¹²⁹ George P. Majeska, *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth centuries*. (Washington D.C., 1984 = *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, 19), p. 4.

¹³⁰ «Хождение игумена Даниила», see *Памятники литературы древней Руси. XII век* (Москва, 1980), pp. 24-115.

¹³¹ *Памятники древне-русского канонического права, часть первая: Памятники XI-XV в.*, см. *Русская историческая библиотека* (РИБ), т. VI, изд. 2-е (Санкт Петербург, 1908), col. 27.

¹³² *Памятники древне-русского канонического права*, cols. 61-62.

¹³³ Majeska, *Russian Travellers*, p. 4.

hut in the middle of the woods and did not travel anywhere.¹³⁴ It seems that this notion of traveling pilgrims demanding food and drink and singing songs and telling stories as a payment was a widespread phenomenon, and it included travelers to Jerusalem, Constantinople, and to Mount Athos. Pilgrimage to Jerusalem was an important theme in the Novgorodian folklore tradition: some *byliny* about Vasili Buslaevich (“Василий Буслаевич молиться ездил” or “Путешествие Василия Буслаева в Иерусалим”) tell about his wish to kiss Christ’s tomb and to bath in the River Jordan.¹³⁵

By the time of Hattin, going on pilgrimage was customary for many people, both wealthy and poor. Majeska mentioned about *kaliki perekhozhie* (калики от калѣки перехожие), groups of pilgrims who sang “spiritual songs” (стихи духовные) and told stories in return for food, hospitality, and drink.¹³⁶ One could assume that among the spiritual songs, the pilgrims recounted the latest news and popular legends. The story of the Battle of Hattin existed in various oral versions, but how closely these stories aligned with the information found in the *Chronicle of Ernoul* is difficult to say. Massimiliano Gaggero, however, highlighted the importance of the French vernacular Crusader Chronicle, *Eracles*, to which the Chronicle of Ernoul was attached, in the creation of a common historical discourse in Europe and the Mediterranean from the 13th century to the Early Modern times.¹³⁷

Conclusion

The Rus’ relationship with the Crusader movement is of crucial interest. Earlier some scholars linked the battles of the Galician prince Roman Mstislavich against the Polovtsy to a larger historical picture, where Galich and Byzantium were allies.¹³⁸ But both the *Primary Chronicle* and later the *Kievan Chronicle* does not show any particular enthusiasm towards Byzantium. Moreover, in *Primary Chronicle* we could find (along with other more positive remarks) even a hostile attitude towards the Greeks. In the famous passage often quoted Greeks are described as crooked and manipulative people

¹³⁴ Majeska, *Russian Travellers*, p. 5.

¹³⁵ See *Новгородские былины*, изд. подг. Ю.И. Смирнов и В.Г. Смолицкий (Москва, 1978), pp. 92-98, 101-110. See also Т. Новичкова, *Василий Буслаевич: Бунт и паломничество новгородского богатыря*, <http://palomnic.org/heritages/history/first/buslaevich/> (accessed November 10, 2016).

¹³⁶ Majeska, *Russian Travellers*, p. 4. Repertoire of *kaliki* included poetic adaptation of Gospels, lives of saint, history of Church feasts, etc.). One of the famous songs “Сорок калик со каликою” included into the *Sbornik Kirshi Danilova*, a collection of Russian heroic, religious and humorous folksongs, reads as follows: “А изъ пустыни было Ефимьевы, / Изъ монастыря изъ Боголюбова, / Начинали калики наряжаться / Ко святому граду Иерусалиму, / Сорокъ каликъ ихъ со каликою. / <...> «А идтить намъ, братцы, дорога не ближняя, / Идти будеть ко городу Иерусалиму, / Святой святынѣ помолитися / Господню гробу приложитися, / Во Ердань-рѣкъ искупатися, / Нетлѣнной ризой утеретися»,” see П. Бессонов, *Калѣки перехожие: сборник стихов*, в 6 томах (Москва, 1861-1864), esp. т. 1, pp. 7-8; *Древние российские стихотворения, собранные Киршеем Даниловым*, 2-е доп. изд., подг. А.П. Евгеньева и Б.Н. Путилов (Москва, 1977), p. 121.

¹³⁷ Massimiliano Gaggero, “The Circulation of the Eracles in Italy and Galeotto del Garretto’s Chronicles,” oral presentation delivered in *Diversity of Crusading. Ninth Quadrennial conference of the SSCLE* in Odense, June 30, 2016.

¹³⁸ See footnote 54 above.

(cf. the entry for 971).¹³⁹ The same attitude prevailed in Western Europe during the Crusades and was widespread among crusaders. One of the most influential crusader chronicles, *Gesta Francorum*, is known, among other things, for its quite negative image of Byzantine authorities. This image was borrowed by those who never traveled to the East, for instance, by William of Malmesbury or Orderick Vitalis, and they described the Byzantine emperor as “wily and smooth-spoken, a prolific and ingenious master of the art of deception.”¹⁴⁰ On the other hand, the *Kievan Chronicle* provided quite an idealistic portrait of the German Emperor Fredrick Barbarossa and his cohorts as martyrs in the Holy Land.¹⁴¹ Perhaps, we are dealing here merely with literary and historical *topoi* that penetrated the political, historical and literary discourses of the Europeans and Slavs. According to these *topoi*, the Byzantine secular authorities are deceitful, those who died in the battle for Holy Land are martyrs, and natural disasters are revelations of God’s wrath and punishment.

But there could be another explanation as well. The *Kievan Chronicle sub anno* 1190 recounts how — “because of our sins” — God punished the whole earth again and again (се бо створи Гб̄ за грѣхы наша . казна всь миръ . и пакы вбращаѣ).¹⁴² Is it possible that the scribe knew about *several* failed attempts to recover Jerusalem? The same entry tells about *several* German emperors who had spilled their blood in the Holy Land: “сии же Нѣмци ѣко моученици стии . прольаша кровь свою за Ха̄ . со цри своими”.¹⁴³ After Emperor Fredrick’s death in 1190, his son and successor, Emperor Henry VI, died during the Crusade in Messina on 28 September 1197. Did our scribe refer to the death of Henry VI as well? If so, then the entry for 1190 must have been compiled after September 1197. Were the Igor narratives influenced by the story of Hattin battle and, if so, when were they compiled and included into the *Kievan* and *Suzdal’ Chronicles*? I suggest that it might have been done at a later stage, most probably when the *svody* have already been compiled. Aleksey Tolochko’s hypothesis of the relatively late dating of the *Kievan Chronicle* would fit perfectly with the European circulation of the Hattin texts. That would definitely place the dating of the Igor cycle somewhat later than it is usually perceived, that is after the year 1187.

Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies
University of Helsinki

¹³⁹ “се же рѣша Гръци лѣстаче подѣ Русью . [сѹ̄ бо Грѣци лѣтивы и до сего дни], phrase in square brackets is an addition to the main text preserved by Radziwiłł and Academy copies of PVL, see *ПСРЛ*, т. 1, col. 70.

¹⁴⁰ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta rerum Anglorum*, trans. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1998-99), pp. i, 611; Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1969-80), esp. vol. 5, pp. 46-47, 331-332; see also Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, (Hableton, UK, 2003 = *Crusader Worlds*), pp. 88-91.

¹⁴¹ *ПСРЛ*, т. 2, col. 667.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, col. 668.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, col. 667.