

## СТАТЬИ НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

УДК 94(470)"1238/1480"

RUSSIAN CHRONICLES ON THE SUBMISSION  
OF THE KIEVAN RUS' TO THE MONGOL EMPIRE*Roman Hautala**(University of Oulu, Finland)*

In this paper I would like to present the fragments of the Russian chronicles from the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, dedicated to the period of submission of Rus' to the Mongols in 1237–1260.

The process of submission of Russia to the Golden Horde is divided into two periods. The first one (1237–40) regards properly the Mongol invasion of the Russian territories. The second period (1240–60) concerns gradual submission of Russia to the Golden Horde, the process which had more peaceful nature.

Mongol invasion was the defining moment for Kievan Rus': for the first time in its history Russian population has undergone to full-scale extermination with destruction of chief towns. Contemporary to the invasion Russian chronicles describe warfare at length and show emotion involvement as well. The requirement of the Mongolian governors of absolute submission of their power with payment of the tenth share from all types of income and the property are perceived as absolutely inadmissible. The succeeding destruction of main towns of Russia, the last centres of resistance, is perceived in chronicles as a divine punishment for lack of military cooperation between Russian princes. Mongols themselves are presented as the people absolutely alien to orthodox culture and their pagan customs cause disgust in authors of Russian chronicles.

The subsequent period of the gradual submission of Russia to Golden Horde is not less important in evolution of political and cultural relations between nomads and Russian settled population. Russian chronicles testify fast restoration of towns after the Mongol invasion and stabilization of economic life. Governors of Golden Horde are limited to the requirement of formal submission of Russian princes and avoid direct military showdown. Russia gradually gets involved in the fiscal system of the Mongolian empire, but in exchange Russian princes receive a considerable political autonomy.

**Keywords:** Medieval Russia, Mongol invasions, Russian Chronicles, interaction between the Mongols and the Russian principalities, fiscal system of the Mongol empire.

In this paper I would like to present the fragments of the Russian chronicles from the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, dedicated to the period of submission of Rus' to the Mongols in 1237–1260. The chosen fragments throw light on many aspects of the history of interaction between the Mongols and the Russian principalities and we undertake this presentation in order to make these texts accessible to all those scholars who do not read ancient Russian. I will begin the presentation with a short description of the geopolitical situation which had developed up to the moment of the first invasion of the Mongols on Russian territories, then I will concisely describe the chronicles, whose fragments we have chosen in order to then pass on to

some aspects that these texts bring out: for example, how the Kievan Rus' is described on the eve of the Mongol invasion; how losses and damages brought by the invasion are pictured; then the religious and economic dimensions of contacts; the political submission of Eastern Rus' to the Golden Horde and the problems of interpretation connected with it. Naturally, we are not speaking of the newly found texts: for a long time these chronicles were already a subject of various interpretations in Russian and Soviet historiography, therefore it seemed relevant to us to add some modern discussions as well, wherever possible.

*First Mongol Invasion in Eastern Europe and the value of Russian medieval sources*

By the time of the first invasion of the Mongol divisions under the command of Subedei and Jebe in the Eastern Europe steppes (1222–1223), one part of the Cuman tribes which were occupied territory between the Don and Dnepr rivers, had reached a relatively solid tribal unification under the domination of Khan Iuri Konchakovich. After the first collision with the Mongols, about which we have very limited information, the Cumans looked to the Russians for assistance. Over the course of two centuries of the Cuman neighbourhood in the frontiers of southern Rus', the political relations with the Russian population gradually became peaceful. The Cumans no longer represented a particular threat for the southern borders of Kievan Rus' and during the first 3 decades of the 13<sup>th</sup> century the Cuman mercenaries were repeatedly employed in the internecine collisions of Russian princes. The governors of Kievan Rus' considered Cumans as natural allies in the conflict with the new steppe people, undoubtedly possessing the bigger military potential. The Mongol ambassadors' visit to the court of the prince of Kiev, Mstislav, with the diplomatic peace offering shows that the Mongol generals tried, in every way possible, to avoid conflict with the Russian military forces and considered conflict with the Cumans as not belonging to the sphere of the influence of Kievan Rus'. However, the princes of Kiev, of Galich and of Chernigov decided to take part in the conflict and Russian divisions suffered the first defeat from the Mongols in the battle of Kalka in the beginning of the summer of 1223<sup>1</sup>.

The battle of Kalka caused a significant change in the political balance in Eastern Europe and had no less great a value in the history of the Mongol Empire: in the subsequent western campaign (1236–1242) the Mongols considered it necessary to destroy the Russian military potential, which explains why the army of Batu invaded the territory of Eastern Rus' first of all. After the defeat of Kalka, the Cumans in turn tried to attain the military support of the kingdom of Hungary through the intermediation of the Dominican missionaries. With the foundation of the Cuman episcopate on the territory of modern Moldova in 1227 the long period of their gradual Latinisation began. The letters of Honorius III and of Gregory IX demonstrate the success of the Dominican missionary activity on the territory of the Kievan Rus' and the occurrence of the possibility of unification between the Russian and Latin Churches, thanks to the support of the Russian governors preoccupied with the Mon-

---

<sup>1</sup> Golden P.B. Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the Pre-Chinggisid Nomads of Western Euraisa, p. 69; Pubblici L. Dal Caucaso al Mar d'Azov. L'impatto dell'invasione mongola in Caucasia fra nomadismo e società sedentaria (1204–1295), pp. 49–50.

gol threat and searching for military aid from the West. However, despite the doubtless importance of the consequences of the battle of Kalka, western scholars are deprived of the possibility to familiarize themselves with its details, as the accessible translations of the Arabian and Persian sources give insufficient information<sup>2</sup>.

The Russian chronicles represent paramount and detailed sources on the beginning of the conflict with the Mongols. First of all, they transmit a total absence of any information on an origin of Mongols by the time of their first appearance in the Cuman steppes, being similar in that to the apocalyptic perception of the Armenian annals which describe the invasion of Subedei and Jebe in Transcaucasia in 1221. The Russian chronicles describe the continuous attempts of the Mongol generals to avoid conflict with the princes of south-western Rus': Subedei and Jebe sent another embassy with a peace offer after the execution of the representatives of the first one: despite the delicate attitude, inherent to Mongols, to the inviolability of ambassadors. The sources also show that Russian commanders underestimated the Mongols' military potential, whose troops consisted basically of archers. The Russian army outnumbered the Mongolian one, but after the retreat of the Cumans, the Russian princes preferred to combat with isolated divisions, which facilitated the Mongols' victory<sup>3</sup>.

#### *Description of the Chronicles*

The fragments chosen for presentation belong to the five Russian chronicles closest, chronologically, to the period of submission of Kievan Rus' to Golden Horde.

1. *Novgorod Chronicle*. For the presentation the edition of the second half of 14<sup>th</sup> century will be used, representing a copy of the old edition finished in 1330. The *Novgorod Chronicle* is divided into two parts. The first one continues until 1234 and contains information on the battle of Kalka. The second part covers the events of the 1234–1330 period and was written by several monks of the Jur'ev monastery of

---

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the beginning of the Catholic missionary activity among Cumans, see Acta Honorii III, pp. 206–209; Boswell A.B. The Kipchak Turks, p. 79; Vásáry I. Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185–1365, pp. 63–64; Jackson P. The Mongols and the West, 1221–1410, p. 17; Richard J. La Papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen Age (XIIIe–XVe siècles), p. 23. For the beginning of the ecclesiastic negotiations with the Russian Church, see Acta Honorii III, pp. 261–262; Zatko J.J. The Union of Suzdal, 1222–1252, pp. 36–38. Ibn Abi-l-Hadid describes the tactic of inveiglement of the Russian army in the steppe and asserts that the Mongolian divisions participated in the battle on Kalka, were under the command of Chormagan; Ibn Abi l-Ḥadīd al-Madā'ini. Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, pp. 52–53. Juvaini does not mention the battle and its description of the campaign of Batu against the Kievan Rus' is reduced to several lines in which he gives particular attention to the siege of the Alan capital Magas; Juvainī 'Aṭā Malik. Gengis Khan il conquistatore del mondo, p. 304. Rashid al-Din asserts that the small Mongol army took advantage of the victory on Kalka to devastate entire territory of Rus', mixing thus information on the first and second western Mongol campaigns; Rashid ad-Din Fazlallah. Sbornik letopisej, p. 229.

<sup>3</sup> Lavrent'evskaja letopis', pp. 445–447; Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' starshego i mladshhego izvodov, pp. 95–100. Describing the battle of Kalka the author of the Hypatian Chronicle asserts that Mongols won thanks to a deeply developed strategy and transmits information on the subsequent military campaign against Tanguts; Ipat'evskaja letopis', pp. 739–745. Concerning the Armenian perception of the first Mongol invasion, see Vardan Arewelc'i. The Historical Compilation, p. 213. Kirakos Ganjakets'i. History of the Armenians, pp. 137–138.

Novgorod during the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. It is necessary to note that to the present day just one attempt to translate the chronicle into English has been made: this 1914 edition is already outdated<sup>4</sup>.

2. *Laurentian Chronicle*. This is the basic source on the history of Eastern Rus' in the period of interest. The chronicle is named after the monk Laurenty, under whose direction the new edition of the chronicle in 1377 has been created. The *Laurentian Chronicle* represents a copy of the chronicle made in the 1280's, probably in the monastery of Rostov.

3. *Hypatian Chronicle*. The major source on the history of Western Rus'. The chronicle is named after the Ipat'evsky monastery near Kostroma, where it was found. For the present project the third part of the chronicle – the chronicle of Halych-Volyn' – is important, covering the 1199–1292 period. One of the values of the *Hypatian Chronicle* is the fact that its authors, being from Kiev and moving later to Holm, compiled the text contemporarily with the described events.

4. *Ravaging of Ryazan by Batu Khan*. The major source on the beginning of the Mongol invasion in 1237. The remaining copy was made in the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century in Zarajsk (near Ryazan) for its inclusion in a complex of stories about Nikola Zarazsky. The chronicle of Ryazan however, stands out from the whole, representing a copy of the secular chronicle made in the 1280s.

5. *Lay of the Ruin of the Russian Land*. A short introduction to the not extant 'Life of Alexander Nevsky'. It is written concurrently with Batu's invasion into Eastern Rus' (1237–1238) and is included in the list of proposed translations as a source, transmitting an emotional perception of the political changes connected with the submission of Rus' to the Golden Horde.

#### *Kievan Rus' on the eve of the Mongol invasion*

At the moment of the Mongol invasion, 3 centres of considerable military and economic potential excelled among the numerous principalities of the Kievan Rus'. The most powerful was the principality of Vladimir-Suzdal' in Eastern Rus', which reached its apex during the government of the grand duke Vsevolod the Big Nest (1176–1212). However after his death, the conflict between his sons Jury and Konstantin led to a sudden decrease in the power of principality. Iuri II's rough policy of state centralization encountered the vigorous resistance of Konstantin, who was supported by the governors of the neighbouring Ryazan principality. The republic of Novgorod led by Mstislav the Daring took advantage of the attenuation of the principality of Vladimir for the expansion of its own influence in southern Rus'. After victory in the battle of Lipitsa (1216), Kiev was conquered by Mstislav, who interfered in the internal political struggle of the principality of Halych-Volyn', the third power centre located in Western Rus'. Galicia and Volyn' were united during Prince Roman's government (1199–1205). However, its successors encountered vigorous resistance by the local aristocracy, with whose support Mstislav the Daring declared himself as the prince of Halych in 1217. The descendant of Roman, Daniel of Halych, was able to restore a relative centralization of the principality in 1236, on the eve of the Mongol invasion.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471. R. Michell; N. Forbes (eds.). London: Camden Society, 1914.

In spite of the constant internal struggle, the Kievan Rus' reached, at the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the peak of its cultural and economic development. Thanks to their considerable military potential, the territories of the Kievan Rus' were relatively safe. The subsequent Mongol invasion, which caused unprecedented losses among civilians, is described by the Russian sources as the end of the era of prosperity. The author of the *Lay of the Ruin of the Russian Land* contrasted the economic wealth of Rus' and its military power on the eve of the Mongol invasion with the misery of the country that was destroyed over the course of several months. The author of the *Ravaging of Ryazan by Batu Khan* considered the moment of the Mongols' appearance on the south-east frontiers of Rus' as the end of prosperity of the principality of Ryazan' and paid particular attention in listing the names of all the members of the princely dynasty that were killed during a siege of Ryazan. The author of the *Hypatian Chronicle* mourns the last epoch of power of the prince of Halych, Daniel, who dominated southern and western Rus' on the eve of the Mongol invasion, and who afterwards suffered the humiliation of having to ask for recognition of power from the khan of the Golden Horde<sup>5</sup>.

*Mongol invasion of Rus' (1237–1240) and the polemic concerning the dimensions of damages*

As it has already been noted, the Mongols considered it necessary to first of all destroy the military potential of the principality of Vladimir which was the strongest centre of power in Eastern Europe. The author of the *Ravaging of Ryazan by Batu Khan* describes a systematic devastation of the principality of Ryazan during the autumn of 1237, whose territory was used afterwards as a base for the invasion of the principality of Vladimir. The authors of the *Novgorod* and *Laurentian Chronicles* represent the no less detailed description of the Mongol invasion of Eastern Rus'. The Mongols, at this stage, dedicated their military operations to the destruction of the basic Russian military forces, concentrated in most of the main cities of Eastern Rus'. The fact that the Mongols destroyed 14 cities in just 3 months at the beginning of 1238 presumes the probable absence of baggage trains and explains the rush of the Mongols – which undoubtedly caused a considerable loss of troops<sup>6</sup>.

The defeat of the principality of Vladimir convinced the Cumans of the futility of resistance and caused their mass resettlement to Eastern Hungary. After the Cuman deviation the Mongols devoted the whole of 1239 to the submission of Alans and the rest of the Cumans, but in the beginning of 1240 Batu undertook the massive offensive of Western Rus'. The content of the *Hypatian Chronicle* shows that, despite the destruction of the chief cities of the principality of Halych-Volyn', the Mongols did not consider the destruction of all military forces of Western Rus' necessary and were satisfied with achieving the relative attenuation of its potential. So if Chernigov, Kiev and Halych were taken by assault, causing considerable losses both among the civil population, as well as in the Mongol army, in a case with less considerable cities (for example Kremenets and Danilov) Batu turned

<sup>5</sup> Slovo o pogibeli Russkoj zemli; Povest' o razorenii Rjazani Batyem; Ipat'evskaja letopis', pp. 805–809; Jakubovskij A.Yu. Feodalizm na vostoce, pp. 39, 48.

<sup>6</sup> Povest' o razorenii Rjazani Batyem, pp. 185–187; Lavrent'evskaja letopis', pp. 469–470; Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov, pp. 131–135.

away from a siege at the first signs of resistance. The *Hypatian Chronicle* is also important in discovering the details of all of the Mongols' Western campaign and gives a satisfyingly extensive list of the names of the Mongol commanders<sup>7</sup>.

The general line of the Soviet historiography was to negatively estimate the economic and social consequences of the Mongol invasion. Based on the results of archaeological analysis the Soviet historians argued that the Mongol aggression caused the agrarian crisis in Eastern Rus', which in turn provoked the instant decline of the urban economics. In the best tradition of the Marxist approach it was argued that the considerable decay of manufacture, which led to the economical crisis in Rus', caused the delay of social development and the extension of the feudal period by three centuries. In this way the underdevelopment of Russia in comparison with Western Europe is explained by the general negative influence of the Mongol Empire<sup>8</sup>.

An impartial analysis of the Russian chronicles, however, allows us to revisit the dimensions of destruction caused by the Mongols while avoiding exaggeration. As has been already noted, a considerable part of the territory of the principality of Halych-Volyn' was untouched by the invasion. The levels of destruction in the principality of Vladimir should be reconsidered as well, as the Mongols occupied the territories of Eastern Rus' over the course of the short period. Some main cities, for example Rostov, escaped destruction thanks to their timely capitulation. Furthermore the destroyed cities were quickly built up. The author of the *Laurentian Chronicle* specifies, that the city of Vladimir continued to function as the principality's capital for some months after devastation. Notwithstanding the Mongols' defeat, Vladimir's military potential represented a considerable threat for the neighbouring principalities. The *Laurentian Chronicle* shows that in the year after the Mongol aggression, the grand duke Jaroslav was able to conquer Kamenets and achieve the submission of Smolensk<sup>9</sup>. Doubts concerning the vastness of the destruction caused by the Mongol invasion were expressed by some Soviet historians as well, causing the rather lively criticism of their colleagues. So Nasonov tried to avoid exaggerating the vastness of the destruction, specifying that at least half of the cities of Eastern Rus' had not been destroyed. Jakubovsky describes the natural ability of medieval cities to be reconstructed rapidly and partly underestimates the relevancy of an economic crisis<sup>10</sup>.

#### *Religious and economic aspect of contact with the Mongols*

*Ravaging of Ryazan by Batu Khan* represents Batu's requirement for unconditional submission to the Mongol empire on the eve of the invasion of the principality of Ryazan as absolutely inadmissible from the point of view of the Russian governors. The requirement to pay the tithe from all incomes and property is interpreted in the light of religious values and is represented as the requirement of the pagan gover-

<sup>7</sup> Lavrent'evskaja letopis', p. 470; Ipat'evskaja letopis', pp. 784–789.

<sup>8</sup> Nazarov V.D. Rus' nakanune Kulikovskoj bitvy, pp. 99–100; Polubojarinova M.D. Russkie v Zolotoj Orde, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Lavrent'evskaja letopis', pp. 470–471.

<sup>10</sup> Jakubovskij A.Yu. Feodalizm na vostoce, p. 12; Nasonov A.N. Mongoly i Rus', pp. 36–37. See also the general reevaluation of the Mongol influence in Rus' which suffers from the absence of the convincing argumentation; Gumilev L.N. Drevnjaja Rus' i Velikaja Step', pp. 19–20, 61–62, 73.

nor menacing the integrity of the Christian religion. With the foundation of the Golden Horde Russian princes were obliged to visit the khan's court in order to receive confirmation of their power. Authors of the chronicles, who find the very voluntariness of these journeys humiliating, remember that even in the days of the Mongol invasion, the princes of Eastern Rus' rejected the requirement of submission and preferred open resistance. So the same *Ravaging of Ryazan by Batu Khan* describes the martyrdom of the prince of Ryazan's son, who refused Batu's requirement. It is worth noting that, according to the authors of Russian chronicles, the act of submission to the Mongol power involved a partial refusal of the Christian religion. So the *Laurentian Chronicle* pays particular attention to the persistence of the prince of Vladimir's nephew, who preferred martyrdom to the acceptance of the pagan religion. A special place in the list of martyrs of the Russian princes is given to Michael the prince of Chernigov who, according to the *Novgorod Chronicle*, refused to carry out the pagan rituals at the khan's court, an integral part of submission to the Mongol power. The Russian chronicles show an obvious disapproval of the participation of the Christian governors in the pagan rituals, but on the other hand, justify their behaviour as a political necessity. So the author of the *Hypatian Chronicle* obviously sympathises with Daniel, the prince of Halych, compelled to visit the court of the khan in order to avoid the Mongol attacks. The chronicle's author describes with disgust the rituals of purification by fire and worship of the sun and the ancestors of the Mongols, but finishes his narration with a description of the political benefits, which the prince achieved<sup>11</sup>.

Thus, the Russian chronicles describe the humiliation of submission to the Mongol power, but on the other hand cannot deny the benefits that followed it. According to Riasanovsky, the khans of the Golden Horde conceded a wide political autonomy to the Russian princes and were interested exclusively in tax collection which will be discussed further on. Acknowledgement of the Russian power by the khans of the Golden Horde after the formal act of submission helped the rise of the governors of Rus' political authority. So, according to the author of the *Hypatian Chronicle*, after Daniel returned from Batu's court, the king of Hungary Bela IV was forced to reconsider his own policy in the relation to Western Rus' and offered Daniel military alliance. The formation of the Golden Horde was also of benefit to the Kievan Rus'. The foundation of Sarai, according to Alexander Jakubovsky and Vadim Egorov, led to the inclusion of the Russian merchants in the continental trade. However, mainstream Soviet historiography was to cautiously relate the description of economic gains, as a consequence of the contacts with the Golden Horde. Soviet historians tried to underestimate the importance of the trade relations with Sarai, despite mention of the presence of Russian merchants in the Golden Horde capital. So Magomet Safargaliev and German Fëdorov-Davydov assert that the main object of trade at Sarai were the nomad-slaves, and the Russian merchants were, as a consequence, excluded from participating in the general turnover of commodities of the Golden Horde<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> *Povest' o razorenii Rjazani Batyem*, pp. 184–187; *Lavrent'evskaja letopis'*, pp. 469–470; *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' starshego i mladshhego izvodov*, pp. 805–809.

<sup>12</sup> Riasanovsky V.A. *Fundamental Principles of Mongol Law*, pp. 273–274; Jakubovskij A.Yu. *Feodalizm na vostoce*, p. 12; Grekov B.D., Jakubovskij A.Yu. *Zolotaya Orda i ee padenie*, pp. 53–54, 61. Egorov V.L. *Gosudarstvennoe i administrativnoe ustrojstvo Zolotoj Ordy*, p. 38. Safargaliev M.G. *Raspad Zolotoj Ordy*, pp. 35, 48, 51, 70–78, 90–101; Fedorov-Davydov G.A. *Tri srednevekovyh nizhnevolzhskih goroda*, pp. 212–216.

*Political dependence of Eastern Rus' on the Golden Horde*

The interpretation of submission to the Mongol power of the princes of Vladimir and their simultaneous requests for military help from the West gave rise to a polemic in the Soviet and Western historiographies. The *Laurentian* and *Novgorod Chronicles* are the main sources that concern a duality of the behaviour of Vladimir's prince Jaroslav and of his more well-known son Alexander Nevsky in the relation to the Golden Horde. In 1243 Jaroslav visited Batu and received the khan's permission to govern the Vladimir's principality. This decision of the khan of the Golden Horde had considerable historical consequences for the mutual relations of the Russian princes with the Jochi's *ulus*. One year later a number of Russian governors visited Batu for acknowledgement of the status of independence from the principality of Vladimir. In 1245 Jaroslav, worried by the weakening of his own authority in Eastern Rus', visited Batu with all the representatives of his family to receive the title of Predominating Governor of entire Rus'. Thus the Russian chronicles confirm that the grand duke adhered to the political line of submission to the Golden Horde. The papal letters, on the other hand, prove that Jaroslav carried on parallel negotiations with the Roman See for the conclusion of a military alliance with the West. The prince of Vladimir promised Innocent IV that he would promote the conclusion of ecclesiastical union, but his diplomatic activity was interrupted in 1246 by the requirement of Guyuk to visit the imperial court, where he died<sup>13</sup>.

The behaviour of Jaroslav's son, Alexander Nevsky, shows no less duality in his relations with the Golden Horde. In 1247, Batu required Alexander to visit the Sarai to express submission to the khan. In spite of the menacing tone of the requirement, the khan of the Golden Horde kindly welcomed the prince of Vladimir and recompensed him with gifts. Thus the content of the Russian chronicles helps us to interpret the behaviour of the governors of the Golden Horde too, who most likely aspired to strengthen the power of the princes of Vladimir in Eastern Rus', considering them allies. On the other hand, the letters of Pope Innocent IV (for example, 'Pater futuri seculi', on January 23, 1248) show that Alexander carried on secret negotiations with the papal curia to get the military support of the Teutonic Order<sup>14</sup>. The lack of information concerning the relation of the Mongol *kaghan* with the territories, subordinate to the Golden Horde, does not allow us to confidently assert that Guyuk demanded Alexander's presence at the imperial court in 1248 because of rumours of the rapprochement of the prince of Vladimir with the West. However, the Russian chronicles show that, with the prince's return from Mongolia in 1250, Alexander Nevsky abruptly broke off negotiations with the papal envoys and refuted offers of the conclusion of ecclesiastical union. The choice of the pro-Mongol line brought certain political benefits to Alexander: in 1252 the Mongol general Nevruï invaded the territory of Eastern Rus' at Alexander's tacit consent and expelled his brother Andrei from Vladimir, who was adhering to the pro-Catholic line and was in opposition with Alexander Nevsky<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> Lavrent'evskaja letopis', pp. 470–471; Acta Innocentii, pp. 64–69; Giovanni di Pian di Carpine. Storia dei Mongoli, pp. 393–394.

<sup>14</sup> Lavrent'evskaja letopis', p. 472; Acta Innocentii, pp. 110–118; Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, №. 12815.

<sup>15</sup> Lavrent'evskaja letopis', p. 473.



The content of the letters of Innocent IV (firstly 'Aperuit Dominus oculos', on September 15, 1248) indicates Aleksandr Nevsky's intentions to conclude ecclesiastical union with Rome and complete the information provided by the Russian chronicles. However, some Russian historians have expressed their doubts on the reliability of the papal letters. In their opinion negotiations with the Roman See could not take place because of a long-term anti-Latin line, to which the princes of Vladimir adhered. Concerns on the expansion of the Catholic Church's influence in Eastern Europe were increased by the aggression of the Teutonic knights in northern Rus', which coincided chronologically with the Mongol invasion. Nevertheless, Zatkan adhered to the absolutely contrary point of view asserting that negotiations regarding the military and ecclesiastical union between the Papal curia and the princes of Vladimir started immediately after the battle of Kalka. According to Zatkan, Innocent IV gave Eastern Rus' a special place in his projects to create the anti-Mongol block in the east of Europe and promised Alexander military support from the Teutonic knights. Alexander was ready to accept the Papal offer, but after his journey to the imperial court, he accepted much more advantageous proposals from the *kaghan*<sup>16</sup>.

*Submission of Western Rus' to the Golden Horde and the polemic about its character*

The dating and character of Western Rus' submission to the Golden Horde caused no less intense polemic in historiography. Unlike the governors of Eastern Rus', Daniel of Halych refused to submit himself to Batu's supremacy until 1245 and achieved the consolidation of power in the principality of Halych-Volyn' by the time of the foundation of the Golden Horde. The *Hypatian Chronicle* gives information about the submission of the territory of Volkhov on the southern frontiers of the principality, whose governors adhered to the line of union with the Mongols. The prince of Halych adhered instead to the anti-Mongol line and after the chronicle statement, confirmed by the papal letters, started negotiations with the Papal curia regarding conclusion of the military and ecclesiastic union with the West. By the time of the Papal legate Giovanni di Pian di Carpine's arrival in Krakow, Daniel was required by Batu to visit the Sarai. The *Hypatian Chronicle* mentions Batu's requirement of the tribute payment, however the subsequent content of the chronicle shows that Daniel received confirmation of absolute autonomy from the Golden Horde. Daniel's independent position allowed him to conclude military alliances with the Hungarian and Polish kings and to receive, from Innocent IV, status of 'King of Rus' in 1253. Daniel's formal belonging to the anti-Mongolian block forced him to start demonstrative military operations on the frontiers against the Mongol general Kuremza. However, the beginning of military operations with the marginal Mongol troops did not lead to open military conflict with the Golden Horde. If, in 1245, Batu's actions can be explained by his conflict with Guyuk, in 1253 the khan of the Golden Horde strengthened his position thanks to his friendship with Mongke. In 1259 the Mongol general Burunday invaded the territory of the principality of Halych-Volyn' and forced the Russian military forces to take

<sup>16</sup> Acta Innocentii, pp. 117–118; Halecki O. From Lyons to Krevo and Constance, 1245–1418, pp. 20–21; Pashuto V.T. Aleksander Nevskij, pp. 86, 95; Nasonov A.N. Mongoly i Rus', pp. 23, 26, 33–34, 39, 50, 52; Zatkan J.J. The Union of Suzdal, pp. 33–52.

part in a campaign against Lithuania. One year later at the repeated invasion of Burunday on Russian territories, Daniel's brother Vasil'ko was forced to pull down the defensive walls of the main fortresses of the principality, which represented an act of submission to the Golden Horde<sup>17</sup>.

According to Pashuto, the two invasions of Burunday were the principal causes, not only of the loss of political autonomy of Western Rus', but also of the introduction of the Mongol tax system in the territory of the principality of Halych-Volyn'. Vernadsky asserts that Berke inserted the decimal system of the administrative division in Western Rus' and practically annexed the principality of Halych-Volyn' to the Golden Horde. However, the content of the *Hypatian Chronicle* does not mention the presence of the Mongol fiscal agents in the territory of the principality and speaks only about the formal payment of a tribute collected by Daniel. The chronicle also omits any mention of the act of submission of the Russian prince to the new khan of the Golden Horde. The information of the *Hypatian Chronicle* allowed Zdan to criticize Vernadsky's statements, who used the distant sources of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries for his argumentation. According to Zdan, up to the moment of his death in 1264 Daniel kept his status as Independent Governor, and the principality of Halych-Volyn' was subordinate to Mongol taxation during the government of his son Lev, which started in 1269<sup>18</sup>.

*Mongol fiscal system in Rus' and the polemic connected to its character*

The special position of Rus', which had relative autonomy within the limits of the Golden Horde, led to a rather irregular character of the Mongol taxation (in comparison, for example, with the Persian territory). The absence of clear information in the Russian chronicles concerning the fiscal system practiced by the Mongols in Rus', caused a lively polemic both among the Soviet and Western historians. The inclusion of Rus' in the Mongol fiscal system occurred within the framework of Mongke's reform in 1257; however, the *Novgorod Chronicle* relates the Mongols' attempt to effectuate the census of the principality of Kiev as early as 1245. The total absence of information on the principality's future destiny – left without its local governor after the execution of Michael of Chernigov – permitted the Ukrainian historian Grushevsky to presume presence of a certain 'non-Class' society in southern Rus', on the basis of which the social structure of the Zaporozhye Cossacs was created in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The consequences of the beginning of Mongke's fiscal reform are described by the *Laurentian* and *Novgorod Chronicles*. During 1257–1258 the entire territory of Eastern Rus' was subordinate to the census effectuated by the Mongol fiscal agents. However, their arrival in Novgorod in 1257 caused popular unrest. But the second *baskaks'* visit to Novgorod in 1259 was more successful and finished with an evaluation of the city's real

<sup>17</sup> Ipat'evskaja letopis', pp. 805–855. Concerning the negotiations with the Papal curia, see Acta Honorii III, pp. 60–70, 85–87; 151–154; Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, №. 12668–12670; Giovanni di Pian di Carpine. Storia dei Mongoli, pp. 13–16. Concerning the involvement of the Russian divisions in the Burunday's invasion in Poland in 1259–1260, see Chronica Poloniae Maioris, p. 130.

<sup>18</sup> Pashuto V.T. Ocherki po istorii galicko-volynskoj Rusi, p. 298; Vernadsky G. The Mongols and the Russia, pp. 158, 222–227; Zdan M.B. The Dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde, pp. 510–511, 517.

estate with Alexander Nevsky's support, using the presence of the imperial representatives for the consolidation of proper power in the republic<sup>19</sup>.

Together with other regions of the empire, Eastern Rus' was included in the general fiscal system within the framework of Mongke's reform; however, the character of the taxation system applied by the Mongols on Rus', is a subject for discussion. For example, the amount of taxes still remains obscure until now. Schurmann has tried, in some way, to systemise the information on the Mongol Empire's fiscal administration. In his opinion, among two of the main types of taxes known in Rus', the *dan'* (tribute) corresponded to the Mongolian term *alban* and represented the constant annual tax which at the same time symbolized an act of submission. The *poshlina* (duty) in this system should correspond to *qubchur*, or rather to the entirety of extraordinary taxes. In his criticism of Schurmann's research, John Smith has convincingly shown that *alban* meant, to the Mongols, the constant taxes that existed before they subjugated a territory, and in the case of Rus', *alban* should correspond to the Russian *poshlina*<sup>20</sup>.

The discovery of administrative prerogatives of tax agents in Rus' also shows itself to be no less problematical. According to Thomas Allsen, the general aspiration of Mongke to create *joint administration* within the limits of Empire in which the fiscal system would have both local representation, and imperial power, did not work in the Golden Horde because of Batu's absolutely independent position. In the case of Rus', the imperial agents named in the Russian sources with the Turkic term *baskaks*, acted as representatives of the khan of the Golden Horde. According to Riasanovsky, because of the general indifference of the khans of the Golden Horde to the internal political situation of Rus', *baskaks* had no administrative privileges and carried out the role of addressees of the tax collected by Russian princes. A similar opinion has also been expressed by Jakubovsky; among the Soviet historians, however, the role of the *baskaks* was exposed to more in-depth studies and Jakubovsky's opinion was criticized. According to Anton Nasonov, Batu's invasion of Eastern Rus' caused a significant weakening of control by the Vladimir prince over the subordinated territories. Nasonov considered the *baskaks* as Mongolian chiefs of the military groups that consisted of Russian mercenaries who not only carried out the taxation of the local population, but also functions of public order supervision. These *baskaks'* functions, according to Vladimir Nazarov and Lev Cherepnin, were soon increased and the tax agents should now also investigate the activities of the local princes. To represent the diversity of interpretations of the *baskaks* functions, I would also like to add German Fëdorov-Davidov's statement, according to which the *baskaks*, remaining formal representatives of the power of *kaghan*, informed him of the movements of the Golden Horde governors<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov, pp. 167–168, 176–178; Lavrent'evskaja letopis', pp. 474–476; Grushevskij M.S. Oчерк istorii Kievskoj zemli ot smerti Jaroslava do konca XIV stoletija, pp. 455–459.

<sup>20</sup> Schurmann H.F. Mongolian Tributary Practices of the Thirteenth Century, pp. 305, 307, 309–310, 327, 340–351; Smith J.M. Mongol and Nomadic Taxation, pp. 48–60.

<sup>21</sup> Allsen Th.T. Guard and Government in the Reign of the Grand Qan Möngke, 1251–59, pp. 499–503, 519; Morgan D.O. Who Ran the Mongol Empire?, p. 129; Riasanovsky V.A. Fundamental Principles, pp. 272–273; Grekov B.D., Jakubovskij A.Yu. Zolotaya Orda i ee padenie, p. 101; Nasonov A.N. Mongoly i Rus', p. 5, 7, 13–23; Nazarov V.D. Rus' nakanune Kulikovskoj bitvy, p. 109; Cherepnin L.V. Tataro-mongoly na Rusi, p. 200; Fedorov-Davydov G.A. Obshhestvennyj stroj Zolotoj ordy, p. 30.

## REFERENCES

1. Cherepnin L.V. *Tataro-mongoly na Rusi* [The Tatar-Mongols in the Rus']. Moscow, 1977.
2. Egorov V.L. "Gosudarstvennoe i administrativnoe ustrojstvo Zolotoj Ordy" [State and Administrative Structure of the Golden Horde]. *Voprosy istorii* [Questions of History], 1972, no. 2, pp. 32–43.
3. Fedorov-Davydov G.A. *Obshhestvennyj stroj Zolotoj ordy* [The Social System of the Golden Horde]. Moscow, 1973.
4. Golubinskij E. *Istorija russkoj tserkvi* [History of the Russian Church]. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1900.
5. Grekov B.D., Jakubovskij A.Yu. *Zolotaya Orda i ee padenie* [The Golden Horde and Its Downfall]. Moscow, 1998.
6. Fedorov-Davydov G.A. "Tri sredenevekovyh nizhnevolzhskih goroda" [Three Medieval Cities of the Lower Volga Region] *Voprosy istorii* [Questions of History], no. 3, 1974, pp. 201–217.
7. Grushevskij M.S. *Ocherk istorii Kievskoj zemli ot smerti Jaroslava do konca XIV stoletija* [Essay on the History of Kievan Land from the Death of Yaroslav to the End of 14<sup>th</sup> Century]. Kiev, 1891.
8. Gumilev L.N. *Drevnjaja Rus' i Velikaja Step'* [The Ancient Rus' and the Great Steppe]. Vol 2. Moscow, 1997.
9. Jakubovskij A.Yu. *Feodalizm na vostoke* [Feudalism in the East]. Leningrad, 1932.
10. *Ipat'evskaja letopis'* [Hypatian Chronicle]. Ed. by A.A. Shahmatov. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej* [A Complete Collection of the Russian Chronicles]. Vol. 2. Moscow, 1997.
11. *Lavrent'evskaja letopis'* [Laurentian Chronicle]. Ed. by E.F. Karskij. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej* [A Complete Collection of the Russian Chronicles]. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1997.
12. Nazarov V.D. "Rus' nakanune Kulikovskoj bitvy" [Rus' on the Eve of the Battle of Kulikov]. *Voprosy istorii* [Questions of History], 1978, no. 8, pp. 98–115.
13. Nasonov A.N. *Mongoly i Rus'* [The Mongols and Russia]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1940.
14. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov* [The First Novgorod Chronicle in the Older and Younger Versions]. Ed. by A.N. Nasonov. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej* [A Complete Collection of the Russian Chronicles]. Vol. 3. Moscow-Leningrad, 1950.
15. Pashuto V.T. *Aleksander Nevskij* [Alexander Nevsky]. Moscow, 1974.
16. Pashuto V.T. *Ocherki po istorii galicko-volynskoj Rusi* [Essays on the History of the Galich-Volyn' Rus]. Moscow, 1950.
17. *Povest' o razorenii Rjazani Batyem* [The Tale of the Ravaging of Ryazan by Batu Khan]. Ed. by D.S. Likhachev. *Izbornik (Sbornik proizvedenij literatury Drevnej Rusi)* [Izbornik (Collection of the Literary Writings of Ancient Rus')]. Moscow, 1969.
18. Polubojarinova M.D. *Russkie v Zolotoj Orde* [The Russians in the Golden Horde]. Moscow, 1973.
19. Rashid ad-Din Fazlallah. *Sbornik letopisej* [Compendium of Chronicles]. Ed. by L.A. Khetagurov, A.A. Semenov. Vol. 1. Moscow-Leningrad, 1952.
20. Safargaliev M.G. *Raspad Zolotoj Ordy* [The Collapse of the Golden Horde]. Saransk, 1960.
21. *Slovo o pogibeli Russkoj zemli* [Lay of the Ruin of the Russian Land]. Ed. by L.A. Likhachev. *Pamjatniki literatury Drevnej Rusi. XIII vek* [Monuments of the Literature of the Ancient Rus']. Moscow, 1981.
22. *Acta Honorii III (1216–1227) et Gregorii IX (1227–1241) e regestis vaticanis aliisque fontibus collegerunt notisque adornarunt. A.L. Tăutu (ed.). Fontes. Pontificia*

*missio ad redigendum codicem juris canonici orientalis*. Series III. Vol. III. Romae: Typis pontificae universitatis gregorianae, 1950.

23. *Acta Innocentii P.P. IV (1243–1254) e regestis vaticanis aliisque fontibus collegerunt notisque adornarunt T.T. Haluscynskyj; M.M. Wojnar (eds.) Fontes. Pontificia missio ad redigendum codicem juris canonici orientalis*. Series III. Vol. IV/1. Romae: Typis pontificae universitatis gregorianae, 1960–1966.

24. Allsen Th.T. “Guard and Government in the Reign of the Grand Qan Möngke, 1251–59”. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. Vol. 46/2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1986, pp. 491–521.

25. Boswell A.B. “The Kipchak Turks”. *The Slavonic Review*. Vol. 6/16. London: School of Slavonic Studies in the University of London, King's College, 1927, pp. 68–85.

26. *Chronica Poloniae Maioris. «Velikaja hronika» o Pol'she, Rusi i ih soseďjah XI–XIII vv.: (perevod i kommentarii)* [“The Great chronicle” about Poland, Rus' and their neighbours in XI–XIII c.]. Ed. by V.L. Janin; comp. by L.M. Popova, N.I. Shhaveleva. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1987.

27. *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471*. R. Michell; N. Forbes (eds.) London: Camden Society, 1914.

28. Giovanni di Pian di Carpine. *Storia dei Mongoli*. P. Daffinà; C. Leopardi; M.C. Lungarotti; E. Menestò; L. Petech (eds.). Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1989.

29. Golden P.B. *Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the Pre-Činggisid Nomads of Western Euraisa. Nomads and Their Neighbours in the Russian Steppe: Turks, Khazars and Qipchaqs*. Chapter I. Aldershot, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2003, pp. 37–76.

30. Halecki O. “From Lyons to Krevo and Constance, 1245–1418”. *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium*. Vol. V. Roma: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1958, pp. 15–32.

31. Ibn Abî l-Ĥadîd al-Madâ'inî. *Sharĥ Nahj al-Balâgha*. Djebli M. (ed.). *Les Invasions Mongoles en Orient vécues par un Savant Médiéval Arabe. Ibn Abî l-Ĥadîd, al-Madâ'inî (1190–1258 J.C.)*. Paris: Le Groupe Harmattan, 1995.

32. Jackson P. *The Mongols and the West, 1221–1410*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Longman Publishing, 2005.

33. Juvainî 'Aṭā Malik. *Gengis Khan il conquistatore del mondo*. A cura di G.R. Scarcia. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1991.

34. Kirakos Ganjakets'i. *History of the Armenians*. R. Bedrosian (trans.). New York: Sources of the Armenian Tradition, 1986.

35. Morgan D.O. “Who Ran the Mongol Empire?”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. No. 2. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1982, pp. 124–136.

36. Pubblici L. *Dal Caucaso al Mar d'Azov. L'impatto dell'invasione mongola in Caucasia fra nomadismo e società sedentaria (1204–1295)*. Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2007.

37. *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. A. Potthast (ed.). Graz, Akademische Druck, 1957.

38. Riasanovsky V.A. *Fundamental Principles of Mongol Law*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1965.

39. Richard J. *La Papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen Age (XIIIe–XVe siècles)*. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1998.

40. Schurmann H.F. “Mongolian Tributary Practices of the Thirteenth Century”. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. Vol. 19/3–4. Cambridge, MA: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1956, pp. 304–389.

41. Smith J.M. “Mongol and Nomadic Taxation”. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. Vol. 30. Cambridge, MA: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1970, pp. 46–85.

42. Vardan Arevelc'i. *The Historical Compilation*. R.W. Thomson (tr.). *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. Vol. 43. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989, pp. 125–226.

43. Vásáry I. *Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185–1365*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

44. Vernadsky G. *The Mongols and the Russia*. New Haven: Yale University press, 1953.

45. Zatko J.J. “The Union of Suzdal, 1222–1252”. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol. 8/1. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1957, pp. 33–52.

46. Zdan M.B. “The Dependence of Halych-Volyn’ Rus’ on the Golden Horde”. *The Slavonic and East European Review*. Vol. 35/85. Menasha, Wis.: Published for a committee of American scholars by the George Banta Pub. Co., 1957, pp. 505–522.

**About the author:** Roman Hautala – researcher, Historical branch at the Faculty of Humanities, University of Oulu, PhD (History) (Oulu, Finland); virisequisque@hotmail.com

---

## РУССКИЕ ЛЕТОПИСИ О ПОДЧИНЕНИИ КИЕВСКОЙ РУСИ ИМПЕРИИ МОНГОЛОВ

*Роман Хаутала*

*(Университет Оулу, Финляндия)*

В статье представлены фрагменты русских летописей XIII–XIV веков, описывающих обстоятельства подчинения Руси монголам в период 1237–1260 годов.

Процесс подчинения Руси монголам делится на две фазы. Первая фаза (1237–1240) непосредственно связана с вторжением монголов на русские территории. Вторая фаза (1240–1260) связана с постепенным подчинением Руси, имевшим более мирный характер.

Монгольское вторжение имело поворотное значение в истории средневековой Руси: в первый раз в своей истории, население Руси было подвержено полномасштабному истреблению, в особенности, в связи с разрушением основных городских центров Руси. Наряду с детальным описанием военных действий, авторы русских летописей выказывают личное эмоциональное отношение к вторжению монголов. Требования со стороны монгольских полководцев абсолютного подчинения русских правителей и выплаты десятой доли со всех доходов и имущества, воспринимаются летописцами совершенно недопустимыми. Последующее разрушение основных урбанных центров Руси, центральных оплотов сопротивления монголам, воспринимается в летописях как божественное наказание за междоусобицы русских правителей, не способных организовать сплоченное военное сопротивление кочевникам. Сами монголы представлены как народ, абсолютно чуждый православной культуре; и упоминание их языческих обычаев сопровождается выражением откровенного отвращения авторов русских летописей.

Однако последующий период постепенного подчинения Руси монголам имел не меньшее значение для эволюции политических и культурных взаимоотношений между кочевниками и оседлым населением средневековой Руси. Русские летописи указывают на относительно быстрое восстановление урбанных центров, свидетельствуя тем самым, что экономическая ситуация на Руси, подорванная монгольским вторжением, стабилизировалась в довольно короткий период времени. В этот период монгольские правители ограничивались требованием формального подчинения русских князей, избегая прямого военного конфликта. Русь постепенно была включена в фи-

кальную систему империи монголов. В обмен, однако, русские князья получили значительную политическую автономию.

**Ключевые слова:** Средневековая Русь, нашествие монголов, русские летописи, взаимоотношения между монголами и русскими княжествами, фискальная система империи монголов.

**Сведения об авторе:** Роман Хаутала – исследователь на историческом отделении гуманитарного факультета Университета Оулу, PhD (История) (г. Оулу, Финляндия); [virisequisque@hotmail.com](mailto:virisequisque@hotmail.com)