

УДК 930.23

**Iu.V. SELEZNEV'S CONTRIBUTION
TO THE STUDY OF THE JUCHID ULUS¹**

Charles J. Halperin
(Indiana University, USA)

This article for the first time in scholarship surveys the contribution of Iurii Vasil'evich Seleznev of Voronezh State University to the study of Rus'-Tatar relations and the Juchid ulus, called the Golden Horde, during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. The article contains analyses of five major monographs written by Seleznev dealing with Rus'-Tatar relations from 1385 to 1434, the composition of the elite of the Juchid ulus, military conflicts between Rus' and the Horde during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, (with Andrei Olegovich Amel'kin) the history and historical memory of the battle of Kulikovo Field in 1380, and the role of Rus' princes as members of the Juchid ulus elite. The article identifies the strengths and weaknesses of each monograph. Finally the article attempts for the first time to draw connections among the conclusions of the five monographs. The strength of Seleznev's work are his equal mastery of the societies on both sides of the Rus'-Tatar border. He employs the Rus' sources and Russian translations of oriental sources in new and creative ways to extract hard data on previously unposed questions or on questions which have been previously posed but answered subjectively such as the parameters of Rus' princely trips to the Horde or the frequency of Rus'-Tatar military conflicts. In addition he appreciates the complex evolution of Rus' literary works such as those about the battle of Kulikovo Field in 1380. Seleznev also approaches questions of social history with an open mind inoculated against nationalist prejudices which would reject out of hand any possibility of Tatar influence on the Rus' mentality or society. He is sparing in his use of anachronistic and biased terminology toward the Tatars. The weaknesses of his studies include a lack of familiarity with studies of the Mongol Empire and its successor states other than the Juchid ulus in Western languages which by and large precludes comparative analysis and results in an insular presentation of Rus'-Horde relations in isolation from the parallel experience of other sedentary societies subjected to Mongol rule. He has not himself integrated the results of his separate monographs, for example by addressing the contradiction between what must have been the enormous Rus' expertise about

¹ This essay substantially reprints my reviews of Seleznev, Iu.V. «A peremenit Bog Ordu...» (Russko-ordynskie otnosheniia v kontse XIV – pervoi treti XV vv.). *Ab Imperio*, 2006, no. 4, pp. 428–431; Seleznev, Iu. V. *Elita Zolotoi Ordy*. *Ab Imperio*, 2009, no. 4, pp. 396–400; and Amel'kin, A.O. and Seleznev, Iu.V. *Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov*. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 14, 2013, pp. 853–64. I wish to thank the editors of «*Ab Imperio*» and «*Kritika*» for permission to do so.

the Horde with the often simplistic pejorative depiction of the Tatars in Rus' sources. Seleznev had not as yet written a comprehensive study of Rus'-Tatar relations which would encompass the totality of Rus'-Tatar interaction, including for example institutional borrowing. Nevertheless the strengths of his research far outweigh the weaknesses. Seleznev's ever-growing body of work makes a significant contribution to increasing historical knowledge of medieval Rus' and the Tatars of the Juchid ulus.

Keywords: Rus', Juchid ulus, Golden Horde, battle of Kulikovo, Tatar Yoke.

1) Seleznev, Iurii Vasil'evich. «A peremenit Bog Ordu...» (Russko-ordynskie otnosheniia v kontse XIV – pervoi treti XV vv.) [«If God should change the Horde...» (Russian-Horde relations from the end of the fourteenth through the first third of the fifteenth centuries)]. Voronezh, Voronezhskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 2006. 160 p.

2) Seleznev, Iurii Vasil'evich. Elita Zolotoi Ordy. Nauchno-spravochnoe izdanie [The elite of the Golden Horde. A scholarly-reference publication]. Kazan', Izdatel'stvo «Fen» Akademii Nauk Respubliki Tatarstan, 2009. 232 p.

3) Seleznev, Iurii Vasil'evich. Russko-ordynskie konflikty XIII–XV vekov. Spravochnik [Russian-Horde conflicts during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. A Guide]. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo «Kvadriga», 2010. 224 p.

4) Amel'kin, Andrei Olegovich and Seleznev, Iurii Vasil'evich. Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov [The battle of Kulikovo in the Testimonies of Contemporaries and Memory of Posterity]. Moscow, Kvadriga, 2011. 384 p.

5) Seleznev, Iurii Vasil'evich, Russkie kniaz'ia v sostave praviashchei elity Dzhuchieva ulusa v XIII–XV vekakh. Monografiia [Rus' Princes as Members of the Ruling Elite of the Juchid ulus from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. A monograph]. Voronezh, Tsentral'no-Chernozemskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 2013. 472 p.

Iurii Vasil'evich Seleznev of Voronezh State University is a prolific specialist in the history of Rus'-Tatar relations and of the Juchid ulus itself. His numerous publications attest to the synergistic benefits of investigating both sides of the forest-steppe frontier. Knowledge of the Juchid ulus creates a better context in which to understand Rus' relations with the Horde. Knowledge of the Rus' written sources, above all chronicles – apart from archeology, the mainstay of Horde research – enables him to elucidate Horde society and politics more comprehensively. The five monographs reviewed here – four solely by Seleznev, the fifth co-authored honorifically by his late mentor, Andrei Olegovich Amel'kin –

represent very well the fruits of his research. [I have not referenced any of Seleznev's numerous articles, many of which are not accessible in the United States.]

The first book, «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*» (*Russko-ordynskie otnosheniia v kontse XIV – pervoi treti XV vv.*), was devoted to a relatively narrow period, the under-studied decades of Russian-Tatar relations from 1382–1434, or approximately from after the sack of the city of Moscow by Khan Tokhtamysh until the death of Prince Iurii Dmitrievich of Galich two years after Horde Khan Ulug-Muhammed had ruled in favor of his nephew, Grand Prince Vasiliu II, in their dynastic dispute. It is a valuable addition to scholarship.

Most of the book is a narrative of political and military relations between Rus' and the Horde, personified by an Appendix containing a chronological register of Russian-Tatar «conflicts» (military encounters) from 1387–1434. However, this narrative is framed by thematic sub-chapters which exceed the monograph's stated chronological limits and raise wider issues.

The book begins with the usual obligatory surveys of historiography, which is quite selective of relevant Western publications, and sources. In general Seleznev does not regurgitate the often heated disputes among scholars on the dating of texts, such as the epic *Zadonshchina* about the battle of Kulikovo in 1380, confining himself to citing secondary works, identifying alternatives, and expressing his preference. He productively draws upon his numerous previous articles, but in his Bibliography modestly lists only six of the more than forty to his credit. In general he pays the most attention to recent secondary works in Russian. When appropriate he draws upon recent scholarship in archeology, numismatics, and geography, and even the Idigu (Edigei) Turkic epic.

Seleznev begins by repeating from his articles his conception of the place of the Rus' principalities in the system of Horde administration and on the integration of Rus' princes into the social and political hierarchy of the Horde. The general principles articulated here infuse the narrative which follows and all of the books which follow. One of the strengths of the monograph is precisely Seleznev's expertise on the Horde and sensitivity to its point of view.

In the narrative core of the volume Seleznev pays scrupulous attention to the interaction of the Rus' with their Horde overlords, tracing the ebb and flow of political relations through chronicles and princely treaties and testaments. He focuses on all the north-eastern Russian principalities, not just Moscow, which facilitates his perspective on events. He emphasizes that there was no precedent for Tokhtamysh to have kept the heirs to the thrones of Moscow, Tver', Riazan' and Nizhnii Novgorod-Suzdal' as captives in the Horde during the 1380s, which Seleznev interprets as a sign not of Tokhtamysh's strength but of his vulnerability. Seleznev highlights the interplay between inter-Rus' and Rus'-Tatar relations; the provi-

sions of treaties in which Tver', Nizhnii Novgorod or Riazan' princes promised not to deal separately with the Horde from Moscow impinged on Horde political privileges.

Seleznev presents both Rus' policy toward the Horde and Horde policy toward Rus' as often complex if not outrightly contradictory. He concludes that Vasilii I's Tatar policy, given Edigei's successful attack on Moscow in 1408, must be judged a failure. On a larger scale, Seleznev convincingly argues that the Muscovite civil war of the middle of the fifteenth century undermined progress in Rus' aspirations toward national independence by reviving Horde influence. However, this setback should not be exaggerated. Judicially Horde sovereignty was enhanced when Rus' princes again traveled to the Horde for recognition of their thrones, but in practice the Rus' princes did whatever they wanted. Payment of tribute, the defining trait of Horde sovereignty, continued until the 1470s.

Less successful is Seleznev's presentation of the possible presence of Vasilii I in Tokhtamysh's forces fighting Timur in the battle on the Kunchurga (Kondurcha) river, which could have been clearer. [Seleznev later presented an indirect argument for Rus' participation in Tokhtamysh's forces in *Russkie kniaz'ia v sostave praviashchei elity Dzhuchieva ulusa v XIII–XV vekakh*, p. 225.]

Seleznev appreciates the social and political structure of the Horde, for example, that Edigei was not a khan and, because he was not a Chingissid, could never have aspired to become one. However, Seleznev's understanding of the place of Rus' princes in the Horde hierarchy, itself an original contribution to the modus vivendi between Rus' and Tatars, leads him to the somewhat formalistic observation that Vasilii I, as a Grand Prince, was hierarchically equal to Edigei, a senior or great emir (Seleznev does not call Edigei a bekliaribek, an office or status often attributed to him by historians although there is no direct source evidence) as if this explains Vasilii I's disrespectful policy toward Edigei's puppet khans. Surely power politics determined policy, although both sides were very sensitive to questions of status in ceremonial.

In explaining why Timur (Tamerlane) did not attack Moscow in 1395 after taking Elets Seleznev makes good use of his analysis of the organization of the Horde to argue that Elets was part of the Horde's core, Rus' was not formally part of the Juchid ulus, so attacking Moscow would not have been part of Timur's strategy. Seleznev examines the anomalous position of Chervlennyi Iar, part of the Horde administratively but ecclesiastically under the jurisdiction of the Rus' metropolitan.

After completing his narrative Seleznev attempts to estimate the size of the population of the grand principalities of Moscow and Vladimir on the basis of the Horde tribute, and, following existing scholarship, evaluates the significance of Russian coinage for Russian-Tatar relations. In discussing the ideological theme of national independence, Seleznev creatively argues that the shift in a passage of the vita of Stefan of Perm' to

dating events listing the regnal years of the Byzantine Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople ahead of, instead of after, that of the Horde khan, as in earlier chronicle entries, suggests a change in the relative hierarchical status of the khan in Rus' eyes.

The conclusion is largely summary.

This is a well-researched, professional monograph, addressed primarily to specialists, containing many original and interesting observations. The narrow chronological focus, despite the thematic flexibility, precludes addressing broader issues of the overall Tatar influence on Rus' society, economy or culture or institutional borrowing, except in his historiographic introduction, a gap which Seleznev has felt no need to correct in his subsequent publications which remain devoted to political, social and military issues. Seleznev does not address substantively Tatar institutional, economic or cultural influence on Rus'. [Seleznev, Iu. V. *Russkie kniaz'ia v sostave praviashchei elity Dzhuchieva ulusa v XIII–XV vekakh*, p. 25] ascribes to Donald Ostrowski the judgment that Mongol influence on Muscovy was greater in the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries than in the fourteenth century and criticizes Ostrowski for not dealing with formative Tatar influence on the very structure of Rus' principalities in the thirteenth centuries. Ostrowski was concerned with institutional borrowing, only one aspect of Tatar influence, and there is no evidence for the thirteenth century of institutional borrowing. To my knowledge Ostrowski has never ranked the two periods of institutional borrowing to which Seleznev refers. Ostrowski would hardly consider fourteenth-century Muscovite borrowing of Tatar institutions «insignificant.»] One of the less obvious virtues of the book is its restraint in vocabulary. Although in his Introduction Seleznev (p. 6) does refer to «struggle of Rus' for independence and liberation from the Tatar Yoke,» this is the only invocation of the anachronistic and value-laden term «Tatar Yoke» in the study. Similarly, Seleznev refers throughout to «the Horde», eschewing the anachronistic term «the Golden Horde» by replacing it with the term most often found in the medieval chronicles.

Of courses many sources are subject to differing interpretations. The passage in the epic *Zadonshchina* that the fleeing Tatars will no longer collect tribute (*vykhod*) from the Rus' refers, I think, not to termination of the tribute in principle but to the imminent death of Mamai's Tatars [12, pp. 16–17]. I have become skeptical that it is permissible to cite the reconstructed «Trinity Chronicle» (*Troitskaia letopis'*) as if it were a text, i.e. an actual source [16, pp. 248–63].

Seleznev's conclusion that the Rus' princes conducted censuses in the fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is of wider import. It strikes me as a dubious inference from paragraphs in the princely wills and treaties which refer to a written allocation of Tatar tribute. There is no other evidence that the Muscovite princes had the administrative expertise to conduct censuses or that the Rus' ever referred to anything other than

the original thirteenth-century Mongol Empire census. The referenced written source may have been no more than a tax allocation table. While Seleznev's attempt to infer the population of the Moscow and Vladimir principalities from the amount of their tribute is imaginative, it assumes not only the validity of modern statistics on family size, even though he allows for ranges here, but also crucially that the Tatars maintained the tribute at the level of a tithe of total income based upon the precedent of the conquest tithes exacted by Chinggis and Batu. I seriously doubt that the apportionment of the tribute was nearly that fastidious by the fourteenth century. By the same token, his assessment of the size of Tatar armies rests upon the assumption that every Chingissid, following his table of status equivalents, commanded a *t'ma* or tumen of 10,000 troops, and every emir 1,000. For the Mongol successor state in Iran, the Ilkhanate, this assumption is demonstrably false, a tumen could have significantly fewer troops. For the Horde, there is simply no evidence to decide the matter.

In the second monograph discussed here, *Elita Zolotoi Ordı. Nauchno-spravochnoe izdanie*, Seleznev, by now author of more than eighty scholarly works, turned to a broader period of Juchid ulus history, from the time of its creation through the first third of the fifteenth century when that ulus began to fragment, which sets the chronological parameters for subsequent books.

Seleznev provided scholars with an invaluable biographical dictionary of the elite of the Juchid ulus. This book constitutes an essential reference tool in all research on the Juchid ulus as well as Rus'-Tatar relations.

Seleznev's «Introduction» (pp. 5–23) is a concise social history of the Juchid ulus and a political history of its elite. Each of these themes could easily be the subject of an entire monograph. He highlights the interaction of social status, military office, and genealogy in determining the careers of the aristocracy of the Juchid ulus. Seleznev defines the elite to include Chingisids; non-Chingisid aristocrats called noyon in Mongol, bek in Turkic, emir in Arabic and Persian, and prince (*kniaz'*) in Rus' sources; and Muslim clergy. Although obviously drawing upon his previous research, he also makes many original observations about individuals, events and processes. Seleznev compares the charges for which Grand Prince Mikhail' of Tver' was executed to the accusations against Grand Prince Vasilii II of Moscow used to justify his overthrow by his uncle and nephews. He draws an analogy between the procedure of installing a Rus' prince who had received a charter (*yarlyk*) to a throne to the Mongol ceremony for raising a noble to the rank of noyon. Seleznev's comments on the tension between the autocratic authority of the khan and the power of the elite would have been enhanced by situating them within the context of recent western scholarship on the collegial and consensual elements of the Mongol Empire and its successor states and of Inner Asian pastoral nomadic empires in general [Excellent surveys and bibliography can be

found in 5]. I am skeptical that Grand Prince Alexander Nevskii assuaged Tatar chagrin at the urban revolts of 1262 by persuading the Tatars to accept financial contributions in lieu of all future conscription. That there was a monetary penalty payment in 1262 is highly likely, but the chronicle does not mention recruitment (the Rus' chronicles never mention conscription per se) rather than taxation as the precipitating factor of the 1262 revolt and it is most plausible that the 1327 uprising in Tver' against Chol-khan was connected to conscription. Seleznev's stimulating analysis always raises interesting questions.

The bulk of the book is a biographical dictionary of the elite (pp. 24–226), whose entries are enhanced by maps (not all equally legible) and genealogical tables (pp. 227–31). Some entries or parts thereof were written by A.V. Kuz'min. Each entry presents, when available, the individual's ancestry and progeny, a narrative of his or her activities, and to the greatest extent possible a comprehensive list of relevant sources and secondary works. This is an impressive feat of collecting and collating massive data from Rus' and Oriental written sources (via Russian translations), numismatics, archeology, and art history. The value of such a reference work will be immediately apparent to all historians. The most extensive entries describe (in descending order) Idegei (pp. 78–88), Nogai (pp. 138–45), Mamai (pp. 119–24), and Tokhtamysh (pp. 182–86). Each entry requires to a greater or lesser degree reconciling and synthesizing the evidence into a straight-forward encyclopedia-style entry. Not all specialists will agree with each of the innumerable judgments Seleznev had to make to compose such narratives. His candidate for the «real» Petr, tsarevich of the Horde, later a saint of the Rus' Orthodox Church, is certainly intriguing. I am dubious that the Rus' chronicle notation that Metropolitan Maksim left Kiev in 1299 for Vladimir-on-the-Kliazma because of Tatar oppression «in all likelihood» alluded to the Muslim Nogai's harsh attitude toward Christians, for which no evidence is advanced.

Seleznev assiduously informs the reader when different names might pertain to the same person or when different sources present different genealogies of the same individual. When he does so he usually analyzes the reliability of each source. Different transliterations of the same name are included separately and cross-referenced, although I do not know what purpose was served by twice referencing «Mukhammed Uzbek» (pp. 209, 213) when the entry under that name merely cross-references the entry under «Uzbek.» Sometimes but not always Seleznev indicates the specific source cited from such anthologies as Tizenhausen or *Materialy po istorii kazakhsikh khanstv*. Unfortunately not all entries follow Seleznev's template. The entry for Buval, son of Juchi, does not include the names of his sons, which is significant because in Seleznev's exposition one son, Tatar (Tutar), fathered Nogai. This example dovetails with a second occasional issue, that Seleznev finesses some scholarly disputes. One would not know from his depiction that Nogai's ancestry as a Chingissid has been

disputed. Similarly, Seleznev cites the version of Tokhtamysh's ancestry in Muizz from Batu's son Teku Timur without mentioning the alternative genealogy in Zambaur from Batu's son Orda.

It would be impossible within the compass of a book of this length to present exhaustive references to sources or secondary works. The citations for Rus' chronicles, which I know best, are not always comprehensive. Seleznev's citations to scholarly works in Western languages are extremely sparing, although, to be sure, a few salient English- or German-language works are utilized via Russian translations. His reference to Tatar-language studies, inaccessible to me, are even more sparse. The failure to consult foreign-language publications explains the lack of comparison between the elite of the Juchid ulus and the elites of the Mongol Empire and its other successor states [For example see 6].

In recognition that this book will be consulted at random, identical narrative segments are repeated for each individual involved in same event, although there is a flaw in the quotation of the charges brought against Grand Prince Mikhail' of Tver' in 1318 (on p. 200); a clause mentioning his desire to flee to the Pope in Rome has been deleted. However, this appreciation of how the book will be utilized was not taken into account in fashioning the apparatus. After the first full bibliographical entry Seleznev employs abbreviated references. To be sure, there are also not immediately understandable exceptions when he repeats the full entries. Therefore historians entering the book *in medias res* will have to backtrack abbreviations to find full citations to publications. There is no «List of Abbreviations» or, what would have been better still, comprehensive bibliography with both long and short references. Finally, secondary works are cited in alphabetical order; whereas in tracing the evolution of scholarship chronological sequence might have been more useful.

As in «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*» Seleznev continues to believe that the Yasa was a single law code issued by Chinggis Qan; to date the *Zadonshchina* following Rzhiga, which has few adherents among specialists in Old Rus' literature nowadays; and to cite the «Trinity Chronicle» as if it were a source, not a reconstruction. Although in that volume Seleznev admirably eschewed use of the anachronistic term the «Golden Horde» here he takes a step backwards and indiscriminately uses «Juchid ulus» and «Golden Horde» as synonyms.

In his «Introduction» Seleznev provided no statistical analysis whatsoever, not even an estimate of the total number of entries, corrected in a later book.[My original guess as to the number was quite inaccurate.] He did not then count the numbers of Chingissids versus non-Chingissids among the secular elite nor the number of clerics. He did not track tribal or geographic names, for which an index would have been extremely helpful, nor has he done so since. As in the Great Mongol Empire, women in the Juchid ulus could exercise decisive political influence, enough to be executed if their schemes failed, so Seleznev rightfully includes women

among the elite, for which he later did provide a total as well a total of the few Tatars who became Orthodox Christian converts. A definitive prosopographical study should have entailed quantitative analysis in its original form.

From the perspective of source study, it would be intriguing to aggregate how many individuals are known only from Rus' sources, how many only from Oriental sources, and how many are found in both, which might provide very intriguing insights into how reliable each group of sources is. Additional source types, such as treaties with Venice, are also of interest.

Of course just by themselves the names in the dictionary will provide much food for thought for linguists and specialists in onomastics. But in addition, buried within the biographical entries, if read from cover to cover, one can find a wealth of anecdotal information of great relevance and utility for constructing an entertaining and enlightening social history of the Juchid ulus. Here one can find divorces, marital discord and family feuds galore. My favorite is the story of Tuguldzha, daughter of Nogai, husband of Emir Taza, who in 1301 reputedly mounted horse and fought in battle against her husband on behalf of her brother Dzheki.

Seleznev indicated that this project was a work-in-progress which he hoped to supplement. For this purpose he invited colleagues to send him corrections and additions. One hopes that this solicitation did not go unanswered and that eventually a definitive catalogue of the elite of the Juchid ulus can be compiled.

Russko-ordynskie konflikty XIII–XV vekov, the third book reviewed here, is a valuable study of both Rus'-Horde relations and the Juchid ulus. In chronological focus it matched and exceeded that of *Elita Zolotoi Ordy*, in methodology and substance it expanded the listing of Rus'-Tatar conflicts from 1387–1430 in the appendix to «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*». The handbook tabularizes all episodes of Rus'-Tatar military conflict from the battle on the Kalka River in 1223 until the destruction of the Great Horde, the successor of the Juchid ulus, in 1502.

In his «historical survey» of Rus-Tatar conflicts (5–20) Seleznev notes the transition of Rus' from an object of Mongol conquest to one of the main sources of tribute and human resources for the Juchid ulus. He presents an overview of the conflicts listed in his register. It is notable that by the first half of the fifteenth century Rus'-Tatar warfare had acquired a much more local flavor. In the preface to the register (21–23) Seleznev explains that he has included armed conflicts on territory that became part of the Rus' state but neither Tatar campaigns against the Grand Principality of Lithuania nor the campaign of Timur (Tamerlane) against Elets, topics which each require separate treatment. In practice this means he includes conflicts involving thirteenth-century Galicia-Volynia, now in Ukraine. He includes some episodes recorded only in the sixteenth-century Nikon Chronicle but flags them as possibly unreliable. Because his data run through 1502, he treats not only Rus' battles with the Great

Horde but also with the khanates of Kazan' and the Crimea, successor states of the Juchid ulus.

The register (24–190) contains 152 «tables.» For each encounter he provides, when available, the date, cause, and the military commanders, quantity of troops, routes for both Tatars and Rus' forces, place and date of fundamental battle, consequences, and citations to all relevant sources and secondary works. This meticulous data base will be invaluable to all future students of Rus'-Tatar relations, indeed, of Rus' or Tatar history in general during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries.

As good as the register is, the crown of this monograph is the «conclusion» (191–95) which in a scant five pages answered every quantitative question that will occur to the reader of the register. In approximately two-thirds of the enumerated incidents the Tatars were the attackers, Rus' the defenders. Twenty-two times Tatar «raids» constituted participation in internecine Rus' princely wars (which constitutes a hefty one-fifth of all Tatar incursions), although Rus' princes also took part in Tatar civil wars. Twenty Rus' raids intruded into Horde territory, including six purely looting expeditions by Novgorod freebooters. Seleznev counts how often each Rus' city or region was subjected to punitive or exploitative raids. He rightly notes that the decline in central Horde authority led to an increase in mutual bandit raids by Tatars and Rus' alike. The relocation of Old Riazan' because of its devastation by the Tatars is well-known, but not as much attention has been paid to the fact that after Edigei's raid of 1408 Starodub and Gorodets ceased to exist as cities. Seleznev comments on the meaning of the «peace in the Rus' Land» between 1328 and 1375. The only prolonged Tatar military assaults on the Rus' principalities were by Batu 1237–42 and Mamai 1374–80; all other campaigns were finite and brief. The book is worth reading for Seleznev's superlative summary of the data alone.

Abbreviations and bibliography, consisting of 85 items of published sources, 282 secondary works, and ten (actually nine, because Seleznev cites *Elita Zolotoi Ordy* both here and in «Literature» #227) handbooks complete the volume.

There are a few matters in *Russko-ordynskie konflikty XIII–XV vekov* which should be criticized, although none impugns its value. It was to be hoped that Russian historians would stop demonizing the Tatars as *zakhvatchiki* (predators) (6); fortunately, Seleznev does so only once and his treatment of the Tatars merits praise for its evenhandedness. Numbers of troops are open for discussion, but that is to be expected. That the Tatars did not succeed in establishing their nomadic base on the lower Danube, but were compelled to relocate to the lower Volga (8) rests upon the dubious assumption that the Mongols wanted to settle in the Balkans; the superior pastures of the Pontic and Caspian steppe in southern Ukraine and Russia argue against such a premise. I suspect that the purpose of the

Mongol campaign versus Eastern, East Central and Balkan Europe was to create a buffer zone between Europe and the true Tatar steppe homeland.

Technically it is regrettable a book which tries to identify the routes of advance of both Tatars and Rus' on their mutual campaigns contains no maps. As in *Elita Zolotoi Ordy* Seleznev presents secondary literature in his table entries in Russian alphabetical order, whereas chronological order would have been more useful. Of course the amount of information on conflicts varies considerably. The least information appears in Table 31 about a Tatar raid in the fall of 1307 led by Tair. All other substantive rubrics of the table are empty. Seleznev does not cite the *Kazanskaia istoriia*, not even concerning the Stand on the Ugra River in 1480, which is eminently defensible given its date of composition and historical unreliability. He does continue to cite Priselkov's reconstruction of the «Trinity Chronicle,» which is *not* a source but a textual exercise and should not be cited as if it were an actual text. Most disappointing is Seleznev's extraordinary stinginess when it comes to citing scholarly literature in English. This bibliographic insularity seriously diminishes the value of the apparatus of the register for Western readers.

When Amel'kin and Seleznev planned *Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov*, the fourth book reviewed here in which Seleznev returned to a part of the period covered in «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*», they had already collaborated on two books, on Batu's invasion of Rus' and on Kulikovo in history and historical memory respectively. [1 and 2. The latter is not nearly as comprehensive as *Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov*] *Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov* consists of a «substitute for a preface» (*vmesto predisloviia*), ten chapters, and a conclusion. In the «substitute for a preface» Seleznev explains that Amel'kin passed away in 2007 soon after he and Seleznev had finalized plans for the project so Seleznev had to finish it alone, in part as a tribute to his mentor. The first two chapters are introductory. Chapter 1 deals with Russian historiography on the battle itself, chapter 2 with scholarship on the literary monuments devoted to the battle, including but not confined to the Kulikovo cycle. [The Kulikovo cycle is a trilogy of literary works: the epic *Zadonshchina*, notorious for its crucial role in determining the authenticity of the «Tale of the Host of Igor'» (*Slovo o polku Igoreve*); the so-called «Chronicle Tale» (*Letopis'naia povest'*) found within the corpus of Rus' chronicles; and the «Narration of the Battle with Mamai» (*Skazanie o Mamevom poboische*), the latest and most extensive narrative. Additional sources about the battle of Kulikovo include the «life» of St. Sergius.] Chapters 2 through 8 discuss the battle itself – the political situation in Eastern Europe before the battle, Rus'-Tatar relations, the military strengths of the two opposing sides, the movement of both armies toward the battle site, the actual battle, and the significance of the battle at the time. The last two chapters discuss the memory of the battle during the

fifteenth to seventeenth centuries and the image of the battle in «societal consciousness» (*obshchestvennoe samosoznanie*) in the eighteenth to twentieth centuries respectively, encompassing works of art and architecture in both periods as well as novels, plays, poetry, and short stories in the modern period. The authors conclude that despite some later exaggerations the battle of Kulikovo was still «one of the decisive moments in the history of the complicated relations of Rus' with the Horde.» The Rus' victory at Kulikovo Field demonstrated that it was possible to defeat the Tatars (260). [On the myth of the myth of Mongol invincibility supposedly shattered at Kulikovo, see 13, pp. 168–81.]

The book does not contain a list of abbreviations, a bibliography or an index, but it does include a magnificent collection of over thirty glossy color illustrations, including maps, artefacts, photographs, and historical reconstructions of the appearance of Rus' and Tatar warriors in full battle dress.

The surveys of historiography about the battle and the literary monuments are comprehensive for Russian (*otechestvennaia*) historiography, which here includes not only works in Russian but also Ukrainian and Belarusian as well as a few works by Western scholars which have been translated into Russian. Amel'kin and Seleznev do not confine themselves to the works of historians alone. They observe that the celebration of the six-hundredth anniversary of the battle in 1980 inspired much innovative and more sophisticated archeological research into the battle. In their substantive chapters Amel'kin and Seleznev almost never cite and absolutely never engage Western scholarship, justifying their neglect with the observation that the study of foreign historiography requires separate treatment, thus perpetuating the pattern of Seleznev's other books.

Concerning the vexed question of the dating of the literary monuments, all of which survive only in later manuscripts, Amel'kin and Seleznev by and large choose from among existing opinions, primarily the most recent theories by Russian scholars, as Seleznev did in «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*» . They conclude that the *Zadonshchina* dates to the brief interval between the battle of Kulikovo and the sack of Moscow by Tokhtamysh, the «Long Redaction» of the «Chronicle Tale» to no later than the first third of the fifteenth century, and the «Narration of the Battle with Mamai» (*Skazanie o Mamevom poboische*) to the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century. Although they do not dismiss the unique contents of the latter work entirely, they are highly skeptical about its historical accuracy. Amel'kin and Seleznev conclude that «contemporaries did not immediately appreciate the role which the victory at Kulikovo would play in Russian life and most of all in its self-consciousness» (58). In other words, Russians could not fully understand the importance of Kulikovo until the passage of time had given them the opportunity to acquire historical hindsight.

In their historical background Amel'kin and Seleznev make a convincing case against the proposition that Lithuanian expansion into former Kievan Rus' lands freed them from the Horde. The authors deal judiciously with the question of the size and composition of the opposing armies. Although they admit that Rus' and Tatar armaments were similar and that the Rus' borrowed the five-division field army structure from the Horde, they deny significant Mongol influence on Rus' arms and armor. Their depiction of the routes taken by the opposing armies toward the admittedly not definitively identified battle site reflects the authors' intimate knowledge of the geography of the region. R. Solopov's two-page photograph of that possible battle site stands out among the book's illustrations.

Amel'kin and Seleznev make some original observations concerning the actual battle. While they deny the historical accuracy both of the «Chronicle Tale» account that Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi of Moscow changed clothes with one of his servitors and fought on foot in the front ranks and of the «Narration of the Battle with Mamai» that Donskoi was found severely wounded and unconscious under a tree after the battle was over, they accept the framework of the «Narration of the Battle with Mamai» that an attack by a Russian force held in reserve turned the tide of battle.

Although Tokhtamysh soon restored Horde authority, he was nevertheless forced to recognize Muscovite supremacy in Northeast Russia. The passage in the *Zadonshchina* in which the fleeing Tatars lament that they will never again collect tribute (*vykhod*) from the Russians reflects a change in Russian consciousness after the battle concerning Russian dependence on the Juchid ulus. Variations in Russian coinage after 1380, which sometimes included Tokhtamysh's name, reflect fluctuating Tatar influence over Russia. These conclusions were advanced by Seleznev in «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*».

Amel'kin and Seleznev have carefully read the literary monuments about Kulikovo.

Their meticulous delineation of the gradual evolution of Russian ideas about Kulikovo takes into account the textual history of each literary monument they discuss, redaction by redaction, and changes among different compositions. They are adept at illustrating how the evolution of the texts responded to developments in Muscovite history. The strength of their textual exposition is its documentation of the integration of concepts and phrases from Scripture into the texts. This religious framework fundamentally shaped the perception of the battle by Russian book-men. Amelkin and Seleznev's thorough examination of cultural reflections of and historical allusions to Kulikovo in the eighteenth to twentieth centuries attests to the significance of the battle in modern Russia's historical mentality.

Of course, given its scope and source base, some points of detail in the authors' analysis may be questioned. O.V. Fedorov's reconstruction of

typical Russian and Horde mounted warriors suggests and Donald Ostrowski's publications make a convincing case that Rus' arms and armament, especially the compound bow, were borrowed from the Tatars [Conveniently see 19, pp. 28–32]. Seleznev was obviously not persuaded by my interpretation of the lament of the fleeing Tatars in the *Zadonshchina* to mean not that tribute-payment had been terminated to all Tatars but rather that *these* Tatars, who are also never again going to kiss their wives, expected to die imminently. The defeat of a non-Chingissid usurper like Mamai could not possibly have altered the political relationship between Russia and the Juchid ulus. Amel'kin and Seleznev assume rather than elucidate the process through which elite literary texts penetrated «popular» consciousness.

More important than such specific issues is a conceptual discrepancy embedded in the authors' presentation. Amel'kin and Seleznev do not themselves use the anachronistic term «the Tatar Yoke» (*tatarskoe igo*) but they do attribute to the *Zadonshchina* the view that the battle of Kulikovo constituted the «liberation of the Russian lands from the Yoke of the Horde» (*osvobozhdenie russkikh zemel' ot ordynskogo iga*), as Seleznev did in «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*», although neither the word «yoke» nor the concept of «liberation» occur explicitly in this or any work of the Kulikovo cycle [12, pp. 7–103]. The authors do not fully appreciate this point because they do not take into account the intellectual framework of Rus'-Tatar relations in which the Rus' only very ambiguously at best acknowledged the Mongol *conquest*, i.e. change of sovereignty. The Rus' knew that they *had* been conquered and narrate the political and administrative consequences of that conquest, but they chose not to articulate that concept intellectually. Instead they presented Rus'-Tatar relations as a series of unrelated mostly violent encounters devoid of overarching consequences for sovereignty, «conflicts» so comprehensively elaborated in Seleznev's *Russko-ordynskie konflikty XIII–XV vekov*. It was impossible for Muscovite sources about Kulikovo to claim «emancipation» from a foreign «yoke» because the Rus' had barely admitted that they were under foreign rule [15; 7].

Amel'kin and Seleznev, despite their critical approach to the contents of some of the literary sources about the battle of Kulikovo, continue to adhere to the «Russian national paradigm» that this battle was a significant event in Russian-Tatar relations at the time, that it had a beneficial effect upon «Russian national consciousness,» that its heroic image was not impaired by the temporary setback to Russian emancipation from Tatar rule by Tokhtamysh's sack of Moscow in 1382, that the seminal consequences of the battle became more apparent as time went on culminating in definitive «liberation» from its foreign «yoke» in 1480, and that to this day the battle can serve as an inspiration to Russian patriots. The connection between the late manuscripts of literary works about Kulikovo and «Russian national consciousness» after 1380 is very problematic. Thank-

fully they only sparingly employ the anachronistic pejorative stereotype of the Tatars as «predators» or «invaders» (*zakhvatchiki*). Amel'kin and Seleznev strike a sour note when they denigrate Turkic «nationalistic» publications on Kulikovo, singling out Rustam Nabiev (Nabi) as a representative of this «nationalistic school.» [Amel'kin and Seleznev cite some articles by Nabiev (Nabi) to which I do not have access but I have read 4.] Apparently Tatar patriotism in their eyes does not merit equal treatment with Russian patriotism. Such *ad hominem* arguments are unprofessional. If Amel'skin and Seleznev wanted to contest Nabiev's views they should have done so on scholarly grounds alone. Their invocations, however rare, of «liberation» from the «Tatar Yoke» weaken their analysis. These conceptual limitations limit the book's utility for Western readers but of course cannot undermine its overall enormous scholarly value.

The very title of the fifth and final monograph by Seleznev considered here, *Russkie kniaz'ia v sostave praviashchei elity Dzhuchieva ulusa v XIII–XV vekakh* [«Rus' Princes as Members of the Ruling Elite of the Juchid ulus»] embodies an ambitious and revisionist thesis. While drawing upon his earlier work, in this monograph Seleznev raises his analysis of the relationship of the Rus' princes to Horde society to a new level. The chronological scope and content match *Elita Zolotoi Ordyy*.

The book consists of an introduction, five hefty chapters, a conclusion, two appendices, the first quite substantial, and an impressive bibliography.

The brief introduction (5–7) states in bold type (which Seleznev effectively uses throughout the monograph) that the Rus' princes, although sedentary and Orthodox Christian, were part of the elite of the Juchid ulus, despite those differences in life-style and religion. As subordinates of the khan of the Juchid ulus they should not be treated as if they were independent.

The first chapter (8–47) contains the obligatory survey of historiography and sources but also explicitly for the first time in the publications reviewed here Seleznev declares that the term the «Tatar Yoke» did not appear in contemporary Rus' sources. The first foreign use of «yoke» occurred in the Latin-language Polish historian Dlugosz from the late fifteenth century, its first Russian use in Alexander Radishchev. Current authors, he contends, avoid the term «yoke»; he is speaking for himself and some Russian specialists on the Mongol period of Rus' history, but far from all. [And certainly not for 3. For a review see. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 14, 2013, pp. 853–64.]

Chapter two on Rus'-Tatar relations in the Rus' chronicles (48–86) contrasts the «honor» that Alexander Nevskii received from Khan Batu in the thirteenth century to the «grants» (*pozhalovaniia*) Rus' princes received from the Horde in the fourteenth and fifteenth century, because a «grant» is given by a superior to an inferior.

Chapter 3 on the ruling stratum of the Juchid ulus (87–154) summarizes *Elita Zolotoi Ordý*, only here Seleznev provides the statistics lacking there. His prosopography of the Horde contains 1,287 people, 705 Chingissids, 787 nobles, 131 women, and 47 clergy. For 65 no class identity can be established. Only seven converted to Christianity. Seleznev interprets the low number of Muslim clergy even during the reign of Khan Uzbek, who made Islam the official religion of the Horde, as evidence of the low level of the Horde's Islamization.

Chapter 4 deals with the theme of the book's title, the role of Rus' princes in the body of the Horde's ruling stratum (155–253). It is the heart of the narrative section of the monograph. He compiles statistics of how many princes made how many trips to the Horde during successive centuries of Tatar rule. The last Rus' prince to visit the Horde did so in 1445. As the power of the Horde weakened, fewer princes traveled to Sarai or the nomadic camp of the khan, and the Horde sent more and more envoys to the Rus' forest instead. The average trip of a Rus' prince to the Horde took six months. Seleznev soundly concludes that when Rus' princes attended a Mongol quriltai they were observers, not participants. A total of eleven Rus' princes were executed at the Horde, none after the 1340s. From 1242 to 1445 99 Rus' princes out of a possible 351 traveled 250 times to the Horde, but grand princes or aspirants to be grand princes were disproportionately represented among the travelers. The princes of Galicia and Volynia in the southwest spent the most time joining the Tatars on campaign (206) (so much for Ukrainian greater independence than Great Russians from the Mongols). Spending time at the Khan's court was a necessary part of the life of a major Rus' prince, an essential element of their political culture. But Rus' princes spent far more time in the «Fatherland» (*Rodina*) [Seleznev's upper case] than at the Horde, so Seleznev insists that the Horde trips did not exercise a decisive influence upon domestic Rus' political culture (253).

Chapter 5 analyzes the historical and anthropological consequences of Rus' princely trips to the Horde. River travel downstream on the Volga River was safer and faster than the land route but the land route had to be employed on the return trip because of the difficulty of going upstream. The safest way to travel was to accompany a Horde envoy, which guaranteed security, both because the envoy carried the prestige of the khan and because his suite comprised between 700 and 1500 persons, probably most if not all armed. The Rus' princes, during their month-long sojourn among the Tatars, had no choice but to commit the sin of drinking kumis, for which they did penance in prayer upon their safe return home. [Seleznev cites the Franciscan missionary to the Mongols William of Rubruck that the Rus' considered it a sin to drink kumiss but neither Rubruck nor Seleznev explain why. Neither alcohol nor goats were forbidden in Orthodox canon law, but eating or drinking with non-Christians was. Seleznev cites the Franciscan missionary to the Mongols William of

Rubruck that the Rus' considered it a sin to drink kumiss but neither Rubruck nor Seleznev explain why. Neither alcohol nor goats were forbidden in Orthodox canon law, but eating or drinking with non-Christians was.] The Rus' princes knew their way inside and out of Horde society and politics.

The conclusion (303–12) notes that an average prince made an average of two-and-a-half trips to the Horde in his lifetime. The Horde was part and parcel of the mental map of the world of Rus' princes. Rus' princes fully assimilated the rites, rituals, ceremonies, customs and traditions of the Horde in order to manifest the appropriate behavioral practices incumbent upon vassals attending their Tatar overlord. Eventually the Moscow princes came to see themselves as heirs and successors of the Horde khans. Vassian Rylo's «Epistle to the Ugra River» in 1480 proclaimed that Rus' repentance of sin would lead to emancipation from Tatar slavery, the end of the «Babylonian captivity» of the Rus'. Although the Tatar conquest changed Rus' social structure, the Rus' princes did not fuse with the Horde elite. Five Riurikid intermarriages with Chingissids were outnumbered two-to-one by ten marriages to Polovtsy. Rus' princes did not give their daughters in marriage to Tatar khans.

The first appendix (313–415) provides the data base for the conclusions of chapter 4. In alphabetical order it lists every Rus' prince who traveled to the Horde, how long he lived, how much of his life as a prince or a grand prince was spent at the Horde both absolutely and as a percentage of his biography, and how long each trip took, corroborated by the citations to the relevant primary sources and secondary works. This appendix should not be taken as definitive; Seleznev continues to discover additional princes to include. The second appendix concerns Horde envoys to the Rus' princes: identity, chronology, khan at the time, results, and sources. [This list does contain some, but not many, envoys I missed in 8, pp. 43–61.]

The Bibliography is strongest on Russian (and Ukrainian) language materials. Only one volume of Latin sources is included. Seleznev is credited with 37 single-author publications. Of note is inclusion of four issues of the new Kazan journal *Zolotoordynskaia tsivilizatsiia*. Foreign-language works in the bibliography were not included in the apparatus to the first appendix.

It is astonishing that no one until now, including this reviewer, had ever taken full advantage of the immense information in the Rus' chronicles and other narrative to catalogue quantitatively Rus' princely trips to Horde, replacing subjective impressions with hard data. Seleznev deserves all the credit for conceptualizing and carrying out this enormously useful project. Of course many Rus' non-princes also traveled to the Horde, including boyars, merchants, clergy, artisans and slaves, some voluntarily, others involuntarily, but none of these classes of Rus' society joined the

Horde elite, not even the boyars, justifying their exclusion from Seleznev's survey.

Seleznev continues to pay attention to the Scriptural language and analogies which Rus' book-men employed to depict Rus'-Tatar relations rather than to modern concepts such as the «Tatar Yoke.» I would prefer to differentiate the generic use of «yoke» or even «yoke of slavery» to describe Tatar rule from the phrase «the Tatar Yoke,» which has a separate history not noted by Seleznev [14, pp. 168–8; 18, pp. 244–45; 17, p. 241]. The arbitrariness or at least malleability of the Old Testament analogues used to encapsulate Rus'-Tatar relations by Rus' clergy needs to be clarified: the Mongols did not deport the Rus' to an alien land as in the Hebrews' Babylonian captivity, the Rus' were not literally «enslaved» as the Hebrews were in Egypt and therefore did not need to be «liberated» from slavery. Biblical language was used metaphorically, not literally. Religion – not politics – partially explains the dynamic of Rus'-Tatar intermarriage. «Pagan» Tatar brides converted to Orthodox Christianity to marry Rus' princes; once the Horde became Muslim, the religious barrier precluded further intermarriage. But it is curious that «pagan» or even Nestorian Chingissids in the early decades of Horde rule did not marry Riurikid brides who could have remained Christian. That Muscovy was the heir and successor of the Juchid Horde remains in my mind problematic, although other specialists on Tatar history in Russia, not just in Kazan, share this conclusion.

Seleznev presents only one comparative comment: like Rus' chronicles and khans, Armenian sources kept track of changes in ilkhans (309). More comparative analysis of the Mongol Empire and its successor states contemporary to the Juchid ulus would have enhanced Seleznev's argument. Armenia and Georgia were also sedentary and Christian and subordinate to a non-Christian Mongol ruler. Comparison of the experiences of Armenian and Georgian princes in the Ilkhanate to Rus' princes in the Juchid ulus would facilitate determining the uniqueness of the Rus' phenomenon among sedentary peoples conquered by the Mongols. Surely the absence of comparative analysis in the book is related to Seleznev's increased but still very spotty use of Western scholarship not translated into Russian.

Russkie kniaz'ia v sostave praviashchei elity Dzhuchieva ulusa raises broader issues which he does not address about the relationship of the Rus' principalities and the Horde in the context of Seleznev's previous books. The place of the Rus' princes in the Horde elite was ambivalent: they were part of the Horde elite but they did not fuse entirely with that elite. This ambivalence exactly matches the status of the Rus' principalities and city-states in the Horde: they were an ulus but they were not part of the core ulus of the Horde [10, pp. 308–27]. Seleznev does not make the point that this very ambivalence resonates with the complex picture of military encounters involving the Rus' and the Tatars addressed in

Russko-ordynskie konflikty XIII–XV vekov, which included joint Rus'-Tatar campaigns against foreign foes of the Horde such as the Poles, Hungarians or Circassians, and campaigns with some Rus' against their Rus' rivals; purely Tatar punitive expeditions and raids against Rus' principalities; and purely Rus' raids against the Tatars. Furthermore, as Seleznev does not observe, the tensions and contradictions inherent in such a relationship between the Rus' princes and their Tatar overlords infuse their political interaction which Seleznev narrates for the period from 1387 to 1430 and from the 1360s through primarily 1382 in «*A peremenit Bog Ordu...*» and in *Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov* respectively. Finally, Seleznev does not confront the disconnect between what must have been the sophisticated and very informed understanding of Horde dynamics and the factors that influenced Horde policies toward Rus' acquired by Rus' princes on their numerous visits to the Horde with the depiction of Tatar motivation in the literary monuments of the Kulikovo cycle so carefully elucidated in *Kulikovskaia bitva v sviditel'stvakh sovremennikov i pamiati potomkov* and, I would add, in all Rus' sources about the Tatars from the tales of the battle on the river Kalka in 1223 through retrospective perspectives on the Horde written in the middle of the sixteenth century. The proportions of outright religious hostility and more «rational» motives attributed to the Tatars, let alone the calibrated portrayal of Chingissid khans, did not remain entirely fixed [9, pp. 53–62]. Perhaps Seleznev will pursue these connections among his conclusions in a future publication.

Iurii Seleznev's monographs on Rus'-Tatar relations and of the Juchid ulus constitute an outstanding and significant body of work. Their strengths far outweigh their weaknesses. Their weakness is a provincialism which isolates the Juchid ulus and Rus'-Tatar relations from the histories of the Mongol Empire, its other successor-states, and other sedentary peoples conquered by the Mongols, an insularity driven no doubt by problems of access, both linguistic and practical, to non-Russian language publications in the vast field of Inner Asian studies. Its strengths are comprehensive research, sound logic, clear exposition, and scrupulous attention to detail. Seleznev continues to formulate significant original research themes and topics not previously investigated in the voluminous historiography of medieval Rus' of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries and then to write monographs about them in record time. His field of expertise fully encompasses the totality of the Tatar period of Rus' history, from the Tatar conquest to the destruction of the Juchid ulus. All specialists in Rus' and the steppe should look forward eagerly to his future publications.

REFERENCES

1. Amel'kin A.O., Seleznev Iu. V. *Nashestvie Batyia i ustanovlenie ordynskogo iga v obshchestvennom soznanii Rusi XIII–XIV vekov* [Batu's invasion and the establishment of the Horde Yoke in the societal consciousness of Rus' during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries]. Voronezh. Voronezhskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii universitet, Istoricheskii fakul'tet; Voronezhskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, Istoricheskii fakul'tet, 2004. 143 p.
2. Amel'kin A.O., Seleznev Iu.V. *Kulikovskaia bitva v soznanii sovremennikov i potomkov* [The battle of Kulikovo in the consciousness of contemporaries and posterity]. Voronezh, Nauchnaia kniga, 2006. 115 p.
3. Azbelev S.N. *Kulikovskaia pobeda v narodnoi pamiati. Literaturnye pamiatniki kulikovskogo tsikla i fol'klornaia traditsiia* [The battle of Kulikovo in popular memory. The literary monuments of the Kulikovo cycle and the folkloric tradition]. St. Petersburg. Dmitrii Bulanin, 2011. 311 p.
4. Nabi (Nabiev). R. *Pravda o «Kulikovskoi bitve»* [The truth about the «battle of Kulikovo»]. Kazan, Iman Publ., 2004. 132 p.
5. Di Cosmo N., Di Cosmo F., Allen J. ed., *Cambridge History of Inner Asia: the Chinggisid Age*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Publ., 2009. 488 p.
6. de Rachewiltz I., Chan, Hok-lam, and Hsiao, Ch'i ch'ing, ed., with the assistance of Wang, May *In the Service of the Khan. Eminent Personalities of the Early Mongol-Yüan Period (1200–1300)*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1993. 808 p.
7. Halperin Ch.J. The East Slavic Response to the Mongol Conquest. Halperin, Charles J. *Russia and the Mongols*, pp. 201–218.
8. Halperin Ch.J. Know Thy Enemy: Medieval Russian Familiarity with the Mongols of the Golden Horde. Halperin, *Russia and the Mongols*, pp. 43–61.
9. Halperin Ch.J. Paradigms of the Image of the Mongols in Medieval Russia. Volker Rabatzii, Alessandra Pozzi, Peter W. Geier, and John R. Krueger, ed., *The Early Mongols: Language and History. Tümen tümen nasulatugai. Studies in Honor of Igor de Rachewiltz on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series vol. 173; Bloomington, IN. 2009, pp. 53–62.
10. Halperin Ch.J. The Place of Rus' in the Golden Horde. Halperin, *Russia and the Mongols*, pp. 308–27.
11. Halperin Ch.J. *Russia and the Mongols. Slavs and the Steppe in Medieval and Early Modern Russia*, Victor Spinei and George Bilavski, ed. Bucharest. Editura Academiei Romane, 2007. 329 p.
12. Halperin Ch.J. The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar: The Emergence of Muscovite Ideology, 1380–1408. *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 23, 1976, pp. 7–103.
13. Halperin Ch.J. Russo-Tatar Relations in Mongol Context: Two Notes. Halperin, *Russia and the Mongols*, pp. 182–200.
14. Halperin Ch.J. The Tatar Yoke and Tatar Oppression. Halperin, *Russia and the Mongols*, pp. 168–81.
15. Halperin Ch.J. *The Tatar Yoke: The Image of the Mongols in Medieval Russia*. Bloomington, IN. Slavica Publishers, 2009. 239 p.

16. Halperin Ch.J. Text and Textology: Salmina's Dating of the 'Chronicle Tales' about Dmitry Donskoy. *Slavonic and East European Review* 79, 2001, pp. 248–63.

17. Keenan Ed.L. Ivan III, Nikolai Karamzin, and the Legend of the Casting Off of the Tatar Yoke (1480). Chester Dunning, Russell Martin, and Daniel Rowland, ed., *Rude and Barbarous Kingdom Revisited: Essays in Russian History in Honor of Robert O. Crummey*. Bloomington, IN. Slavica Publishers, Inc., 2008, pp. 237–251.

18. Ostrowskii D. *Muscovy and the Mongols. Cross-cultural influences on the steppe frontier*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Publ., 1998. 329 p.

19. Ostrowski D. Sixteenth-Century Muscovite Cavalrymen. Valerie A. Kivelson and Joan Neuberger, ed., *Picturing Russia. Explorations in Visual Culture*. New Haven. Yale University Press, 2008, pp. 28–32.

About the author: Charles J. Halperin – Research Fellow of the Russian and East European Institute, Indiana University Bloomington (Bloomington, Indiana, USA); chalperi@indiana.edu

ВКЛАД Ю.В. СЕЛЕЗНЕВА В ИЗУЧЕНИЕ УЛУСА ДЖУЧИ

Чарльз Дж. Гальперин
(Индианский университет, США)

Юрий Васильевич Селезнев из Воронежского государственного университета написал пять больших монографий о русско-татарских отношениях и Улусе Джучи (Золотой Орде). В своих монографиях он рассмотрел русско-татарские отношения в 1385–1434 гг.; состав элиты Улуса Джучи; военные конфликты между Русью и Ордой в период XIII–XV вв.; (в соавторстве с Андреем Олеговичем Амелькиным) историю и историческую память о Куликовской битве 1380 г.; роль русских князей в качестве членов элиты Улуса Джучи. Ю.В. Селезнев не только отличается созидательным умением формулировать новые темы исследований, но и плодотворно публикует многочисленные монографии по этим темам.

Недостатком его исследований является изолированность автора от исследований кочевых империй Внутренней Азии, опубликованных на западных языках. Тем не менее, он продолжает вносить существенный вклад в изучение истории средневековой Руси и средневековых татар Золотой Орды.

Ключевые слова: Русь, Улус Джучи, Золотая Орда, Куликовская битва, татарское иго.

Сведения об авторе: Чарльз Дж. Гальперин – внештатный научный сотрудник Института исследований России и Восточной Европы при Индианском университете г. Блумингтона (г. Блумингтон, штат Индиана, США); chalperi@indiana.edu