

Reflection of the Crusading Movement in Rusian Sources: Tantalizing Hints¹

Yulia Mikhailova
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

Keywords

Crusades, Rus', interconfessional relations, miracle narratives, Dietrich von Bern, scribal editing

This paper discusses references to the crusades in Rusian literature and their implications for the question of relations between Rus' and Latin Europe. This question, in turn, is linked with a methodological problem, familiar to all medievalists but especially relevant for Rus' studies: how do we use sources that survive only in later copies? Needless to say, this is true of all the Rusian chronicles for the period before the Mongol invasion of the 1230s: they exist as manuscripts produced in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries or later still; only the part of the *Novgorodian First* chronicle covering the period to 1234 survives in a copy datable to the second half of the thirteenth century. There is, of course, a scholarly consensus that these later copies are based on earlier extinct texts; however, it is unclear how faithfully the extant manuscripts reflect the lost originals. This situation has profound implications for all areas of Rus' studies, and it is of fundamental importance for our subject, Rus' and crusades. A central question is whether the virtual silence of Rusian sources about the crusades reflects the attitude that existed in the twelfth-century.

Before the 1990s, this question was not posed explicitly. Scholars largely ignored the subject of Rusian perceptions of the crusades; the few who did discuss it assumed that the extant sources were a faithful mirror of the twelfth-century reality: the chroniclers ignored the crusading movement because it was of no interest to the Rusian elites.² A notable exception was André Vaillant, who showed a connection between some representations of the Cumans in the chronicles and crusading ideology, which, he argued, was known in Rus'.³ This connection is generally recognized in recent scholarship, although the works discussing the possible influence of the crusading narratives on the Rusian chronicles do not offer definitive criteria for distinguishing between borrowings and topoi.⁴ The *Primary Chronicle* may have displayed crusading overtones in its accounts of the struggle with the steppe, but it does not report actual crusades and does not mention any relations between Rus' and crusaders.

¹ I am grateful to Markus Stock, David Savignac, Talia Zajac, Michael Osmani, Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, John Lind, Adriana Carilli, and to the participants and audience of the session "Global Rus: International Connections in the High and Late Middle Ages" at the 2016 ASEES convention, especially to the organizer Monica White, the discussant Simon Franklin, and to Donald Ostrowski. Needless to say, all errors are mine.

² Zaborov (1974), 85-6.

³ Vaillant (2013), 20

⁴ Chekin (1992), 19; Isoaho (2017).

However, such a relation is present in another source from the early twelfth century, a description of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land by Hegumen Daniel.⁵ It also survived only in later copies; however, they appear to be copies of a single text, with no visible breaks in the narrative nor inconsistencies in style and content that abound in the chronicles. It is thus not less, and arguably more, an authentic source than its near contemporary *Primary Chronicle*. This source suggests strongly that the Rusian elites had contacts with the crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, because Daniel apparently combined his pilgrimage with a diplomatic mission to its king Baldwin I (r. 1100-1118). Thus, Daniel went to Baldwin directly to ask permission to be admitted to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, at a time when it was normally closed to the public; Baldwin instructed the church clergy to grant the request and had his man escort Daniel there. Daniel was among select clerics who accompanied Baldwin to the Church of the Resurrection on the Holy Saturday, and he lit his candle from Baldwin's.⁶ Even though Daniel, being the head of a monastery, was not an ordinary pilgrim, it is highly implausible that every cleric of his rank was treated by the king in this way. In what is the most recent detailed analysis of Daniel's text, A. V. Nazarenko reconstructs Daniel's possible mission to Baldwin and, most importantly, shows that the traffic between Rus' and the Middle East was much more significant than is reported in the extant Rusian sources,⁷ which are virtually silent regarding both Middle East and Latin Europe.

A major exception to this silence is the *Tale of the Capture of Constantinople by the Franks*, an account of the Fourth Crusade, found in the *Novgorodian First* chronicle. An interest in the Fourth Crusade is easily explained by the shock that the 1204 sack of Constantinople undoubtedly caused in Rus'. What is hard to explain, however, is the degree of familiarity with Western Europe that the *Tale* displays. Nothing else in Rusian literature suggests the possibility of a Rusian author describing Venice as "[St.] Mark's island" and Verona ("Bern") as "the city where evil pagan Dedrik lived."⁸

This "Dedrik" can only be Theodoric of Ravenna (493-526) who became "Dietrich" or "Thidrek" in Germanic legends, which mistakenly placed his capital in Verona ("Bern" in German). Knowledge of these legends in Rus' is not otherwise attested, but it may be expected in Novgorod, given its close contacts with Northern Europe where stories about Dietrich were immensely popular. The Scandinavian *Thidrekssaga* that recounts adventures of Thidrek in various lands, including Rus', mentions Novgorod, Polotsk, and "King Valdimar," thus attesting to the connections between Rus' and the milieu that produced the saga. This milieu may have been one channel through which "Dedrik" reached Rus'.⁹

However, if the presence of "Dedrik" in a Rusian text may be explained by information that the author picked up while socializing with Germans or Scandinavians, the epithets "evil" and "pagan" are puzzling. Epic poems portrayed Dietrich/Thidrek as a valiant hero, in contrast to

⁵ *Khozhdenie igumena Daniila*.

⁶ *Khozhdenie igumena Daniila*, 108, 112.

⁷ Nazarenko (2001), 629-48.

⁸ NIL, 49. For an English translation, see Savignac (2017).

⁹ Gibbs and Johnson (2000), 391-99; Kleinenberg (1974), 129-131. For the latest research on Theodoric and the literary transformations of his image, see Wiemer (2018).

clerical writings, where Theodoric was a heretic and a tyrant. The historical Theodoric was, indeed, an Arian; he imprisoned, and possibly caused the death of, Pope John I (d. 526), and he famously executed the philosopher Boethius (c. 477-524) and his father-in-law Symmachus (d. 526). According to Gregory the Great (pope 590-604), Theodoric was thrown into Etna as God's punishment; in a twelfth-century Latin chronicle, he rides to hell on an infernal horse while still alive. However, most vernacular sources do not include these motifs, and the few that do mention Theodoric's terrifying end do not connect it with his Arianism and persecution of Catholics. Thus, in the *Thidrekssaga*, Thidrek, while being carried away by an infernal horse, invokes God and Saint Mary who eventually helped him, as was “revealed in dreams” to some Germans.¹⁰

The most negative vernacular representation of Dietrich is found in the twelfth-century *Kaiserchronik* whose author claims that his work is based on what he learned from books. Indeed, the Dietrich of the *Kaiserchronik* is the closest to the historical Theodoric known from the Latin sources. Unlike other vernacular texts, the *Kaiserchronik* has Dietrich/Theodoric cause the death of Pope John, Boethius, and Symmachus. However, instead of an Arian heretic persecuting Catholics, he is a bastard son seized by diabolical rage every time someone mentions his birth. In the *Kaiserchronik*, Theodoric's victims incur his wrath when they question his right to rule because of his illegitimacy.¹¹

Ernst Hellgardt argues that the *Kaiserchronik* substituted illegitimacy for heresy, because, with all his glorification of book-learning, the author still depended on the oral tradition representing Dietrich as an epic hero. The motif of a heretical ruler persecuting Catholic Christians was so alien to this tradition that, writing as he was in vernacular verse, the author of the *Kaiserchronik* had to provide an alternative explanation for his character's evil deeds.¹²

I. E. Kleinenberg suggested that Dietrich was perceived in Rus' as “evil” because, in the *Thidrekssaga*, he fights against King Valdimar and devastates “Rusiland.” It is, of course, quite likely that to the Russian audience these actions (presented in the saga as just and heroic) appeared evil; however, Kleinenberg's argument that Dedrik was “pagan” because this is how all the enemies of Rus' were viewed is tenuous, because it is based on the early modern epic songs (*byliny*).¹³ Contemporary reports of hostilities with the Catholic neighbors of Rus' never call them “pagans,” not even while depicting Catholic Hungarians as desecrating Orthodox churches.¹⁴

To sum up, the image of Dietrich that a Russian author could form on the basis of the oral tradition would be that of a glorious epic hero. The knowledge of his “evil” side could result from a more thorough familiarity with the vernacular literature or from perceiving his exploits in “Rusiland” as evil. However, labeling a pious Christian of the *Thidrekssaga* “pagan” because of his campaigns in Rus' would be anachronistic. The notion of “pagan” Dietrich existed in Latin historiography and was so much at odds with the vernacular tradition that even the learned author

¹⁰ Marold (1985), 443-48; *Saga of Thidrek*, 269.

¹¹ Hellgardt (1995), 101-4.

¹² Hellgardt (1995), 108.

¹³ Kleinenberg (1974), 133.

¹⁴ PSPL 2, 663, 665.

of the *Kaiserchronik* chose not to follow his Latin sources when it came to Theodoric's Arianism. The source of the remark about “pagan Dedrik” thus remains a mystery, all the more intriguing because Dedrik's “paganism” is assumed to be common knowledge: the text describes Bern as the city “where evil pagan Dedrik had lived,” thus using “Dedrik” as a known to explain an unknown.

That the author and his audience were well-versed in Western European affairs is further confirmed by the correct use of the terms “marquess,” “count of Flanders (*kondof oflandr*),” and “doge.” The latter, in accordance with historical truth, is presented as the mastermind of the attack on Constantinople and the provider of the crusaders' ships.¹⁵

The level of immersion in the world of medieval Europe displayed in the *Tale* makes this text unique among Russian literary sources. However, it looks nothing like a writing by an exceptionally well-educated maverick disconnected from the general literate public. Its intended audience appears to be the same as the readers of the *Novgorodian First* chronicle, of which *Tale* is a part and which otherwise consists mostly of laconic, unadorned reports of local events. Works of some other Russian authors demonstrate greater literary sophistication, but none of them indicate a comparable familiarity with Latin Europe. Had it not survived in an authentic thirteenth-century manuscript, the *Tale* would surely be dismissed as a forgery. Since its authenticity is beyond doubt, we are left with an unexplained drastic difference in the degree of engagement with the Latin West that sets the *Tale* apart from the rest of Russian literature.

An explanation for this difference beyond speculation is hardly possible. An analysis of a body of texts may explain what is found there, but not what is absent, especially when the texts in question are copies of copies. It is impossible to know whether the originals ignored Western Europe as completely as the extant copies do, or whether references to the West were at some point edited out. An important discovery by John Lind hints at the latter possibility. Lind examined an East Slavonic prayer that includes names of Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon martyrs. In a manuscript from the second half of the thirteenth century, Magnus, Canut, and Alban, found in other copies of the prayer, are replaced with Manuel, Sabel, and Ismael, three martyrs widely venerated in the Orthodox Church. Lind found that these three names of “traditional” Orthodox saints are written in a different handwriting above a scraped-off text, some traces of which are still visible. Lind's analysis of the traces shows that the three names of the Western saints known from other copies of the prayer had been originally present there as well.¹⁶ Thus, this manuscript provides hard evidence for a deliberate alteration of a Russian text aimed at a partial elimination of its Western elements.

Of course, this case only shows that scribes who produced extant copies of pre-Mongol texts *could* remove references to Latin Europe, not that they always *did*. However, used in conjunction with circumstantial evidence for the integration of Rus' into medieval Europe,¹⁷ Lind's finding strengthens the argument that the chronicles, as they exist now, are not a reliable source for Rus'-West relations. This paper seeks to add to the body of circumstantial evidence for strong

¹⁵ NIL, 49.

¹⁶ Lind (1991), 188-92.

¹⁷ Nazarenko (2001); Raffensperger (2012).

cultural ties between Rus' and the West, leaving aside the question of why these ties are not fully reflected in extant sources.

The First Crusade is not so much as mentioned in any extant Rusian text; nonetheless, the description of the 1111 anti-Cuman campaign in the *Hypatian Codex* suggests familiarity with accounts of the crusade that circulated in Latin Europe, more specifically with a miracle tradition, the earliest evidence for which is found in the *Gesta Frankorum* (ca. 1100). In the *Gesta*, Christ appeared in a dream to a certain priest and promised to send mighty help; during the battle of Antioch, the enemies were put to flight by men on white horses holding white banners, who appeared out of nowhere and who were led by commanders looking like Saints George, Mercurius, and Demetrius.¹⁸ Some authors authenticate this miracle by claiming that the Turks also saw the mysterious figures on white horses.¹⁹

Historia Iherosolimitana (1110s or early 1120s) offers the most elaborate version of such authentication. It reports a conversation between the crusaders' leader Bohemond and a prominent Turk Pirrus. Pirrus told Bohemond about unusual knights, wearing white armor, shields and banners, who ravaged the Turks during the siege of Antioch, and Bohemond realized that they were saints invisible to the crusaders. Raymond of Aguilers, writing between 1099 and 1105, reports that at the battle of Dorylaem the Turks saw "two wondrous knights with shining weapons" who preceded the crusading troops and were invulnerable to Turkish lances. The crusaders did not see them, but after the battle, marching along the road where no fighting took place, they found dead enemies, presumably struck down by the invisible knights.²⁰ Similarly, the *Hypatian* entry for 1111 reports that "many" Rusian soldiers saw the Cumans' heads being cut off by some invisible force. After the battle, the prisoners related that "some terrifying beings rode above you with shining weapons and helped you." The chronicler explains that these were angels helping the Rusian troops invisibly.²¹

Of course, it was typical of medieval authors to attribute victory to divine assistance, but before the twelfth century they rarely reported the actual appearance of supernatural beings on the battlefield; when they did, it was usually saints and the Theotokos, not angels.²² An important exception is a miracle of St. Demetrius who saved Thessaloniki besieged by enemies. After the battle that lifted the siege, the captives described an army, invisible to the citizens, that, under the command of a beautiful youth on a white horse holding a cross, exited the city gates and put the besiegers to flight. In fact, the crusading tradition of supernatural intervention in battle is itself indebted to the *Miracles of St. Demetrius* known in the West in a Latin translation.²³

Nonetheless, it appears more likely that the *Hypatian* entry for 1111 is modeled on the crusading tradition and not directly on the Byzantine *Miracles of St. Demetrius*. Indeed, the

¹⁸ *Gesta Francorum*, 69.

¹⁹ Lapina (2015), 27, 39.

²⁰ *Le "Liber,"* 45.

²¹ PSRL 2, 267-8.

²² Lapina (2015), 52.

²³ Anastasius Bibliothecarius; Lapina (2015), 54-74.

Hypatian narrative differs from the Byzantine prototype so much that Dimitri Obolensky did not include it among the Russian texts related to the cult of St. Demetrius.²⁴ The most obvious departure from the Thessaloniki miracle is the absence of either St. Demetrius or other “military saints,” such as Boris and Gleb, who took over some aspects of Demetrius's role in Rus’.²⁵ Another difference is in the way the miracle is “proved”: the citizens of Thessaloniki did not see anything supernatural themselves; it was only the enemies who saw Demetrius and his angelic army, and they mistook them for human soldiers. In the *Hypatian*, however, “many” Russian soldiers see heads severed by an invisible force, just as crusaders see the enemies killed by an invisible force in Raymond's account. Finally, when St. Demetrius came to defend Thessaloniki, he was riding a white horse, in accordance with a long-standing tradition that described supernatural helpers as wearing white clothes, carrying white banners, or, indeed, riding white horses.²⁶ Angels fighting the Cumans had none of these; instead, they had shining weapons, a very unusual detail that the *Hypatian* entry for 1111 shares with Raymond's report of the miraculous knights.

Another parallel is the theoretical discussion of the miraculous appearance. According to the *Hypatian*, angels appearing to humans show themselves “either as a fire, or as a pillar, or else as some other image,” because “it is impossible for humans to see angelic nature (*estestva angelskogo viditi*).”²⁷ This corresponds almost verbatim to the words of Bohemond's chaplain in *Historia*: angels “assume the bodies of air so that they can appear to us, because they cannot be seen in their spiritual essence (*in spirituali essentia sua*).”²⁸

Given the chronological proximity of all these texts, the most plausible suggestion is that the chronicler heard crusading miracle stories and used them to convey a message that, by fighting the Cumans, Rus’ participated in the same struggle between Christians and infidels that was conducted by the crusaders. The message was reinforced by the claim that the news of the victory over the Cumans reached “even Rome.”²⁹

Thus, the *Hypatian* entry for 1111 suggests that Russian *literati* knew about the First Crusade and viewed it sympathetically, even though it is not mentioned in the chronicles directly. After all, neither is the Second Crusade, not even its “Northern” part in which a Russian contingent was involved.

The Second Crusade consisted of a three-pronged campaign: in the Holy Land, the Iberian Peninsula, and Northern Europe. The latter was fought mostly by Saxon nobles who persuaded Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) to obtain papal approval for the extension of crusading status to a campaign against the pagan peoples beyond the Elbe. The Saxons were supported by the Poles whose Grand Duke Boleslaw IV (r. 1146-1173) fought the Prussians, called *saladinistas* by a Polish chronicler eager to connect them with the Middle Eastern Muslims as the common enemies

²⁴ Obolensky (1974).

²⁵ White (2013), 213.

²⁶ Lapina (2015), 42-5, 53.

²⁷ PSRL 2, 261.

²⁸ *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 51-2.

²⁹ PSRL 2, 273.

of the Christians. Boleslaw's anti-Prussian campaign is described by medieval authors as part of the "Northern Crusade," which, in turn, was part of the Second Crusade.³⁰ In this campaign, Boleslaw was helped by a "strong" (*cum maximis armatorum*) Rusian contingent.³¹ Thus, at least one aspect of the Second Crusade was not only known in Rus', but actively supported – and yet extant Rusian sources are silent about it.

The Rusian involvement in the 1147 Northern Crusade may shed light on the claims of the *Kievan Chronicle* that Barbarossa was commanded to go on the Third Crusade by God's angel and that the bodies of the fallen German crusaders were "invisibly taken from the graves by the Lord's angel after three days."³² To my knowledge, this information is not found in other descriptions of the Third Crusade. The closest parallel appears to be the *Rolandslied*, the German adaptation of the *Chanson de Roland*. Among its most important departures from the original is the timing of the earthquakes that signify the death of Roland. In the original version, they occur before the death and thus serve as portents forecasting a misfortune; however, in the *Rolandslied*, the earth trembles at the moment of the death, implying a comparison of Roland to Christ,³³ the same idea that is present in the account of crusaders' bodies being taken from their graves after three days. Moreover, in the *Rolandslied*, Charlemagne is commanded to go to Spain by an angel.³⁴

According to J.W. Thomas, "no other medieval work portrays so vividly the religious zeal, indeed one might call the religious fanaticism that prevailed in many quarters after the Second Crusade."³⁵ These "quarters" included the crusaders who fought in Northern Europe: the *Rolandslied* was commissioned by Henry the Lion of Saxony (r. 1142-1180), one of the main initiators of the 1147 expedition across the Elbe.³⁶ Thus, there was a connection between Rus' and the milieu that produced the *Rolandslied*, which may thus have been known in Rus'. A possible influence of the *Rolandslied* is, of course, a highly conjectural explanation for the miracles reported in the *Kievan* account of the Third Crusade; however, other features of this account are even harder to explain.

Thus, the report of a solar eclipse signifying the fall of Jerusalem to the Saracens that precipitated the Third Crusade is accompanied by the comment: "Such portents occur not throughout the Earth, but only in the land which the Lord wants to afflict with some kind of disaster. For there were reports about darkness in Galich at that time, so that even the stars were seen in the middle of the day ... However, nobody saw this in the Kievan land."³⁷ This sounds as if Galich was directly affected by the fall of Jerusalem in the way that Kiev was not, which may be a reference to special relations between the prince of Galich Vladimir Iaroslavich (1151-1199) and Frederick Barbarossa (1122 -1190). As is well known, Vladimir paid an annual sum to

³⁰ Dragnea (2016), 59; Güttner-Sporzyński (2008), 18-19; Banach (2015); Lind (2003), 209-10

³¹ *Annales Magdeburgenses*, 189.

³² PSRL 2, 667-8.

³³ Farrier (1991), 64-5.

³⁴ *Priest Konrad's Song of Roland*, 17.

³⁵ Thomas (1994), 5.

³⁶ Stuckey (2008), 145.

³⁷ PSRL 2, 655.

Barbarossa, after the latter helped the exiled Vladimir restore the Galich throne.³⁸ However, the remark about the significance of the eclipse implies an involvement of Galich into Barbarossa's crusading enterprise, or some other connection with the crusading movement and the Latin East, of which no information exists, unless one counts a phrase from the *Igor' Tale* about Vladimir's father Iaroslav of Galich "shooting *saltani* in faraway lands" from his throne, where *saltani* may stand for "Sultans."³⁹

Another surprising feature is the view of the German crusaders as fellow Christians. Such a view of the Catholics is typical of the *Kievan Chronicle*, and its description of the fall of Jerusalem as God's punishment "of us" has been discussed by scholars as evidence that a sharp confessional divide did not yet exist.⁴⁰ However, the German crusaders presented a special case. The Byzantine emperor Isaac II Angelos (r. 1185 -1195, 1203-1204) opposed the Third Crusade from the start and eventually entered into an alliance with Saladin; in the Balkans, German troops were repeatedly attacked by the local population.⁴¹ The German history of Barbarossa's crusade is full of hostility against the Greeks and *Grekuli*, as the author contemptuously calls Orthodox Christians of the Balkans.⁴² And yet the *Kievan* chronicler praises Barbarossa and his men as pious Christians. For that matter, so does the famous Byzantine historian Niketas Choniates, who, unlike the *Kievan* chronicler, does not call the German crusaders "martyrs" and does not mention any angels, but still gives a highly positive characteristic of Barbarossa while criticizing Isaac II's policies towards the Third Crusade.⁴³ Such representations of the Western Christians by Russian and Byzantine authors suggest that the matter of the Orthodox versus Catholic identity may be somewhat fluid in the late twelfth century.

This fluidity is still present in the Russian account of the Fourth Crusade, which blames its disastrous outcome primarily on Alexius Angelos; a secondary role is assigned to the greed and disobedience of the crusaders who were explicitly ordered by the Pope and the German emperor "not to do any harm to the Greek Land."⁴⁴ The author does not mention the religious denomination of the Franks even while describing their plundering of the churches. The only evidence of a religious hostility is found in the remark about "Dedrik," to which we now return.

It is found in the passage describing the crusaders' commander Boniface of Montferrat as the "marquess from (*ot*) Rome in the city of Bern where pagan evil Dedrik had lived."⁴⁵ In addition to being factually inaccurate (neither Rome nor Verona belonged to Boniface's domain), this phrase has an unclear syntactic structure and meaning. Boniface cannot be *ot* Rome in the same sense that doge is *ot* Venice unless the author believes that he is Marquess of Rome, in which case he cannot be "in" Bern. Furthermore, this is the only place in the *Tale* that mentions a distant

³⁸ PSRL 2, 666.

³⁹ *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, 262.

⁴⁰ PSRL 2, 656; Nazarenko (2001), 637; Isoaho (2017), 57-8.

⁴¹ Housley (2008), 96.

⁴² *Historia de Expeditione*, 28.

⁴³ *Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 228-229 [416-417]; see also Stouraitis (2011), 39.

⁴⁴ N1L, 46.

⁴⁵ N1L, 49.

historical/epic figure. The author could have placed Boniface in “Bern” simply by mistake, but a reference to “Dedrik” must be there for a purpose. Evidently, the author wants to emphasize that the crusading leader originates from the same place as “pagan evil Dedrik.”

In this context, “Rome” may be a metonymy for the West in general: Boniface is “from Rome” in the same sense as the Swedes are “Romans,” that is Catholics, in the *Life of Alexander Nevsky*.⁴⁶ In other words, the reference to Dedrik may hint at something like an early precursor to the “Third Rome” theory: “pagans” take over Rome and establish a new capital in “Bern”; their descendants proceed to take over Constantinople. Such an interpretation may go too far, but the *Tale* undoubtedly establishes a connection between Rome, “Bern,” “pagan Dedrik,” and the leadership of the Fourth Crusade. This passage may be viewed as a kernel with a potential to grow into a full-fledged negative view of Western Christianity. In the earlier part of the thirteenth century, this was only a potential. In fact, as late as 1236, a contingent from Pskov, a city in the Novgorod Land, participated in the crusade against the pagan Lithuanians led by the Catholic military order of the Livonian Sword Brothers.⁴⁷ Collaboration between Novgorod and the Baltic crusaders ended only in the next decade, when the 1240 Swedish invasion of the Novgorod Land inaugurated the period of military confrontation that eventually eclipsed the memories of the earlier amity. However, before the fateful events of the 1240s, which were triggered by the Mongol conquest,⁴⁸ amity was still prevalent. In the same Novgorodian account of the Fourth Crusade that connects its leaders with the homeland of Dedrik, we see an emphatic exculpation of the Pope and the German emperor from the responsibility for the sack of Constantinople, showing a lack of general hostility against the West.

Such hostility became predominant later, at the time when the existing copies of most Russian sources were produced. It is possible that anti-Western sentiments of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century *literati* affected their editing process. In any case, bits and pieces of information found in the extant sources suggest that Russian literature, as we know it, does not fully reflect the views of the crusades that existed in pre-Mongol Rus’.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Anastasius Bibliothecarius: Anastasius Bibliothecarius. “Passio sancti Demetrii martyris.” PL 129, 715-26.

Annales Magdeburgenses: *Annales Magdeburgenses*. MGH SS 16, 106-196.

Annals of Niketas Choniates: *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates* (Byzantine

⁴⁶ *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, 360, 362.

⁴⁷ NIL, 74; Lind (2003), 213-215.

⁴⁸ Lind (2003), 216-217.

Texts in Translation), translated by Harry J. Magoulias. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984.

Gesta Francorum: *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum: The Deeds of the Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, edited by Rosalind Hill. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

Historia Iherosolimitana: The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk, edited by D. Kempf and M. Bull. Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2014.

Historia de expeditione: *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*. MGH SS rer. Germ, nova series 5.

Khozhdenie igumena Daniila: Хождение игумена Даниила. BLDR 4, 29-117.

<http://lib.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4934>

Le "Liber": *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers*. DRHC 9.

N11.

Priest Konrad's Song of Roland, translated by J.W. Thomas. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1994.

PSRL 1.

PSRL 2.

Saga of Thidrek: *The Saga of Thidrek of Bern*, translated by Edward R. Haymes. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988.

Slovo o polku Igoreve: Слово о полку Игореве. BLDR 4, 254-267.

<http://lib.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4941>

Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo: Житие Александра Невского. BLDR 5, 66-73.

<http://lib.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4962>

Secondary Sources

Banach 2015: Banach, Stanislaw. "Saxons, Slavs, and Conversion. Toward a New Understanding of Crusade." *Clio's Scroll* 17 (2015): 27-36.

- Chekin 1992: Chekin, Leonid. "The Godless Ishmaelites: The Image of the Steppe in Eleventh-Thirteenth Century Rus'," *Russian History* 19 (1992): 9-28.
- Dragnea 2016: Dragnea, Mihai, "Divine Vengeance and Human Justice in The Wendish Crusade of 1147." *Collegium mediaevale* 29 (2016): 50-82.
- Farrier 1991: Farrier, Susan. "Das Rolandslied and the Song of Roulond as Moralizing Adaptations of the *Chanson de Roland*," *Olifant* 16 (1991): 61-76.
- Gibbs and Johnson, 2000: Gibbs, Marion, and Sidney M. Johnson. *Medieval German Literature: A Companion*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Güttner-Sporzyński 2008: Güttner-Sporzyński, Darius von. "Recent Issues in Polish Historiography of the Crusades." In *The Military Orders: On Land and by Sea*, edited by Judi Upton-Ward, 13-21. Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
- Hellgardt 1995: Hellgardt, Ernst. "Dietrich von Bern in der deutschen 'Kaiserchronik'. Zur Begegnung mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition. In *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050-1200. Festschrift für Ursula Hennig zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Annegret Fiebig und Hans-Jochen Schiewer, . Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- Housley 2008: Housley, Norman. *Fighting for the Cross: Crusading to the Holy Land*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Isoaho 2017: Isoaho, Mari. "Battle for Jerusalem in Kievan Rus': Igor's Campaign (1185) and the Battle for Hattin (1187)." *Palaeoslavica* 25 (2017): 38-62.
- Kleinenberg 1974: Клейненберг И. Е. "Дедрик Бернский" в Новгородской I Летописи // Летописи и хроники. 1973, под ред. В. А. Кучкина. С. 129-136. Москва, 1974.
- Lapina 2015: Lapina, Elizabeth. *Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2015.
- Lind 1991: Lind, John. "Pochitanie skandinavskikh sviatykh na Rusi i datsko-russkie otnosheniia XII veka." *Istoriia SSSR* 6 (1991): 188-198.
- Lind, 2003: Lind, John. "Russian Echoes of the Crusading Movement 1147-1478 – Impulses and Responses." *Middelalderforum* 3 (2003): 209-235.
- Marold 1985: Marold, Edith. "Dietrich als Sinnbild der *Superbia*." In *Arbeiten zur Skandinavistik 6. Arbeitstagung der Skandinavisten des Deutschen Sprachgebiets*, edited by H.

Beck, 443-486. Frankfurt: Lang, 1985.

Nazarenko 2001: Назаренко А. В. Древняя Русь на международных путях: Междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX-XII веков. Москва, 2001.

Obolensky 1974: Obolensky, Dimitri. "The Cult of St. Demetrius of Thessaloniki in the History of Byzantine-Slav Relations," *Balkan Studies* 15 (1974): 3-20.

Raffensperger 2012: Raffensperger, Christian. *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus in the Medieval World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Savignac 2017: Savignac, David. "The Medieval Russian Account of the Fourth Crusade - A New Annotated Translation" at <https://independentscholar.academia.edu/DavidSavignac>

Stouraitis 2011: Stouraitis, Ioannis. "Jihād and Crusade: Byzantine Positions towards the Notions of 'Holy War'," *Byzantina Symmeikta* 21 (2011): 11-63.

Stuckey 2008: Stuckey, Jace. "Charlemagne as Crusader? Memory, Propaganda, and the Many Uses of Charlemagne's Legendary Expedition to Spain." In *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, edited by Matthew Gabriel and Jace Stuckey, 18-38. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Thomas 1994 Introduction to *Priest Konrad's Song of Roland*, translated by J.W. Thomas. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1994.

Vaillant 1957: Vaillant, André. "Les citations des années 1110-1111 dans la chronique de Kiev," *Byzantinoslavica* 18 (1957): 18-38.

White, Monica. *Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus, 900-1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Wiemer 2018: Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich. *Theoderich der Große: König der Goten, Herrscher der Römer*. Munich: C.H.Beck, 2018.

Zaborov 1974: Заборов М. А. Известия русских современников о крестовых походах // Византийский временник 31 (1974): 84-109.

