Abstract
The Life of Alexander Nevskii is written in two styles: a hagiographic style and a secular style. Scholarly views are divided over whether the Life was written by one person in two different styles or by two persons, either a hagiographic writer and secular editor or a secular writer and hagiographic editor. The present article hypothesizes that the Life was probably written initially in a secular style as a military tale (the “wolf”) in the second half of the thirteenth century. This Tale was the foundational layer for the subsequent writing of the Life. Some time later, probably in the second half of the fourteenth century (before 1377), an ecclesiastical redactor edited the text adding phrases in a hagiographic style (the “sheep’s clothing”), thus creating a chronicle tale about the life of Alexander Nevskii. In the second half of the fifteenth century, a further editing took place as anti-Tatar interpolations were added, thus creating the First Redaction of the Life of Alexander Nevskii. Following a text critical analysis, this article reconstructs the First Redaction of the Life, in which the two styles are delineated. Then the article provides a translation into English of the hypothetical version of the non-extant military tale about Alexander Nevskii.
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A number of investigators have pointed out that the Life of Alexander Nevskii juxtaposes hagiographic and secular elements. They have, however, interpreted that combination in different ways in regard to the authorship question and to how the Life was composed.
In the following article, I present my own hypothesis that the composition represented a three-step process. My goal is to shed light on the origins of this singular literary composition. It seems to me that a complete secular military tale was written in the second half of the thirteenth century as a celebratory exposition of Alexander’s military achievements and glory (the “wolf” of the title of this article). Then, some time later, perhaps in the second half of the fourteenth century (before 1377) an attempt was made to transform that secular military tale into a saint’s tale (ПОВѢСТЬ О ЗЯМТІЯ) by adding pious sentiments and religious topoi (the “sheep’s clothing”). Only in the second half of the fifteenth century was the final form of the text we know as the First Redaction of the Life completed with the addition of anti-Tatar interpolations.

In 1915, Nikolai Serebrianskii proposed that the Life was written by “a younger contemporary of the prince, a monk of the Rozhdestvenskii monastery” and that it “was written not for placement in a chronicle but for church use.” Thus, he sees the hagiographic elements as preceding many of the secular elements added later, such as the sections pertaining to the six brave men at the battle on the Neva and the khan of the Eastern Country.\(^1\) In 1968, Norman Ingham described in some detail the relationship of the styles; namely, that, although the framing of the text is hagiographic, the middle parts “are distinctly secular in substance and style.” The military events are told as they would be in a military tale but with a “few pious” sentiments subjoined. Like Serebrianskii, Ingham deemed it probable that the author was a monk. In contradistinction to Serebrianskii, Ingham thought this same monk adopted a standard style for describing military matters and did not need to borrow from a secular work or have it added by someone else. Thus, the author, according to Ingham, wrote the Life in two distinct styles.\(^2\)

In 1974, John Fennell also detected two styles in the Life: “the hagiographical passages are distinct from the annalistic episodes, but sometimes religious sentiments are tack on to purely military clichés.”\(^3\) The first example he cited of this adding on of “religious sentiments” is the description of

\(^1\) Nikolai Serebrianskii, Древнерусские княжеские жития. Обзор редакций и тексты (Moscow: Синodal’ная типография, 1915), 178–180.


Alexander’s “returning victorious (vozvratisya s pobedyu)” after the battle on the Neva—the author of the Life tacks on the phrase “praising and glorifying the name of his Creator.” The second example Fennell cited is Alexander’s treatment of the enemy after he razed the fortress that the Livonian knights had built “on Alexander’s land”: “some he killed, others he took with him, and others he pardoned and let go.” The author of the Life adds, “for he was merciful beyond measure.” Also, like Ingham, Fennell thought this was the work of only one individual, “a cleric” who could write in both the style of hagiography and in the style of the chronicle military tale. Yet, Fennell implies this may have been a two-step process with the adding-on of pious sentiments to a secular text occurring within an overall hagiographic framework. Fennell pointed to the entry in the Povest’ vremennykh let (PVL) for 1019 and the “Paroemia” of Boris and Gleb, both of which texts describe the Al’ta battle of 1019, as a possible model for the secular parts of the Life.

Also in 1974, Serge A. Zenkovsky, like Serebrianskii but in contrast to Ingham and Fennell, attributed the two styles to different individuals. Yet he reversed Serebrianskii’s order of stylistic composition; namely, a secular author, who was a “feudal warrior,” and a later redactor, who was “some ecclesiastic from the city of Vladimir.” For his determination that a military tale written by a warrior is at the core of the Life, Zenkovsky cited three pieces of evidence: (1) the title, “Tale of the Life and Courage of Prince Alexander,” is uncommon for a saint’s life; (2) the author’s reflection on the demise of Alexander—“A man may leave the house of his father but he cannot leave the house of his good lord; and if he has to, he should share the coffin with him”—is befitting of someone who owed secular allegiance to Alexander; and (3) the description by the author of the particulars of the deeds of those in Alexander’s army shows that whoever wrote the Tale “[p]robably… knew many of the prince’s warriors….” The redactor, in Zenkovsky’s view, inserted quotations from and allusions to the Bible while altering the
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5. Begunov, Pamiatnik, 169.
“narrative and stylistic unity” and rearranging things in an unsystematic manner.  

In 1979, A. D. Stokes, after discussing the arguments for and against their being genre of military tales in early Rus’, proposed that the Life of Alexander Nevskii had been originally written as a military tale that is no longer extant. According to Stokes, military tales may not have conveyed “a religious message.” Once, however, the land of Rus’ fully adopted Orthodoxy, “the defenders of Rus’ became also defenders of the faith, their martial exploits could acquire a religious significance.” He hypothesized that military tales “that praised the exploits of long-dead heroes in long forgotten struggles would hardly have been of interest to later copyists” so they modified them for “contemporary purposes.” As a result, in his view, no pure military tale is extant, but they exist in “adapted ‘adulterated’” form in which “it is difficult now to discern the true nature of the genre behind layers of later accretions.”

In the present article, I take further Stokes’ proposal that the Life of Alexander Nevskii developed from a military tale by attempting to reconstruct that no-longer-extant version of the tale. In contrast to the example of the Tale of the Destruction of Riazan, which Likhachev, Fennell, and Stokes saw developing from a bare chronicle account to military tale to a religious tale, I propose that the military tale was used as the basis for the chronicle tale about the saintliness of the life of Alexander Nevskii. The chronicle tale was later modified into the First Redaction of the Life. In addition, I incorporate Zenkovsky’s suggestion that a secular author and a subsequent ecclesiastical redactor were responsible for the composition of the work we know as the Life of Alexander Nevskii. In doing so, I am not denying the possibility that one
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writer—whether secular or ecclesiastic—could write in both secular and hagiographic styles. I am saying, however, that, in this particular case, the circumstance that the secular passages together form a coherent unity (see below), the positioning and wording of the pious sentiments in an awkward manner in relation to the secular passages, and certain structural peculiarities of the Life tend to corroborate Zenkovsky’s hypothesis of a secular author and ecclesiastical redactor. I have argued elsewhere that the author wrote a secular tale sometime between 1263 (the year of death of Alexander) and the 1290s when the author would have been in his 50s (if one supposes he had been a young man in his 20s in the 1260s). I based this age estimate on the opening lines of the Tale concerning how he had been an eyewitness, while growing up, to some of the events he describes and that he obtained other information about Alexander from “my fathers” (“отъ отца своих”).

The author also claims that he heard about the details of the Battle on the Neva “from my Lord the Grand Prince Alexander and from others who at that time took part in that battle.”

Fennell cited of two pious motif interpolations, but one can ask how many more of the pious expressions were added during the process of redacting the Tale into the Life. My resulting hypothetical reconstructions (see appendices A and B) are an experiment in progress. I wanted to see how much of the religious wording and other interpolations of the Life it was possible to eliminate and still have a text that made sense. Somewhat surprisingly, I found that all the religious components could be dispensed with and a coherent narrative remain. Whether the original military tale about Alexander Nevskii had no, a few, or many religious components I cannot say. Some scholars may consider this exercise to be pointless, for they may, as Ingham and Fennell did, see only one author of the Life, which was written then as a complete work at one time (although Fennell does seem to imply a kind of two-step process could have been involved). Other scholars may agree that two individuals—an author of the core military tale and a redactor who added hagiographic phrases—are involved but are unwilling to accept that the military tale was written without any expression of pious sentiments. They are welcome to add back religious components as they see fit, but I hope that, when doing so, they will provide reasons for what they are restoring.

The First Redaction of the *Life* is extant in full or in part in 13 MS copies (one of which dates to 1377, two of which date to the second half of the fifteenth century, seven to the sixteenth century, and three to the seventeenth century). The MSS that contain the First Redaction of the *Life* are listed here in alphabetical order according to the sigla that Begunov assigned them:12

- A = RGB, sobranie Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii, fond 173, No 208 [ca. 1550];
- Ap = GAAO, sobranie rukopisnykh knig, No 18 [1550–1575];
- E = GIM, sobranie E. V. Barsova, No 1413 [ca. 1600];
- B = RGB, sobranie Iosifo-Volokolamskogo monastyria, fond 113, No 523 [1550–1575];
- J = IRLI, R. IV, op. 24, No 26 [ca. 1550];
- Jb = RB, sobranie M. P. Pogodina, No 641 [1550–1575];
- M = GIM, Muzeiskoe sobranie, No 1706 [1550–1575];
- O = RGB, sobranie A. N. Ovchinnikova, fond 209, No 281 [ca. 1650];
- II = GAPO, sobranie Pskovo-Pecherskogo monastyria, fond 449, No 60 [1450–1475] (beginning and end only);
- Th = RB, sobranie Olonetskoi seminarii, fond 212, No 15 [1625–1650];
- Ye = GIM, Sinodal’noe sobranie, No 154, fols. 156–162v [end of 15th century].14
- P = RGB, sobranie Olonetskoi seminarii, fond 212, No 15 [1625–1650];
- Y = GIM, sobranie A. S. Uvarova, No 279 [1650–1675].

Five versions of the First Redaction of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* have been published.15 In 1882, Archimandrite Leonid (L. A. Kavelin) published the *Life* from the MS. Moscow Ecclesiastical Academy (MDA), no. 208
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In 1913, Vilho Mansikka also published the Life from A. Neither Leonid nor Mansikka provided a critical apparatus of readings from other copies. In 1915, Serebrianskii published \( \Pi \) and \( P \) in parallel columns with variants from \( A \).

Also in 1915, S. A. Bugoslavskii, in a review of Mansikka’s book provided the first publication of the Life with a critical apparatus of readings from multiple copies. Bugoslavskii used Mansikka’s diplomatic edition of \( A \) as his copy text and provided variants from seven copies: \( \mathcal{A} \), \( \mathcal{I} \), \( \mathcal{C} \), and \( \Pi \) from already published versions; \( \Pi \) from the MS; and \( B \), \( P \), and \( \mathcal{Y} \) from readings for those copies that Mansikka gave in his monograph. Bugoslavskii noted that, because Mansikka did not provide all the readings from \( B \), \( P \), and \( \mathcal{Y} \), his readings from those MSS “are not able to be fully exact.”

Instead of altering the copy text, Bugoslavskii separately proposed three pages of improvements to it. In suggesting these improvements, Bugoslavskii depended mainly on agreements of \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \Pi \) where \( \mathcal{A} \) is extant, and on agreements of \( \Pi \) and \( \Pi \) where \( \mathcal{A} \) is not extant. Begunov was dismissive of Bugoslavskii’s publication: “The attempt of S. A. Bugoslavskii at publishing the ‘original’ redaction of the Life according to the Academy copy (MS. GBL, MDA, \( \Pi \) 208, XVI c.) with introduced variants from other copies is hardly able to be considered successful.” Furthermore: “The publication of S. A. Bugoslavskii was not exact: the variants are provided from the cited text in Mansikka’s monograph and not from the manuscripts.” This criticism is a little harsh since Bugoslavskii acknowledged that the readings for three of the copies he used were incomplete and based on whatever he could glean from Mansikka’s comparisons, but the readings for the other four were complete, being based on three published versions and one de visu examination of the MS. For 50 years, until Begunov’s editions superseded it in 1965.

---


17 Vilho Mansikka, “Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo (Razbor redaktssi i teksty),” *Pamiatniki drevnej pis’mennosti*, 180 (St. Petersburg, 1913).

18 Serebrianskii, *Drevne-russkie kniazheskie zhitiia*, Teksty, 109–120.


22 Begunov, “K voprosu,” 349, fn. 5.

Bugoslavskii’s was the best critical edition of the First Redaction available but was rarely cited.

In 1947, V. I. Malyshev published a diplomatic edition of \( \mathcal{L} \) with facsimiles of the first three folios (fol. 317–318).\(^{24}\) In 1965, in an analysis of the relationship of the *Slovo o pogibele russkoi zemli* to the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*, the researcher Iu. K. Begunov focused solely on the First Redaction of the *Life*. In order to depict the relationship of the known-by-that-time 13 copies of the First Redaction, Begunov constructed a three-branch stemma codicum in which \( \mathcal{L} \) occupied its own distinct branch (see figure 1).\(^{25}\)

![Figure 1 Begunov’s stemma for the Life of Alexander Nevskii](image)

The readings of \( \mathcal{L} \), thus, should have equal status in determining the archetype with the readings of the common protograph of \( EHPb \), on one
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hand, and AAрБЛМОППи, on the other hand. Begunov provided two edited versions of the text of the Life. In the first version, he presented a diplomatic edition of Пс with a full critical apparatus containing variant readings from the other 12 MS copies.26 He corrected Пс only when he thought there was a scribal error in it. In the second version, Begunov “reconstructed” what he considered to be a text closer to the archetype of the Life than any single MS. He used Пс as his copy text and provided readings from other MSS only when he changed it.27 Begunov did not follow his stemma in his reconstruction of the Life. For example, he added the word “ДОМОЧАДЕЦ” after the phrase “Гоне их слышах от отца своих,” in the introductory paragraph of his reconstruction (187.3), although that word is testified to only by E and P. By the rules of stemmatics it could not have been in the archetype for it would require positing an independent dropping of that word in three different places in Begunov’s stemma—in Lв, in the protograph of Ps and У, and in the protograph of the right branch. As a result of this and similar counter-stemmatic changes,28 his “reconstruction” turns out to be further from the archetype than his diplomatic edition of Пс.29

26 Begunov, Памятник, 158–180.
28 See, in particular, adding “бъ” in 187.12 on the basis of У, adding “же” in 189.55 on the basis of BP, changing “от Немцы” to “их” in 190.12 on the basis of MAрУ, adding “баше” in 191.25 on the basis of ЛУ, changing “Господи” to “Боже” in 191.28 on the basis of BP, adding “а” in 191.39 on the basis of У, adding “в ризах со кресты” in 191.41–42 on the basis of БРУ, changing “их” to “я” in 192.50 on the basis of ЛБРУ, changing “уже бь ему” to “ему же бь” in 192.52–53 on the basis of РУ, adding “на мир щедротами” in 192.70–71 on the basis of BP, adding “мира” in 192.72 on the basis of BP, adding “учить” in 192.73 on the basis of BP, changing “дивиа” to “славна” in 193.75 on the basis of ЛБР, adding “царя” in 193.81 on the basis of BP, adding “господиа” in 193.82 on the basis of BP, adding “до возведения царя бь” in 193.83–84 on the basis of BP, adding “уже бо не обряется такоуй царю и один в земли Судьбы” in 194.83–84 on the basis of BP, adding “тысяч” in 194.99 on the basis of P, changing “24” to “23 дня” in 194.3–4 on the basis of ПЛБРУ, changing “хотя” to “хотестя” in 194.5 on the basis of P, adding “Богу же нашему слава, прославляющему святая своя в веки веков. Аминь,” in 194.8–8 on the basis of ПЛУ.
29 In 1969, Begunov reprinted this version as a plain text in his “Житие Александра Невского,” on the even-numbered pages in “Изборник. Сборник произведений литературы древней Руси, ed. L. A. Dmitriev and D. S. Likhachev (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969), 328–343. It has no italics where he had changed his copy text, no footnotes, and no final hard signs on words. A translation into modern Russian appears on
In 1997, Michele Colucci reassessed Begunov’s stemma and, although accepting for the most part the relationship of copies that Begunov proposed, made one major adjustment. Colucci moved \( \mathcal{L} \) to the right (\AApB\l\rn\m\o\n\m\o\P\n\p\p\n\p\) branch of the stemma (see figure 2). Thus, he argued, in effect, that \( \mathcal{L} \) should not be given its own equal status with the other two branches in determining primary readings, but that \( \mathcal{L} \) and \AApB\l\rn\m\o\n\m\o\P\n\p\p\n\p\ (his \( n.a.t \)) together determine readings that are equal in status to those of \BPs\nU (his \( y.P \)). He attributed those cases where the readings of \( y.P \) agree with \( \mathcal{L} \) against those of \AApB\l\rn\m\o\n\m\o\P\n\p\p\n\p\ to a secondary contaminative influence of \( \mathcal{L} \) on \( y.P \). In addition, he attributes the agreements \( P \) and \( L \) with \( P \) and \( U \) to a contamination of \( P \) on \( U \). Colucci pointed out that Begunov did not use his own stemma in reconstructing the text of the Life.

Not using a stemma, even though one was diagrammed, usually with the designation “a schema of the relationship of copies,” was typical for Soviet textology, which, following D. S. Likhachev, held that using a stemma to help determine readings was “mechanistic textology.” Colucci also expressed doubt about
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30 M. Koluchchi [Michele Colucci], “Pervonachal’naia redaktsiia ‘Zhitiiia Aleksandra Nevskogo’: zamekti po istorii teksta,” in 50 (1997): 252–260. Colucci’s cases of when \( \mathcal{L} = y.P \# n.a.t \) are 162.8–11, 166.92–99, 167.42–43, 167.45–47, 167.51, 167.62–63, and 168.88–92. Of these, all but the first involve a lacuna in the left-branch’s \( Hc \) and \( \Upsilon \), which presumes their absent readings had they existed would have agreed with those of \( E \) and \( P \). Even Colucci’s first case is not entirely solid since \( O \) of the right branch agrees with \( E \) and \( P \) of the left. Colucci’s cases of when \( \mathcal{L} = y.P \# n.a.t \) are 160.53, 161.17, 161.28, 161.51, 163.97–100, 163.1–2, 165.41, 165.52, 166.93, 166.6, 166.12, 167.18, and 168.12. Of these, 166.93, 166.6, 166.12, and 167.18 also involve a lacuna in \( Hc \) and \( \Upsilon \), and 165.52 involves an idiosyncratic reading of \( Hc \). The idiosyncratic readings of \( \mathcal{L} \) that Colucci considers to have “real editorial significance” he gives as 166.8–86, 166.1–5, 166.97–99, and 167.26–27. Colucci numbers his cases according to the page number and variant of Begunov’s critical edition (Begunov, Pamiatnik, 158–180).


Begunov’s use of a “codex interpositus”—that is, a hypothetical intervening copy “between a manuscript (or group of manuscripts) and its protograph” (253). Use of such an intervening copy between the archetype and the readings suggested by the MS copies was also characteristic of Soviet textology. It allowed the modern editor to overrule the testimony of the MS copies by claiming readings for the archetype that were not supported by the MSS.

Figure 2 Colucci’s stemma for the Life of Alexander Nevskii

Here I will limit myself to discussing briefly how I edited the text and why I chose to place \( \mathfrak{La} \) above the common protograph of all the other copies. In editing a text for publication, an editor has several options, which are dependent on the goal of the edition and on the relationship of the extant manuscripts to each other. As I wrote recently in the journal *Kritika*:

If one copy is clearly best representative of the archetype or authorial text, then it should be used as the copy text and variants provided from the other copies only to show the history of the development of the text. If no single copy is best and if the manuscript tradition is “open” (i.e., no clear genealogical relationship
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can be established among the copies), then picking and choosing readings from different copies based on the knowledge, skill, and intuition of the editor is to be preferred. If the manuscript tradition is “closed” (i.e., a clear genealogical relationship can be determined), then a stemma should be used.\footnote{Review of S. A. Bugoslavskii, Tekstologiiia drevnei Russi, 2 vols., compiled by Iu. A. Artamanov, vol. 1: Povest’ vremennykh let, vol. 2: Drevnerusskie literaturnye prizvedeniiia o Borise and Glebe. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul’tur, 2006–2007; A. L. Nikitin, Tekstologiiia russkikh letopisei XI–nachala XIV vv., vypusk 1: Kiev-Pecherskoe letopisanie do 1112 goda, Moscow: Minuvshee, 2006; Galitsko-Volynskaiia letopis’. Tekst. Kommentarii. Issledovanie, compiled by N. F. Kotliar, V. Iu. Franchuk, and A. G. Plakhonin, under the editorship of N. F. Kotliar, St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2005, in Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History 9, no. 4 (2008): 940.}

In the case of the First Redaction of the Life of Alexander Nevskii, we have a hybrid situation in regard to the MSS. For the first 44.5% of the text of the Life, in my opinion, a “best” copy exists in \( \mathcal{L} \), but the last 55.5% of the text of the Life is missing in that copy. For the remainder of the text of the Life to the end, a closed tradition exists whereby no one copy is demonstrably better than all the others, although a clear genealogical relationship can be established. Thus, for the last part of the text, I resorted to a stemma to help determine the “best” (i.e., closest to the archetype) reading.

In Appendix A, I present my reconstruction of the First Redaction archetype. For the most part, my reconstruction is similar to the version of the First Redaction that Begunov edited and published in 1965. It differs from his version in two major respects. First, I used \( \mathcal{L} \) for the copy text for the first part of the text and resorted to a stemma for the last part, whereas Begunov used \( \Pi_c \) as his copy text throughout. Second, my understanding of the relationship of the \( \text{MS} \) copies to each other differs from his (see figure 3). As a result, in particular choice of words and phrases, I accepted the primacy of readings in the \( \text{MS} \) copies in a different hierarchical order; namely, where \( \mathcal{L} \) is extant, I accepted the reading of \( \mathcal{L} \) except to correct scribal accidentals; otherwise, I considered \( \gamma \) and \( \delta \) to be of theoretical equal value in determining \( \beta \). In practice, \( \delta \) tends to represent \( \beta \) more often. As Colucci demonstrated the readings of right-branch MSS are more often closer to \( \mathcal{L} \) than are those of left-branch MSS. The agreements of \( \mathcal{L} \) with \( \Pi_\alpha \) that Colucci sees as placing \( \mathcal{L} \) in the right branch of the stemma might better be understood as occurrences of agreements of the right-branch copies with the primary reading of \( \mathcal{L} \) (\( \alpha \)). Thus, where \( \mathcal{L} \) is not extant, I tended to favor the agreements of \( \delta \) (agreements of \( \Pi_\beta, \Pi_\gamma, \), and \( \Pi_\delta \)) over \( \gamma \) (agreements of \( \Pi_c, \gamma, E, \) and \( P \)), when the two disagree. Finally, I rarely looked to \( \Pi_\text{III} \) alone or \( \Pi_\text{A} \), except
insofar as they agree with \( P_t \) or are able to correct some scribal accidental in \( P_t \). In the case of certain readings, this represents an almost complete reversal of Begunov’s hierarchical placement and results in a reconstruction that is closer to the text that would result from Bugoslavskii’s proposed improvements than either to Begunov’s critical apparatus version or to his reconstruction. I also see contamination of the common protograph (\( \theta \)) of \( \text{PsU} \) on the common protograph (\( \epsilon \)) of \( \text{LP} \), whereas Colucci saw the contamination going in the opposite direction. Although I agree with Colucci in general terms concerning the dangers of using a \textit{codex interpositus}, I propose having \( \beta \) as in effect an intervening hypothetical copy between the MSS and \( \alpha \) is justified here.

\[\text{Figure 3 My preferred stemma for the Life of Alexander Nevskii}\]

When turning the military tale into a saint’s tale, the fourteenth-century redactor inserted new sections (indicated as the italicized parts in Appendix A). But, even then in the second half of the fifteenth century, three additional sections were interpolated (indicated with the bracketed designations \( C-1 \), \( C-2 \), and \( C-3 \) in Appendix A). Toward the end of the Tale, “a mighty khan of the Eastern Country” summons Alexander to him (section A-1 below). Then Alexander goes to Vladimir with his army. News of his coming reaches the
mouth of the Volga River, and the Moabite women frighten their children, warning them of Alexander’s coming (C-1). He receives the blessing of Metropolitan Kirill to go to the khan (B-1). Alexander goes to the khan who honors him and lets him go (A-2). No explicit description of Alexander’s return from the khan is given in the text of the Life at this point, as the reader is left to construe from the ensuing section that he did return. In that section, Khan Batu gets angry at Alexander’s brother, Andrei, and sends his general Nevruy to devastate the Suzdalian land (C-2). Alexander rebuilds the cities and churches and returns the refugees to their homes. From Alexander’s rebuilding activities, the reader can suppose that Alexander had returned from his visit to the khan, unless he undertook the rebuilding of Rus’ cities and churches from Sarai. A quotation from Isaiah 1: 16, 17, 23 and 56: 1–2 and a peroration about how God had endowed the land “with wealth and glory” follows.

Then the reader is told about the sending of a letter by the Pope to Alexander asking to be allowed to send two cardinals to instruct him in Catholicism, but Alexander turns the request down (B-2). In the next section, “foreign peoples” (inoplemenniki) are violently forcing the Rus’ to serve in the ranks of the army, but Alexander goes to the khan and pleads with him not to drive his people into misery (C-3). The description that Alexander “went” (poide) to the khan is another indication in the Life that Alexander had returned from his previous trip. In the next section Alexander sends his son Dmitrii to the Western country, where he conquers some German land and takes the city of Iur’ev returning with prisoners and booty. The Life then abruptly begins to describe Alexander’s return from the khan without transition. After the previous section describing Dmitrii’s campaign in the Western country, the α reading merely states: “Князь великий Александръ въидъ отъ иноплеменникъ” (“Grand Prince Alexander went from the foreign peoples”). ΠΕΒΡУ attempt to smooth the transition from the previous section by adding the phrase “Отецъ же его” (“His father”) at the beginning of the sentence.

The general assumption among scholars is that transmission of the text of the Life remained stable for almost 200 years after it was first composed, from ca. 1280s to the second half of the fifteenth century and that the First Redaction represents the late thirteenth-century version. Only then did
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34 As Zenkovsky pointed out, the campaign of Nevruy against Andrei Iaroslavich occurred under Batu’s successor Sartaq. Zenkovsky, Medieval Russia’s Epics, Chronicles, and Tales, 233, fn. 27. For an analysis of the chronicle accounts of this campaign, see my “The Tatar Campaign of 1252,” Palaeoslavica 17, no. 2 (2009): 46–64.
transmission become volatile with the text undergoing many changes over the course of the next 100 or so years. I have proposed that the text originally composed in the second half of the thirteenth century underwent a major transformation in the mid to late fourteenth century. What resulted was a sequence of nested insertions within a foundational layer framework; that is, these interpolations may have occurred in the mid to late fifteenth century when the First Redaction was created. I have designated that foundational layer with the letter “A”, the first layer of insertions with the letter “B”, and the second (later) layer with the letter “C”.

A-1: The khan summons Alexander

C-1: At the death of his father Iaroslav, Alexander goes to the city of Vladimir and news reaches the mouth of the Volga. Moabite women frighten their children by saying “Alexander the prince is coming.”

B-1: Alexander consults with Metropolitan Kirill who gives him his blessing to go.

A-2: Alexander goes to the khan, who renders him honor and lets him go.

C-2: Batu gets angry at Andrei and sends the general Nevruy with an army to ravage the Suzdal’ land. Prince Alexander rebuilds the destroyed churches and the cities gathering the home of the people who had fled during the invasion. Quotation from Isaiah.

B-2: The Pope writes to Alexander wanting to send two cardinals to teach him about the Catholic faith, but Alexander turns his request down.

C-3: The foreign people were violent forcing the Rus’ to serve in the ranks of the army, but Alexander goes to the Khan and pleads with him not to drive his people into misery.

B-3: Alexander sends his son Dmitrii against the Western land. Dmitrii conquers some of the German land and takes the city of Iur’ev, returning to Novgorod with prisoners and booty.

A-3: Alexander returns from “the foreign people” (“отъ иноспе-менникъ”), goes to Niznii Novgorod, then Gorodets where he falls ill and dies.

Thus, if one reads sections A-1 / A-2 / A-3 one after the other, one has a complete narrative: Alexander is summoned by the khan, he goes to the khan, is
honored, and returns from the khan. This sequence is what I posit was the way the Tale originally read; that is, the foundational layer. The second (B-1), fourth (B-2), and sixth (B-3) interpolations were most likely added in the fourteenth century (pre-1377) when the military tale was turned into a saint’s tale. Thus, one can read the sequence as A-1 / B-1 / A-2 / B-2 / B-3 / A-3 for the sequence as it probably was in the continuation of \( \texttt{Te} \). The first (C-1), third (C-2), and the fifth (C-3) interpolations were most likely added in the post-1448 period, when anti-Tatar rhetoric began to pervade Church literature about the steppe people. That is the sequence of the First Redaction as we now have it.

For the sake of consistency, I normalized the text throughout, which includes standardizing spelling, expanding abbreviations, adding front and back yers after superscript consonants in final position, and inserting modern punctuation. I have not provided variant readings, for which one may consult the diplomatic edition of \( \texttt{Pi} \) with critical apparatus that Begunov edited and published in 1965. Those parts that I believe were added to the Tale to transform it into a Life are italicized. In Appendix B, I provide an English translation of the non-italicized parts; that is, of the Tale as it may have existed before attempts were made in the fourteenth century to turn the military tale into a saint’s tale. Here we see a spare but structurally well-organized Tale with an introduction, in which the “thematic clue” is a story about a brave ruler; in this case, the Emperor Vespasian. Then follow three stories—the first involves a ruler from the Northern Country, the second involves a ruler from the Western Country, the third involves a ruler from the Eastern Country. The Tale closes with Alexander’s death and a lament by the author. Into this foundational layer were added religious sentiments, biblical allusions and quotations, and digressive stories in the mid-fourteenth century to make the saint’s

tale, almost half of which appears in Le, and then into the First Redaction in the second half of the fifteenth century.

Appendix A

Житие Александра Невского: Первая редакция (реконструкция)

Тою же лета. Преставился великий князь Александръ сына Ярослава. Скажем же мужество и житие его. О Господинь нашему Иисусу Христе Сыне Божий азъ худы грѣхомъ недостоино начиная писати житие великого князя Александра сына Ярослава внукъ Всеюлаха понеже слышать отъ отцевъ своихъ и самовидце еси въ врзасту его и радъ былъ исповѣдать святому житию и честное и славное но луко же Притчесцени рече: «В злочинну душу не высилить премудрость на высокихъ бо храмъ есть посредь же степь столовь при вратѣ сильныя присѣдить»36 Аще и гробъ еси умомъ молитвою святомъ Госпожи Богородицы поспѣшилъ светало князя Александра начаткомъ вѣкю.

Си бѣ князь Александра Богоять рожены отъ отца милостиюная и мужество паты же кроткаго князя великаго Ярослава и матерью святаго Федосы. Яко же рече Иисуса пророкъ: «Тако глаголеть Господь: “Князь азъ учень священи бо суть азъ божью”37 я». Воистину безъ Божия бо посѣдиша не бѣ княжене его. Но и въ врзасту его паче инныхъ человѣкъ, и гласъ его—язы труба въ народѣ и лице его—аки лице Иосифа38 иже бѣ поставилъ его Египетскому царю втораго царя въ Египтѣ. Сила бѣ его—часть отъ силы Самсонъ. Дали бѣ ему Божѣ премудрость Соломоню и храбрость же аки царя Римскаго Евнина иже бѣ плывшія всю Поднѣжскую землю и ныдѣ исполнися къ граду Атапату приступити и шедше гражане и оувдѣшъ полкъ его, и осташа единъ, и, возврати силу ихъ ко вратомъ ко градымъ, и посмѣяся дружинъ своеи, и укори я, река: «Оставите мя единого». Также и си князь Александръ бѣ побожая а не побдымъ.

36 Cf. Wisdom 1: 4; Proverbs 8: 2–3.
37 азъ вожь changed from а вожь in Le.
38 Cf. Isaiah 13: 3.
39 Иосипа changed from Есиива in Le.
И сего ради нькто сильней отъ Западных странъ иже нарицаясь слуги⁴⁰ Божья отъ тѣхъ пріиде, хотя видѣти дивши то взрасть его яко же древне цесаря Уежска приходъ къ Соломону хотѣти слышати премудрость его. Также и се именемъ Андріянъ, видѣвъ цесарь Александру возвратися къ своему и рече: „Прошедъ страны, и языки, не видѣхъ такова и въ цесаря ни въ царяхъ цесаря“.⁴¹

Се же слышавъ, король части Римское отъ полунощныхъ странъ, такое мужество цесарь Александра и помышли въ собѣ: „Да поиду плѣню землю Александрову“. И собра силу велью наполни корабля многихъ полковъ своихъ подвижес въ силь тажь исполнися духомъ ратнымъ. И приде въ рѣку Неву шатся безумъемъ, послѣ сны загордовся ко цесарю Александру въ Новгородѣ рече: „Аще можеши противитися мнѣ то се есмѣ здѣ уже плѣню твою“.⁴²

Александра же, слышавъ словеса ихъ, разгорься сердцемъ и выйдѣ въ церковь святыхъ Софіи, падь на колѣни предъ олтаремъ, нача молитися со словами: „Боже хвалычъ, и правдычъ Боже великий и крепкий Боже правдычъ создавши небо и землю и постави предъли языкъ и повелѣ жить не преставными въ чюю части“.⁴³ И въпримѣ рѣч: „Суди, Господи, обидаць и мнѣ въбраны борючисся со мнѣ, приими уроѣчь и церковь стаки въ помощь мнѣ“.⁴⁴ Скончавъ молитву встать поклонися архиепископу. Архиепископъ же Спиридонъ благослови его и отпусти. Онъ же выйдѣ изъ церкви утѣря слезы, и нача кричати дружину свою, и рече: „Не въ силахъ Божъ но въ правдѣ. Помнишь Письмена: „Си бо оружи си на конце мы же во имя Господа Божа нашао призвемъ ни спать быша и падоша мы же встакыхъ прости былыхъ“.⁴⁵ И си рѣкъ повидѣ на ны въ маль дружинѣ, не сождавъся со мнѣю силой своею, но уповавъ на святую Троицу.

Жалостно же и слышати яко отецъ его, честны Ярославъ великий не бѣ вдаль таково встанье на сына своего, милого Александра, ни оному бысть послати когда въсть къ отцю: еже бо ратни приближався. Тѣмже мнози Новгородци не

⁴⁰ слуги added.
⁴¹ Deuteronomy 32: 8; 2nd Kings 19: 15.
⁴² Psalms 34: 1–2.
⁴³ Psalms 19: 8–9.
совокупились ближе понеже ускори князь пошит.

И прииже на рек въ день всераскъ, на память святыхъ описи 600 и 30 бывши збора въ Халкийдонъ и святой мученику Корику и Упиту и святого князя Володимера крещающаго Русскую землю и миляже же върну велику къ тѣмъ мученикомъ Бориса и Глѣба.

И бо некто мужъ старшина въ земли Ижерскѣ44 именемъ Пелагий поручено же бысть ему стражу морской. Вспрятъ же святое крещение и жилъше посредь рода своео похана скуча. И народъ бысть и изъ его въ святомъ крещении Филіпъ. Жилъше боголюбиво въ среду и въ платокъ пребывалъ въ амбий. Тѣмже сподоби бо на святѣ видѣть видѣнныя страшнѣ во тѣ день. И сказаѳь вкратиц.

Опишомъ силу ратныхъ, где противу князя Александра, да сказать ему стани и обрытия ихъ. Столици же ему при край моря, стражаетъ обою пути, и пребысть всю коцъ во бѣдѣ. Якоже нача всходить солнце и сливъ шилемъ страшены по морю и видѣ насть единъ гребецъ, посредъ насть столица мученику Бориса и Глѣба въ одежахъ червленихъ, и бысть руцъ держаша на ради греби же съдѣлагъ акы милою одною. И рече Борисъ: „Брать Глѣбъ, поемъ трести да помозьемъ брордникъ своему Александру видѣть же таковыя видѣнныя и сливъ таковыя глазъ очи мученику, столици трепетемъ, докудже насть очи его.

Потомъ скоро прииже князь Александръ, онъ же видѣвъ князя Александра радостнымъ очи ему изповѣди ему единому. Князъ же рече: „Сего не руцъ никому“. Оттоль потщався князъ на нѣ въ 6 часы днѣ [въ лето 6748].45 Бысть сѣча венера надъ Римляны, и изби множество бесчислено ихъ и самыми королевы взложи печать на це острмомъ своимъ конемъ.

Здѣ же явился 6 муть храбрыхъ [с самыи с нимъ ис полку его].46 Единѣ именемъ Гаврило Алексичъ сен47 нѣха на шелкую

44 Corrected from Жерскъ.
45 Bracketed words are not in АArВЛМОПРУ, Лѣтъ read: се же бысть въ лето 6745.
46 Bracketed words are unique to Лѣтъ. Others have: иже [Пис]: и] мужество ваша [Пис]: мужество ваше; АArМО: мужество ваше; B: мужество вами] с ними [АЛП: ними; AB: имъ] крулио.
видь в королевича мча под руку и възъхни по досц и до самогу коробля по нея же хожаху с королевичем иже текоша перед нимъ а самого емище свергоша и с конемъ в воду 48 з доски и Божьему милостыню нережень 49 бысть и паки някъ, и бися с самыми воеводою середи полку ихъ.

2 именемъ Сибила Якуновичъ Новгородецъ, сен 50 нахъ многажды на полкъ ихъ и бяшется единъъ топоромъ не имъ страха въ душъ своемъ. И паде ньколько отъ руко его и подвишашся силь и храбрьстью его.

3 и Яковъ родомъ Полочанинъ ловчий бъ у князъ. Сен 51 нахъ на полкъ с мечемъ и похвиали его князь.

4 Новгородецъ именемъ Мыша. Сен 52 пыш натече на корабли и погуби. 3 корабли з дружиною своею.

5 и Отъ молодыхъ его именемъ Сава. Сен 53 въхна въ шатеръ велики, королевъ золотоверхин и подъъ съ стольъ шатерны. Полц Александрови, видьше шатра паденье въздрадовашся.

6 и Отъ слугъ его именемъ Ратмьръ. Сен 55 бися пыш и остушиша и мицы. Онь же отъ многихъ ранъ паде и тако скончас. Си же вся слышахъ отъ господина своего великого князя Александра и отъ някъ, иже в то время обротоша въ той съчъ.

Бысть же въ то время чудо дивно, яко же во древъ дни при Ежкии цесарѣ, ейда придетъ Сенакиримъ, Асуринскимъ, цесаръ на Персисьемъ томъ пльнишь 56 градъ святны Ерусалимъ внезапу изведе ангель Господи на земли и отъ полка Асуринска 185 тыылыц. И въсткий утро, обротоша групъ мертвы всѧ. Такоже бысть при побои Александровъ, ейда побои корола обь оны полкъ руки Ижерь, иде же не въ проходо полку Александрову. Эцъ

47 сен changed from се in Лв.
48 AАрВЛМОП: море; БР: Неву; IIIсУ: lacuna.
49 Corrected from нережень in Лв.
50 сен changed from се in Лв.
51 Сен changed from Се in Лв.
52 Сен changed from Се in Лв.
53 Сен changed from Се in Лв.
54 Corrected from въхна
55 Сен changed from Се in Лв.
56 пльнишь changed from пльни въ Лв.
обратила много множество избивных отъ ангела Господня. И остановъ побѣже трупы мертвыхъ своихъ каменна корабля истопоша корабля въ мори. Князь же Александръ возвратился съ побѣдою, хвала и слава имя своего Творца Отца и Сына и Святого Духа.

Въ 2-е же лѣто по возвращении съ побѣдою князя Александра, паки придоша отъ западныя страны и вѣстрадия въ отечествѣ Александра. Князь же Александра изъяще на ихъ въ королю и изверже градъ ихъ изъ основаннна, а самехъ изъяще и самъъ съ собою приведеъ, а именъ, пожела, отпусти: быть множествъ вѣчны.

По побѣде же Александра, яко побѣди короля, въ третии годѣ, въ зимнее время, понде на землю немецкую въ силѣ велидѣ, да не хваляться, ркуще: «Укоримъ Словенскія языкъ ниже себѣ».

Уже бо бяше взятъ градъ Псковъ, и тиуны у нихъ посажени. Техъ же князя Александръ ныма и градъ Псковъ свободи отъ пленна. А землю ихъ повоева и похоже и полона всѣ бе числа, а овъ ихъ искечъ. Оне же, изъ городъ, совокупишася и рѣши: «Пондемъ побѣдимъ Александра и имѣю его рукамъ». Ейда приближинася, и поочиша стражи. Князь же Александра оплычися и пондоша противу себѣ, и наступиша море Чудское обоихъ множества. Отечъ же его Ярославъ послалъ бе ему на помощь брата меньшаго Андрѣя въ множѣ храбрыхъ, яко дрѣле у цара Давида сильни, крѣпы. Тако и мужи Александровы исполнися духа ратна: бѣду бо сердца ихъ, аны поломъ, и рѣши: «О княже нашъ дрѧты!: Нынѣ прись врѣй на мѣ положи гладь свои за тя». Князь же Александра воздѣй корабль на небо, и рече: «Суди, Боже, и разсуди прдъ мною отъ языка велерѣчия и помоги ми, Боже, яко же дрѣле Моисея на Амашки и прадѣду моему Ярославу на оваканнаго Салтанополкаго».

Бѣ же тогда день суботны, въ вѣходию солнце, сьступиша обовъ. И бысть сила гла и труся отъ копи номѣлненна и звукъ отъ мечнаго сьченца, яко же морю помертвью двинутился; не бѣ видны отъ покры бо ся кровью.

57 въ гра changed to вѣстрадия in Лк. End of Лк.
Съ же слыша я от самовидца, ик ше рече ми, яко видѣлъ полкъ Божий на влуду, пришедши на помощь Александру. И побѣди я помошою Божею, и даша патрии плѣна своя и спачаути я, горище, якъ по аеру, и не былъ како утеси. Зѣ же просилъ Богъ Александра предъ всѣми полки, яко Иисус Навания у Ереяона. А иже рече: «Имею Александра руками, сего дайшъ ему Богъ в ручь его. И не обрѣтесь противникъ ему въ брани никогда же. Возвратися князъ Александръ съ побѣдою славною. Быше множество полону въ полку его, ведающъ босы подле конны, иже именуются рыдали.

И яко же приближися князъ къ граду Пекову, изуеми же и попове и весь народъ срѣтоша предъ градомъ, подающе квадлу Богою и славу господину князю Александру, поюще пѣнье: «Пословны, господи, кроткому Давицу победити иноплеменникѣ и върному князю нашему оружіе крестнымъ свободити градъ Плескъ отъ язычниковъ рукой Александровою».

«О, невѣсти плѣсцовыхъ! Аще се забудете и до привкушатъ Александровъ, уподобитесь Жидолу, икъ же препита господь въ пустынѣ людною и крестомъ печеными, и сихъ вѣсѣ забвшия Богъ своею, изведато я изъ работы Египетскаго».

И нача слышати имя его по свѣмъ странамъ и до моря Египетскаго, и до горъ Араратскихъ, и обону страну моря Варяжскаго, и до величаго Рима.

Въ то же время умножися языкъ Литовскій и начаша пакостити волости Александровъ. Онъ же, выездя, и нача избиати я. Единою клѣтия ему выехать, и побѣди 7 рати единъ вѣдомъ, множество князей ихъ избы, а овъ рукама изыма; суды же еготъ, ругающеся, взахаууть я къ хвостомъ коней своихъ. И начаша блюстися имени еготъ.

[A-I] Въ то же время некто царь силенъ на Вѣщомилъ странѣ, etu xe be Bogw pokoribw mnogia azyki, ow vzstoka dawe i do zapada. Ты же царь, слышавъ Александра тако славна и храбра, послалъ къ нему послы и рече: «Александре, вѣси ли, яко Богъ покори ми многыя зыки. Ты ли единъ не хочеши покорите силенъ моей? Но же хочеши сѣбѣсти землю свою, то скорѣ приниши къ мя, и да урази честъ царства моего».

[C-I] Князъ же Александръ пришёлъ во Володимьеръ по умртви отца своего въ силенъ величъ. И бысть тронъ пришедъ еготъ, и промчался вѣсть и до усть Волы, И начаша женъ
моантическая политика дни свят, речь: «Александръ едетъ!»

[B-1] Съдумавъ же князь Александъръ, и благослови его епископъ Курилъ, и поидь к цареви.


[C-2] И потомъ же разныя былъ царь Баты на брата и его, межи его Андрю, и послалъ въ немногое его Невру финою земле Суздальскую. По пьянкахъ же Невре князь великий Александръ церкви въ двѣ звану, ради исполненъ, люди распущены сѣра въ дома свое. О таковыхъ бо рече Иисусъ пророкъ: «Книлъ быть въ странахъ – тихъ, увѣрень, кротокъ, съ мирень – по образу Божию естъ».

59 не вмѣкалъ божества не презрѣ криву праведнично, сироты и вдовицы въ правду суду, милостиюцѣ, бѣгъ докладцемъ своимъ и взысканиемъ отъ странъ приготовкию коромыслу. На таковыя Богъ призываетъ: Богъ бо не ангеломъ любить, но человѣкомъ съ идѣя уѣздѣлъ и показаетъ на мирѣ милость свою. Распостраня же Богъ землю его божествомъ и словою, и удовлетъ Богъ людемъ.

[B-2] Никогда же приходитъ къ нему послы отъ папы, изъ великого Рима, рече: «Папа наши тако глаголетъ: "Слыхалъ уже князя честна и дина, и земля твои велики. Сего ради послалъ къ тобѣ отъ двунацедесятъ королеву двѣ житейша – Аллада да и Гьмонта, да послушаети учения изъ о законѣ Божіе"». Князь же Александъръ, здумавъ съ мудрецъ своими, вѣдѣша къ нему и рече: «Отъ Адама до потовъ, отъ потовъ до раздѣленья змыхъ, до начала Авраама, отъ Авраама до принца Израиля сквозь Черное море, отъ сего сыновъ Израиля, до умертвпія Давида царя, отъ начала царства Соломона до Августа и до Христова рождества, отъ рождеств Христова до спасти и воскресения господства, отъ вѣсѣнн aggravated его и до возвышенія на небеса, отъ вѣсѣннаго на небеса до царства Константина, отъ начала царства Константина до перваго собора, отъ перваго собора до седьмого – съ всѣ добръ свѣдѣши, а отъ всѣ учения не приимаетъ». Они же вѣршатся къ вѣрени. И умножаша дни живота его. Бѣ бо червлѣбецъ и мѣщѣніецевъ и княжщия людъ, митрополита же и

епископы чтили и акы самого творца.

[C-3] Бъ же тогда нужна велика отъ потающих: тонутьъ християнъ, величье съ собою воинствовать. Князъ же великимъ Александръ пондѣ къ царству, дывы отпомогь людичи отъ боды.

[B-3] А сына своею Димитрия посыла на Западныхъ странь, и вся плотные свои посыла съ нижимъ, и ближнихъ своихъ домочадецъ, вски къ нимъ: «Слынутъ сыновъ моему, акы самому мнѣ, въ моемъ живопомъ своихъ». Поиде Ярославъ съ сыновцемъ своихъ въ силь вѣличь, и плывша городъ Юрьевъ, и взвершиласъ въсвоемъ съ многимъ полноымъ и съ великою честью.

[A-3] Князъ велики Александъ вздѣ отъ иноплемённикъ и доеди Новагорода Нижнаго и ту пребывъ мало здравъ, дошед Городца, разболется.

О, горь тобъ, бдный человече! Какъ можешь написати кончину господина своего! Какъ не испадета ти зынщи вкунь съ слезами! Какъ же не урвется сердце горкія туты! Отца бо человѣкъ можетъ, а добра господина не могу оставити: акѣ бы лы, и въ гробъ бы ласть съ нимъ!

Погребена же Боговъ крыло, остави же земное царство и бысть мног.: бо бо женище его паче миры апеляскаго образа. Споводи же его Богъ большь чинъ прияти — скиму. И тако Господи фуать свои предаетъ въ миромъ месяца покры въ 14 день, на память святому апостола Филиппа.

Митрополитъ же Кирилъ глаголаше: «Гада мохъ, разумъ вите, ако же здѣ сию землю Судальскую! Первы и диаконы, черноризцы, ниши и богаты, и всѣ люди глаголаху: «Уже посывлыемся!»

Святъ же твъ оно человекъ въ граду Болоховомъ. Митрополитъ же Кирилъ и боре, и всѣ народъ, и земли и вѣличи, скрыючи въ Боголюбльіи съ священи и съ канды. Народы же сънатусятъ, хотыце прикоснутия честінъ одному святого твъ его. Бысть же вотъ и кричаши, и тута, яко же кипь была, тако, и я земли потрепистися. Положено же бысть твъ его въ Рождестве святой Богородицы, въ архмандриты съ величны, месяца покры въ 24, на память святому отцу Амфилохія.

Бысть же тогда чудо испоконъ и памяти достоинъ. Егда удво положено бысть святое твъ его въ руку, тогда Савастянъ и Кирилъ митрополитъ хоты посылати ему руку, да
That same year [6771] Grand Prince Alexander, son of Iaroslav, passed away. Let us speak [about] his courage and life as I have heard it from my fathers, as well as that which I was an eyewitness to while growing up.

Prince Alexander was born from a father Grand Prince Iaroslav, and from a mother Theodosia. He was taller than other men, and his voice as a trumpet reached the people. His bravery was like that of the Roman emperor Vespasian, who conquered the entire Judean land. Once, during the siege of the city of Jotapata, the burghers of the city sallied forth and defeated his regiment, and he remained alone. But he still chased their force to the city gates and thereafter he jeered at his own retinue and reproached them, saying: “You left me alone.”

So also was the Prince Alexander: he used to defeat [others] but was never defeated. Once, because of this, a certain powerful man, whose name was Andreas, of those who call themselves “the servants of God,” came from the Western Country for he wanted to see the marvel in the fullness of his life. He saw Prince Alexander, returned to his people, and told them: “I traveled through many countries and saw many people, but I have never met such a king among kings, nor such a prince among princes.”

Hearing about the courage of Prince Alexander, the king of the Roman part of the Northern Country, thought to himself, “I will go and conquer Alexander’s land.” And he gathered a great force and filled numerous ships with his regiments and he moved forth with great strength being inspired by a martial spirit. He came to the river Neva and, being carried away with madness, sent his envoys, filled with pride, to Prince Alexander in Novgorod, saying, “If you are able to resist me then [do so for] I am here already conquering your land.”
Upon hearing these words, Alexander’s heart burned and he led his small retinue against them, not waiting for the large force. It is a pity to hear that his honorable father, Iaroslav the Great, did not know of such an attack on his son, dear Alexander. Alexander did not have time to send news to his father for already the enemy was approaching. Even many Novgorodians had not joined him because the prince had already set out against them. He decided to go against them in the sixth hour of the day. There was a great battle with the Romans, and he killed a numerous amount of them. On the face of this king, he left a mark with his sharp spear. Here six brave men appeared.

The first was Gabriel by name, son of Alexis. He attacked a ship and, seeing there the royal prince sword in hand, he rode onto the gangway. Everyone escaped from the king back to the ship, but thereafter they turned and threw him and his horse from the gangway into the water. He got out of the water uninjured, charged them again and fought with the general, himself, among his troop.

The second, a Novgorodian Sbyslav by name, son of Iakun, on several occasions charged their troop and fought only with a battle-ax, not having fear in his heart. And several fell from his hand. The people marveled at his power and his bravery.

The third, Iakov, a man from a Polotsk clan, was the prince’s huntsman. He charged the troop with a sword, and the prince praised him.

The fourth one was a Novgorodian, Misha by name, who fought on foot in the stream against the ships. He destroyed three of the ships with his detachment.

The fifth, also from his young men, Savva by name, entered into a large, royal golden-crowned tent and cut the tent pole. When Alexander’s regiments saw the tent fall, they were joyful.

The sixth, also from his servitors, Ratmir by name fought on foot and was encircled by many. He fell from many wounds several times and subsequently died. All this I have heard from my Grand Prince lord Alexander and from others who at that time took part in that battle.

In the second year after the return of Prince Alexander with his victory, they came once more from the Western Country and built a town on Alexander’s patrimony. Prince Alexander went quickly against it and razed the town to its foundations. Some of the enemy were executed and others were taken prisoner.

In the third year following Alexander’s victory, when he defeated the king, in the winter, Alexander went with a great force against the German land, “Let them not boast saying, ‘Part of the Slavic nation is beneath us.’” They had already taken Pskov town and installed their agents. Grand prince
Alexander Iaroslavich captured them and freed Pskov town from bondage. And he waged war against and set fire to their land. He took numerous prisoners and cut others to pieces. In the towns, they got together and said, “Let us go and subdue Alexander and take him with [our] hands.”

When they approached, the guards saw them. Prince Alexander drew up his regiments and went against [their] warriors. And when they came to Lake Chud there were many soldiers on both sides. His father Iaroslav sent him help [in the form of] his younger brother Andrei along with many brave men.

Prince Alexander returned from the victory with great glory. There were a multitude of prisoners accompanying his regiment. They who called themselves knights were walking shoeless next to the horses. When the prince approached Pskov town, the entire population met him in front of the town glorifying lord Prince Alexander.

And they began to hear his name throughout all countries, up to the sea of Egypt, to Mount Ararat, and on both sides of the Varangian Sea, and to Great Rome.

At that time, the Lithuanian nation was increasing and they began to sack Alexander’s territory. Going out against them, he began to defeat them. During one campaign, he defeated seven armies, killed many of their princes, and captured others. Mocking them, his servants tied them to the tails of their horses. And, they began to be aware of his name.

At that time, there was a powerful khan of the Eastern Country. That khan, hearing of the glory and courage of Alexander, sent him envoys, saying, “Alexander, do you not know that God has submitted many nations to me? You are the only one who is not willing to submit to my power. But if you want to save your land, then come soon to me and you will see the honor of my khanate.”

Having given due thought, Prince Alexander went to the khan. Upon seeing him, the Khan Batu marveled and said to his dignitaries: “I was told the truth—that there is no other like this prince.” Bestowing on him honor, he let him go.

The great Prince Alexander went from the foreign people to Nizhnii Novgorod and stayed there a few days in good health, but when he reached Gorodets, he became ill. Woe to you, poor man. How are you able to describe the passing of your lord? How do your eyes not fall out with tears? How does your heart not break from bitter straits? A man may leave his father, but cannot leave a good lord, and if need be, he lies with him in the grave.