

Feliks Koneczny

# The Turanian Civilization of Russia



Feliks Koneczny

# **The Turanian Civilization of Russia**

Compiled by Maciej Giertych

Wydawnictwo ANTYK Marcin Dybowski

ISBN

Fundacja Niepodległościowa  
ul. Klonowa 10a  
05-806 Komorów  
+48227580359, +48509458438  
antykw@wolfnet.pl  
[www.sklep.antyk.org.pl](http://www.sklep.antyk.org.pl)

# Compiler's and translator's note

Koneczny never wrote a work on this subject, but he did plan to write a book entitled "The Turanian Civilization". This is indicated by the fact that in his archives, there is an envelope on which he wrote "For the Turanian civilization" containing paper clippings pertinent to the topic. He referred to the Turanian civilization in most of his works.

Koneczny was of the opinion that a specific civilization of vast proportions had emerged in northern Asia and that it had had an enormous impact on the countries bordering Europe from the eastern side and also on the Far East. In many respects this Asian, basically Mongolian influence was of far greater import in these regions than the Byzantine. To deeply understand Russia, Turkey, Central Asia and the bordering states, Belarus and Ukraine, their specific social ethos based on the arbitrary self-will of the rulers has to be noted. It derives not from Byzantium but from Mongolia.

The present volume is an attempt to collect what Koneczny wrote about the civilizational development of Russia and other cultures of the same Turanian civilization. He wrote primarily about the Muscovy culture, but also about the Mongolian (Uyghur), Tatar (Kipchak), Cossack and Ottoman (Turkish) cultures of that civilization. He usually compared the Turkish culture with the Arabic civilization, which he considered to be superior to the Turanian. Thus this book is composed of excerpts drawn from other works of Koneczny. Those that are from the three volumes of *The History of Russia* and *To Defend the Latin Civilization!* are translations from Polish, while the rest are drawn from the English editions of other works of Koneczny.

Most references to sources have been left out. They are available in the original works of Koneczny.

As in my earlier translations of Koneczny's works, I have added some explanations expanding information that was specifically addressed to Polish readers or that pertains to some text prior to the excerpt. These are given in square brackets [ ] .

As previously the Latin, French and German quotations are given in the original with a translation in square brackets. Russian texts were usually in a Latin alphabet transliteration perfectly understandable to Polish readers. An English transliteration would be meaningless, thus the text is given in the original Russian with an English translation in square brackets.

Maciej Giertych

# Table of contents

Excerpts from vol. 1 of “Dzieje Rosji” [“The History of Russia”] Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 2003. ....	9
Excerpts from vol. 2 of “Dzieje Rosji” [“The History of Russia”] Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 2003. ....	163
Excerpts from vol. 3 of “Dzieje Rosji” [“The History of Russia”] Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 2003. ....	205
Excerpts from “From Ruthenia to Russia, The History from a pre-Soviet Perspective” Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2019. ....	275
Excerpts from “The Development of Morality” Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2016. ....	367
Excerpts from “The Byzantine Civilization” vol. 2 Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2014. ....	375
Excerpts from “The Jewish Civilization” Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 1999. ....	395
Excerpts from “The Latin Civilization” Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2018. ....	401
Excerpt from “Obronić cywilizację łacińską!” [“To Defend the Latin Civilization!”] Publ. Fundacja Rozwoju Kultury Polskiej, Lublin, 2002, p. 79-83 from the chapter “Religie a cywilizacje” [“Religions and Civilizations”]. ....	411
Excerpts from “The Laws of History” Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2013. ....	417
Excerpts from “On the Plurality of Civilizations” Publ. Polonica Publications, London, 1962. ....	445
Index of names and place names .....	451



# Excerpts from vol. 1 of “Dzieje Rosji” [“The History of Russia”]

Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 2003

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 49-50**

Beginning from the VI<sup>th</sup> c. and for many centuries onwards, the eastern Slavs had no history, while the Khazars possessed it.

The Khazars provided history with the single example of conversion to the Mosaic faith. Jewish monotheism reached them through the trade route from Asia Minor and Persia. Amongst the Armenian traders there were also the Jewish and, in a way unknown to us, they began the process of converting the Khazars. We know that some Khagans adhered to the Jewish religion already in the VIII<sup>th</sup> c. Jewish propaganda went further and covered also the neighbouring from the north Burtas people who were under Khazar rule. This was a numerous nomadic population supplying the Khagan on demand with 10 000 horsemen. They remained always on a primitive cultural level and they never passed the first stage of development of their organisation. They knew no other authority apart from the leaders of their settlements and in all else they were subjected to the Khazar Khagans. Traces of Mosaic beliefs could be found among the Burtas still in the XVI<sup>th</sup> c., and some remnants of them are still to be found today [written in 1917] within the sects of the Tambov and Penza oblasts [governorates].

**HR, vol. 1, p. 51-53**

Kiev was the first [Slav] settlement on middle Dnieper River which the Khazars could have met. Below Kiev the banks of the Dnieper were unpopulated almost all the way to the river's mouth. This explains why the Khazars made Kiev the main trading station, thereby awakening the Dnieper region to historical life. We should state at the onset that apart from the participation as intermediaries in trade extending to distant Baghdad this did not bring the Slavs any cultural benefits. As late as the IX<sup>th</sup> c. no one knew there how to solder metals! Beautiful Byzantine and Baghdad artefacts had for long entered the Novgorod-Kiev trade, but the locals were unable to repair them when damaged.

It appears that direct contact of the Khazars with the Slavs ended at the Kiev trading station since nothing of the new historical current that was working among the Khazars passed on to the Slavs. Having recognised the significance of the new trade route they set up a new capital, Sarkel, further West of their territories, on the Don River, (close to what today is Bila Vezha), with buildings erected with the help of Byzantine architects. Trade relations had earlier brought them closer to Byzantium and as a rule the Khagans maintained good relationships with the Byzantine Emperors. The Slavs, however, as yet had no such contacts with Byzantium.

Sarkel was established in the mid IX<sup>th</sup> c. Together with the Greek builders Constantine of Thessalonica, referred to as the philosopher came to the Don region. He was later known to the whole world under his monastic name Cyril. Together with his brother Methodius he was soon to become the apostle of the Southern and Western Slav lands as well as the inventor of the Slavonic

Glagolitic script, known still very well and used until this day [1916] in the liturgical books of Istria and Dalmatia. St. Cyril gathered a rich crop of converts from among the Khazars some time around 850 (probably in the years 857–858), but never did all the Khazars become Christians and it is doubtful whether any Khagan was a Christian. The Mosaic faith was older by at least a century and so it remained besides Christianity and even survived it. What is interesting is that this Christianity did not expand at all from its Khazar followers and it did not even reach the Dnieper River. Contrary to many popular tales, in the name of truth, it has to be said against the predominating views, that Saints Cyril and Methodius had nothing to do with the Eastern Slav lands. The Khazars did not prove to be intermediaries in the spread of the Gospel in spite of the fact that at the time they were tightening their contacts with the Slavs.

In mid-IX<sup>th</sup> c. the Khazars went further and changed the trading station into a state one. They subdued the Polans and Drevlians forcing them to pay a tribute. They wanted to be recognized as the lords of these lands because suddenly a competitor appeared who could prove dangerous and could expel them totally from trade along the Dnieper. They tried to block its way.

That competitor came from the distant North, quite unknown to the Khazars. In 838, for the first time there appeared in Constantinople an envoy from a Scandinavian people calling itself "Rus". As was already mentioned, the Neva River opened a route from Scandinavia along a sequence of lakes and rivers to the Dnieper and the Volga, and thus to Constantinople, Atil and Baghdad. And it was possible to discover many more such routes from Finland to Lake Ladoga, and then along the Dvina River directly towards the portage near Orsha. The soon to become famous *путь из варяг в греки* [route from the

Varangians to the Greeks] was first traversed in 838 by the deputation which went to investigate and make geographic discoveries. It happened for the first time that somebody had travelled this entire route which had been divided into several spheres of trading intermediaries. The Scandinavian Rus could do this, because for them a river was indeed a road in the literal sense of the word, a route that was the easiest for them, most readily available. For the first time boats were seen on the Dnieper which had been built and had sails. Compared to them the single dugouts were awkward floating logs. Should the northern Rus decide to occupy the water routes of Eastern Europe, who could prevent them?

The Khazars did what they could by subduing the lands of the Polans, Drevlians and Sievers and incorporating them into the state of the Khagan. They could not do anything more because they did not know how to build boats that could compete with the Scandinavians.

Besides, the Rus were capable of turning their boats into carriages. They needed no assistance in this. They managed themselves with the portages from river to river and in bypassing the waterfalls on the Dnieper. A Scandinavian boat carried 40 crewmen.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 55-58**

Of all the peoples that stood to compete for the lowlands of the Eastern Slav lands the Scandinavians had the best predispositions to exploit the region and subdue it, and this was so because they were professional sailors. Wherever in Europe they happened to appear, they became lords. There is no need to explain why they occupied the Dnieper region and later the Volga region. The causes and explanations would have to be sought for, had they

not done there the same as they did in other parts of Europe.

The migration of the Scandinavian Swede people and in particular of a tribe called "Rus" was directed towards the Neva and Dvina Rivers. It has to be assumed that at first, in fact for quite some time, they visited these regions only infrequently and not for long. What sort of spoils could they expect to find there? Even having reached the region of Lake Ilmen, they had few benefits. But they learnt that further on there are richer countries for which the Chudes, Slavs and Veps hunt for furs. The industrious Rus made therefore their own exploratory expeditions and finally in 838 their envoys reached Constantinople.

These envoys, having returned to the Swedes could tell that throughout the whole route from Lake Ilmen, along the Dnieper all the way to the sea, there was nothing worth plundering, until at the Black Sea, a province of the Byzantine Empire was reached. There, there was a rich trading city called Kherson that had wide connections with the East and West. The diligent envoys sailed further on to the very capital of the Empire so as to personally witness everything.

Around 850, the Rus already knew about Kherson, Constantinople, Atil and Sarkel. They had a target ahead of them and now they wanted to inhabit a region closer to the origin of the gold yielding water route and to have a relationship with it.

Thus, they themselves started to trade and reach, initially quite peacefully, from Ilmen to the Kiev market. Just as Bulgarian and Khazarian trade routes are noted by the common use of the curved Asiatic scimitar, so the travels of the Rus can be traced by the presence of their long two sided swords. These were the best "merchandise" for which everywhere they were able to exchange

whatever they wanted. On Lake Ilmen the spheres of the Muslim scimitar and the Scandinavian sword met; but the Polans [western Slavs] adopted only the sword.

It needs to be pointed out that the short Byzantine sword was unknown in the Dnieper and the Volga regions, which is the best proof that the Byzantine traders did not travel in this direction. On the contrary, in this same IX<sup>th</sup> c., trade in long swords flourished even on the shores of the Black Sea.

Thus the poor regions between Peipus (lake of the Chudes), Ladoga, White Lake and Ilmen were becoming important in the eyes of the Rus. They were the discoverers of the value of this region which consisted in its being a link for the all waterways and therefore the key for the domination over a large span of the earth. Thus they sailed into the region ever more frequently and numerously, so that finally — around 850 -they intended to become masters there.

What was happening between Ladoga and Ilmen was immediately recognised in Kiev and it was then that the Khazars subdued the local Slav population. The Chronicle of Nestor recalls that “they occupied us and said: Pay us a tribute”. And so they had to pay the Khagan “a sword from ever smoke”, that is, they had to supply one soldier from every hearth.

It was here that for the first time we meet with the eastern system of administration, for which “a smoke” was a unit for everything: for conscription, for tribute in natural goods and later for a tax in money. This system passed on as if an inheritance to the later lords of the Volga region. While in the West “a smoke” was only one of many means of calculating state obligations, in the East it became something universal, a formal administrative unit of the lowest level on which the whole system of state obligations was based. The result was that

the population was not inclined to set up new "smokes", preferring to be crowded together in a common household even though the new families could afford to build a new home. This system meant that enrichment was not followed up with a parallel development of individual culture. We shall need to refer to this circumstance later on. For the moment it is enough to note that this fatal system was not a Slavic invention.

In the Chronicle [of Nestor] there is no mention of any warring with the Khazars or even of any attempt to resist them. There is however information that the conflicts between the Polans and the Drevlians resulted in the falling of all of them under Khazar domination. The Khagan left the prince of the Polans and the princes of the Drevlians. He did not change anything and did not interfere with the Slav arrangements provided that a "sword from a smoke" was supplied on demand. The princes themselves had to supply this living tribute, being as it were representatives of the Khazars in this respect. They had to take upon themselves the entire dissatisfaction of the population in order to maintain their princely positions, of which they could be deprived at any moment by the Khagan. The system of making local princes administrators of a foreign occupier is well known in history. It has been employed in various degrees and scale in all times and in all parts of the world, but nowhere was it so finely developed as in the regions of the Volga and Dnieper rivers. Later rulers would make the local princes tools of oppression in a way that was so cunning that the princes could not shed this role.

The princes who had to recruit the "swords" from the Polan and Drevlian "smokes" could not be popular. Earlier on they had their own military units, without which no princely rule was possible. But these units everywhere were composed of volunteers and there is no

reason to assume that among the Eastern Slavs this was different. But the Khazar occupation introduced compulsory military service. It has to be noted that the local people saw this coerced duty as coming not from a distant and unknown Khagan but from their own prince.

A similar constraint was imposed also on the Severians and soon the Khazar domination extended along the left bank of Dnieper and its tributaries far to the north, to the Vyatichs. The Khazars were in a hurry to complete the organisation of their state before the dangerous boats of the Vikings and their crews, the Varangians, would extend the rule of the Rus.

The northern guests, even though at the time there was no monotheism among them, were in fact bringing in with them more culture than the Khazars who were fluent in the Old and New Testament. The Varangians showed more industry, were more able and inventive.

It seems also that the Ilmen Slavs whom the Varangians met first in the Eastern Slav lands were more advanced in culture from all their fellow Slavs, and it was they, and not the Polans, who from the beginning were the bloom of the Eastern Slav lands.

We have too little information about these times to be able to assess why culture found a more fertile ground in the North, amidst the four Lakes: Chudes (Peipus), Ladoga, White and Ilmen. Not wanting to propose any hypothesis, it is sufficient to point out the causes present in the very nature of the region. The lakes themselves (surrounded by many smaller ones) and the rivers flowing from them destined the region to be a centre of culture on the condition that people appeared who would be willing and capable of exploiting these favourable factors.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 59-60**

It has been rightly said that the Neva can be considered to be the European mouth of the Volga<sup>1</sup>. In this description everything is included. Indeed Ilmen was located on the crossroads linking the Baltic with the Black and Caspian Seas, Scandinavia with Constantinople and Islamic Asia. The whole watershed of the Volga stood open to the industriousness of the inhabitants of the other side of the Valdai Hills. All the peoples inhabiting the enormous spaces from the White Sea to the Black Sea and from the Baltic to the Caspian Sea had at least an intermediary tie with the land of the Slavs. Here was the point of attachment for everything. Here the leverages of this whole land met. And once the Scandinavian boat became known, there were no major obstacles for human endeavour throughout the region.

The Slavs found themselves in between the Khazar trade, to which they were already accustomed for a century and a half and the new Scandinavian one. Both these "spheres of influence" eventually led to occupation. The Khazars failed to reach so far. The Rus preceded them in establishing a state by force.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 71**

The Treaty of Oleg [912] was a treaty between the Varangians and the Greeks. The Byzantine Emperor made the treaty only with the Rus, and the Slav masses that came to the Bosphorus with Oleg [882-912] and under his orders were completely ignored. The Varangians

---

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Rambaud: *Histoire de la Russie*, Paris 1878, p. 11.

took Slavs with them on expeditions, but did not grant them any voice, any participation in decisions pertaining to war and peace<sup>2</sup>. All formalities, if they concerned the “Rus” side, were conducted according to the Scandinavian customary law<sup>3</sup>.

The Slav element was passive, a mere tool in the hands of the Varangians. Until 1015 the Slavs did not act on their own. They only submitted to action pressed upon them.

### **HR, vol. 1, p.73**

Meanwhile Byzantine influences on the Rus increased to such an extent that many of them were adopting Christianity from the Greeks. A new mission appeared in Kiev. The Christian cult emerged from the loess caves and a church of St. Elias was built in Igor’s capital [Kiev]. The Gospel was made known among the highest ranking Varangians.

Igor [ruler of Kievan Rus from 912 to 945] did not object, but he himself remained a pagan.

### **HR, vol. 1, p. 74-77**

Thus two currents competed among the Varangians, the heathen and the Christian and they had not only a religious significance.

---

<sup>2</sup> The text of the treaty as well as of consecutive ones passed on in later Ruthenian translations by Nestor begins with a long list of names of deputies “from the great prince of the Rus and from all principedoms of the Rus land”. There is not a single Slav name among them.

<sup>3</sup> They placed swords on the “charter” and swore the treaty in the name of the god Perun.

Since the arrival of Askold [842-882] and Rurik [862-879] 80 years had passed. The Varangian crews came without women and so they could not maintain an ethnic exclusivity. They would have dissolved within the masses of the local people were it not for the fact that until 1043 new teams continued to come from Sweden. The Varangians born within the Slav lands were of mixed origin and in 940 there was already a second generation of such people. They knew the local language from their mothers and relatives. They were bonded with the Slav families by a whole network of private interests, and this concerned particularly those Varangians who were baptised and as Christians lived in monogamy. All these represented as it were a centripetal force in contrast to the centrifugal one aiming for Byzantium. This was a conflict of permanence with temporality and at the same time of two methods of the struggle for existence: maintaining themselves from spoils or relying exclusively on peaceful benefits from trade relationships with the Greek Empire.

The centripetal force generated a party which by the force of events was politically Slav and this was regardless of their links or lack of them with Slav princes. Wanting to remain in the Dnieper watershed it was necessary to set up a state that could not be anything else but a Slav one.

Igor [913-945] himself had beside him in the person of his wife a representative of the centripetal trend, Christian and Slav. His wife, known among the Varangians as Helga (Olga) was of Slav origin (very likely the daughter of a Pskov prince) and her son, the inheritor of Igor had the Slav name of Sviatoslav.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> This fact settles any doubts about the origin of Olga about which there were many suppositions and arguments; who could have given Sviatoslav a Slav name if Olga were not a Slav?

Unexpectedly the Christian party took over power. The Byzantine tribute did not suffice to support his troops and so on their insistence Igor increased the tribute from the Drevlians. They objected and in the struggles against the Drevlian princes Igor was killed leaving an underage son. The fiction of Sviatoslav's rule was maintained so strictly that no battle was started before the child "threw" his spear, rather one should say "dropped it", because the spear fell on the fore legs of the horse on which the boy was placed. This was in 946. Since a spear was placed in his hand and he was taken to the battlefield he must have been at least seven years old, thereby he became "armed" (i.e. formally of age) at the latest in 953. Meanwhile in place of the formally reigning Sviatoslav, it was Olga who ruled (945-964) and gathered around her the Varangian Christian notables.

She made a decisive step. She received baptism in 957. This she did among particular circumstances. She had in Kiev a Christian priest, Gregory, the pastor of Kievan Christians. She was not baptised by him, nor did she bring over from Constantinople any church dignitary, even though each one of them would be happy to come over, if called, proud and glad to have the fortune and merit of obtaining for the faith the ruler of the Rus. Taking Gregory with her she travelled to Constantinople and in an unheard of example in history she received baptism beyond the borders of her own state. There she became the godchild of the Emperor, Constantine Porphyrogenitus and as such she could no longer wage war against the Emperor, because according to the notions of the time this would amount to patricide. No treaty, no oaths gave such an assurance in this respect as the fact of being a godchild, with the ties and obligations passing onto the descendants of the godfather and onto her son

Sviatoslav, should he also adopt Christianity. She must have considered that he would follow in her steps.

Olga, baptised as Helen adopted Christianity in the Greek-Catholic rite. It is obvious that she was a Catholic, because at the time the whole of Byzantium was Catholic remaining in unity with Rome<sup>5</sup>. Thus she also informed the European West, the "family of Christian nations", that it was joined by a new member. In 959 (or in 960) she sent a delegation to Emperor Otto I. The "Roman" Emperor reacted already in the following year sending bishop Adalbert to Kiev.

This was, if I may use the expression, a notification of the appearance of a new Christian state.

What state? There is no sign of any community consciousness among the peoples from whom Olga collected tributes. Their only common element was the fact that they were paying the tribute, that they were all subjected to the state. This state was that of the Nordic Rus domination and it is for this reason that it was referred to as "Ruthenia". The term had no ethnographic significance.

The Ruthenia of the time extended as far as the power of the Rus, the Varangians. Had they abandoned the Dnieper watershed, moving to the Black or Caspian Sea, the notion of "Ruthenia" would be transferred with them. But Olga worked at fixing Ruthenia in the Eastern Slav lands, as she submitted to the centripetal forces.

Her son, Sviatoslav [945-972], however, was carried by the opposite, centrifugal trend. He was of the opinion that it would be better to transfer "Ruthenia" onto the Black Sea and if possible onto the Bosphorus. The two trends competed. The centripetal, Christian trend, benefited from the fact it was in power and it held Sviatoslav

---

<sup>5</sup> The short term schism of Photius in the IX<sup>th</sup> c. was only an episode. The schism between the churches took place in 1054.

at a distance, because he was in opposition to everything that his mother had done.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 87**

The [Byzantine] proposals of peace must have been honourable for Vladimir [980–1015, son of Sviatoslav]. The Byzantines did not bring a ransom, they did not promise a tribute — these he would not have rejected. He was not offered cession of a part of Bulgaria which he would have accepted. Judging from the following events one can surmise that they were hoping to see the “Khagan” of Kiev dazzled by the great honour they were offering him in the hand of Anna, the 26-years old daughter of the Emperor. In this way he would become a relative of both Emperors, because Anna was the older sister of Theophanu, the famous in universal history wife of Otto II. For this Vladimir would have to be baptized of course, and this was the purpose of the whole arrangement.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 89-90**

Vladimir was baptized [in Kherson in 988] in the Greek-Catholic rite. He was a Catholic and the whole of Ruthenia became Catholic, because at the time there was as yet no schism, and the difference of rite was of no significance. In Kherson itself, in 988 Vladimir met papal delegates who received, just as he, parts of the relics of St. Clement. He maintained permanent relationships with Rome as is indicated by the delegations he sent there in the years 991, 994 and 1000. There was no maintaining of a distance from Rome and the West. The main Basilian monastery was not in Constantinople but

in Rome. The sister of the wife of the Kiev "Khagan" was the "Roman Empress" and thanks to this the Rurik dynasty promptly entered into relations with the Western courts. This fact benefited future generations abundantly. After a strict isolation there came a period of active relationships with the West and in particular since the occupation in 981 of the lands of the Lachs [Poles] the Rurikids became neighbours of the Piasts and the Arpads [Polish and Hungarian dynasties respectively]. Western civilizational influences, the Latin ones reached Ruthenia from the very beginning of its Christian period and they did not meet with any reluctance or any prejudice there. "And Vladimir lived in peace with the neighbouring princes, with Bolesław of Poland [992-1025] and with Stephen of Hungary [997-1038] as well as with the Czech Oldřich [1012-1033] and there was peace between them and friendship". The patriarchal form used by the chronicler expressed fully the reality. The question of the lands of the Lachs could have not have spoiled the relationships with the Piasts because these territories had not been taken from them and were not part of any policy of the Piasts. Bolesław the Great did not know the lands of the Lachs and so far he had never been there.

While on good terms with both Byzantium and the West, Vladimir remained his own master. He was not a godchild of the Greek Emperor and thus he could wage war against him again. The Varangians had something in common with the Romans that a defeat did not interrupt their intentions. The hopes as well as the further realisation of Byzantine plans had to be postponed because the times were most unfavourable. The Emperor's daughter Anna kept an eye over the furthering of Christianity and the importance of the clergy increased. Should Vladimir commit the sin of taking up arms against his Emperor, he would have met with very diverse opinions, divided

unequally in his disfavour, with Sviatopolk being at the head of the opposition waiting for change.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 99**

Meanwhile the Polish prince settled among the Polans and Drevlians. He had no intention of staying in Ruthenia, nor did he leave his permanent garrisons there. After a few months he returned even though he was the victorious master of the situation. Boleslaw the Great wanted to have supremacy over Kiev just as he had over Pomerania, Elbeland and Moravia. The peace treaty of Bautzen made him master of the western Slavs; now his plans were extending eastwards.

Bolesław the Great became the initiator of the pan-Slavic idea.

These aims and intentions inclined Bolesław and so after the victory on the Bug River he moved on to Kiev. Were it only a question of restoring Sviatopolk [1015-1016, 1018-1019] he would have returned immediately. The road to Kiev was open to his son-in-law and there was no need to conquer "the mother of the Ruthenian forts" because locally there was no opponent. It is erroneous to claim that Bolesław conquered Kiev. If he did indeed strike the Golden Gate (so called because of the adjacent Byzantine jewelleryes) with his sword (the Szczerbiec [famous sword used at the coronation of future Polish kings]), it is obvious that he considered himself to be the master there.

The realm of Bolesław extended from the Rivers Elbe to the Dnieper.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 100-101**

With clear consciousness Bolesław abandoned the cause of his son-in-law even though he had only victories in Ruthenia and he could have kept him in Kiev.

It became apparent that to retain Kiev he would have to keep a garrison there. A policy of conquest and occupation was not what he had in mind when he moved to Ruthenia and he was not prepared for this. Should he have decided upon such a program in the future inevitably he would have to occupy the land of the Lachs first. This was so because the mode of operation of the Piasts was different from that of the Rurikids. They would jump over whole territories setting up posts hundreds of miles beyond their subdued territory, whereas the Piasts were building a state. What they occupied they administered, ruled and organized; they progressed on a strict territorial basis without jumping over anything. Thus if there were any intentions with respect to the Kiev Ruthenia (in fact undertaken later by Bolesław the Bold), they had to be postponed to a later time when a state organisation was introduced in the lands of the Lachs and when Mazovia was incorporated. The recognition of tribal differences between the eastern and western Slav lands, something that was observable during these expeditions, must have led to the conclusion that first one had to unify all the lands that are akin by nature. Bolesław took the land of the Lachs and the incorporation of Mazovia was done by his son Mieszko II. Only when the state was consolidated on its eastern flank could it have conducted a policy of conquest with respect to Ruthenia.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 102**

Cordial relationships developed between the Piasts and the Rurikids. There are no signs of any antagonism due to the differences of rite (after all Ruthenia was still Catholic) and Yaroslav [1016–1054] was inclined towards the Western, Latin world.

## **HR, vol 1, p. 103**

At that time Yaroslav was preparing to invade Byzantium. Obviously the Church hierarchy had no political clout in his court. Yaroslav himself was already 65 years old and so he did not plan to personally lead the invasion. He appointed his son Vladimir for the purpose. For the last time, in this year 1043, Varangian troops were brought in from overseas, and the expedition to conquer the golden city was also the last one. The simultaneity of these two facts is notable. The plans pertaining to the Balkan Peninsula were not a Slav issue, but only a Varangian one. They did not derive from the needs or relationships within the indigenous society. They were only the project of the conquerors, armed nomads, who felt everywhere at home, wherever their swords operated. For them it did not matter where would Rus be, i.e. their own rule, and in fact it would suit them best to organize their “Rus” in the Balkans.

The Varangians came to Ruthenia as long as it was the “road to the Greeks”. The moment Kiev ceased to be a military post against Constantinople, the Varangian immigration ceased.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 106-107**

The Varangians did not impose at all any organization on the local society and they themselves were not building a state. Should we want to consider their rule as a state aspect of the history of the Eastern Slav lands at the time, we would perceive something unknown in the West, namely the bifurcation of the society from the state.

The Varangian invasion did not change anything in the tribal arrangements of the Slavs, because the Varangians did not introduce any organisation whatsoever among the Slav population. They were not engaged in the establishment of a government, an administration or a judiciary among the Slavs.

Thus the Slav princes and princelings remained initially in position as was the case during the Khazar domination. They operated still under Olga, but later they disappeared without any sign. Under Vladimir there is no sign of them. They were not removed by violence. They disappeared because there was no reason for their existence. The genesis of princely rule was war, and this was not in their hands. A war between tribes, between peoples, was out of the question, because the Rurikids imposed an internal peace over the Slav peoples, which continued until the end of Vladimir's rule, whereas external wars were the responsibility of the Varangians and their princes.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 115**

The Varangians remained a mobile element, camping temporarily and they had no plans to organise a state,

while at the same time the Slav elements of statehood dwindled, wilted and disappeared.

A state to begin with must have borders, a territory that is strictly defined. The Ruthenia, also in the days of Yaroslav, had not such limits in any direction.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 129**

The attitude of Byzantium towards Ruthenia was very friendly, in fact, too friendly. If there was anything that could be regretted is the fact that during the generations soon after baptism the Byzantine influence was weak and in excessive sympathy, Byzantium lowered its influence even more, granting the newly converted a Slav liturgy. By this fact alone, not Greek but Bulgarian influences came to the fore in the Church. Church culture managed therefore completely without the knowledge of the Greek language. A priest who could directly absorb first hand Byzantine influences was an exception.

Thus Vladimir introduced into Ruthenia what had been ignored by his father Sviatoslav, who on conquering eastern Bulgaria did not even proclaim himself to be the Tsar of Bulgaria, nor was he in any way affected by Bulgarian culture. Already for several decades the Bulgarians had their own script, the so called Cyrillic that was invented for them by a monk Cyril from Preslav during the days of Tsar Simeon (888–927). This script adapted to the needs of the Bulgarian language was more convenient than the Glagolitic of St. Cyril (Constantine) and in comparison with it represented a progress. It contained also this advantage that it was similar to the Byzantine “uncial” used in Greek liturgical texts. With fervour transliterations of the Glagolitic texts into Cyrillic were made and new translations from Greek were rendered in

Cyrillic. The Bulgarians already had their own "Nomo-canon", a compilation of Church and civil laws that was known and used in Ruthenia.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 134**

Already in the days of Vladimir an obnoxious symptom of religious mania was transferred to Ruthenia from Byzantium, namely the practice of castration. There were castrates on Mount Athos and in female convents only such chaplains were accepted, as well as physicians, stewards etc. In Kiev the first castrate appeared already in 1004 and later even bishops were castrates. During meditation the monks had visions of angels appearing in the form of... castrates.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 136-137**

In Church writings and to a larger extent in monastic ones certain political tendencies can be observed. The Church introduced Byzantine influences aiming at the conversion of the Rurikid rule into a state and this was to be done by the changing the family dynastic law into a simple succession of son after father (thus it sympathized with the *izgoi*<sup>6</sup>), by the making of regional princes into representatives of the Kiev prince and by the empowering the latter with unlimited absolute authority. The mode of addressing the Kiev prince in the writings of Hilarion was characteristic. The intent was to stress the monarchic dignity of the prince in respect towards

---

<sup>6</sup> [Deprived of succession rights descendants of princes whose fathers did not rule because they died before their own fathers; derelicts].

all the other princes who were to be simple executioners of the will dictated from Kiev. It was impossible to refer to him as an emperor, because an emperor could be only Byzantine or Roman. The royal title was unknown in the East and the idea of Grand Prince did not come to mind as yet. The founder of the Pechersk Lavra, and later Metropolitan of Kiev did not hesitate to refer to the still not defunct Khazar tradition so as to distinguish the Kiev prince; he called therefore Vladimir and Yaroslav Khagans.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 139-140**

The attitude of Yaroslav to the Church was such that he readily made use of it. He founded monasteries and stone churches, repaying for the support of his interests, but he had no intention of submitting to any influence of the bishops or the Lavra whenever the Church was of a different opinion than the "Khagan". Proof of this can be found in his expedition against Byzantium. It is obvious that the relationships between the lay and Church authorities were affected. Yaroslav could not be haughty after his defeat. He repented his sin and to prove that he was eradicating all remnants of paganism in his family, he exhumed the bones of his uncles Yaropolk and Oleg and... baptized them. This happened in 1044. The history of Christianity does not record any other incident of this kind. Obviously the population was not well versed in the Gospel at the time and rightly soon after this event Hilarion referred to the faithful of his Metropolitan See as a "meagre flock", since the Church allowed for the demonstration of the need for baptism by baptizing bones, a manner bordering on the profanation of the sacrament. But devotion did not prevent

the prince from forcing the Church to abide by his will. So as to ensure that the hierarchy dependent upon Constantinople would not interfere with his or his successor's next expedition against the Empire he proclaimed a schism after the death of metropolitan Cyril I. He called the bishops and ignoring the Patriarch of Constantinople demanded that they elect Hilarion as Metropolitan (year 1051) trusting that he would make appropriate nominations for the other episcopal sees. The next vacancy in the Metropolitan See came a year after the death of Yaroslav. Allegiance to Constantinople was reinstated and a Greek sent by the Patriarch was accepted as the Metropolitan. This is clear proof that the sons of Yaroslav terminated the policy of treating Ruthenia as only a "road to Greece".

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 142**

The will of the Rurikids made Kiev into a capital against social development, because Kiev was the southernmost station on "the road to Greece". The priority of Kiev was based on the intent to conquer Constantinople.

The proximity of the Metropolitan See, actually organised not in Kiev itself but in the principedom of Kiev, increased the importance of the Kiev princes. The secular hegemony was tied with the ecclesiastic. The Church was in favour of maintaining this hegemony, because it linked its monarchic ideals with the person and the first born (or else the eldest of the living) descendant of those who made Christianity the dominating religion, namely Vladimir, Yaroslav and Iziaslav who were primarily Kievan princes. The Church made out of Kiev "the mother of Ruthenian forts" and the Church formulated this opinion both orally and in writing. A tradition developed and then it operated through inertia.

The southern element was to govern over the northern one, even though it was weaker and less developed. Obviously a reaction against this had to develop in the North. The North wanted independence and at the head of this movement stood the townspeople of Novgorod.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 165-166**

There was no political thought in these constant movements and expeditions [of various princes against one other in 1077], nor in the thousands of future ones. This was not a war over primogeniture or over independence of the Church from Rome, but only to diminish the proceeds of some relative. In this turmoil only two princes had some ideas. Iziaslav was a clear representative of Western influences while Vsevoid can be considered a representative of Byzantinism.

Vsevoid was married to the daughter of the Greek Emperor Constantine Monomachos and a niece of Anna the wife of Vladimir. He married one of his daughters to Leon, the son of Emperor Diogenes maintaining constant relationships with the Byzantine court. Emperor Michael VII applied to him for help against rebelling Kherson. He expedited the younger princes on condottiere raids by land and sea towards the Balkans, using them as hired mercenaries. Being related to Byzantium, he was morally closest to the imperial and patriarchal court and he willingly used all this against Iziaslav, but he did not manifest any convictions or personal feelings against "Latinism". He himself was the son of a Latin lady Ingigerda, and at that very time (1074) he married his son, Vladimir (Monomakh) with a Catholic of the Western rite, a daughter of England's Harold (who was killed in the battle of Hastings in 1066). His inclination

towards Byzantium resulted from the maintaining of the former Varangian traditions, which he wanted to resuscitate and carefully transmit to his son. His son adopted the nickname "Monomakh" after his Greek grandfather and began to organize his court in Greek fashion. They dreamt of becoming masters where for the time being they were appearing as mercenaries. Thus they attentively watched Byzantine issues and at times they seemed to be opponents of Catholicism. In reality they were not interested in confessional issues at all.

Vsevolod was also drawn in the warring turmoil between princes. He was attacked by nephews so much so that in 1078 they called the Cumans against him. Unfortunately this example found later many followers and the pagan nomads did not have to conquer the forts of Southern Ruthenia because almost always they were in cooperation and alliance with some of the princes. History should record for Iziaslav that he fulfilled the role of the head of the dynasty. As soon as Vsevolod, his enemy was endangered by the Cumans, he came with assistance to his side. He proved by his own blood that he had a consciousness of overriding interests, whereas the other princes knew only personal ones. Unfortunately he was killed in the battle of Nezhatina Niva (near Chernigov) on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of October 1078.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 171-172**

In place of the killed one [Yaropolk], the youngest of the sons of Iziaslav, namely Sviatopolk came in and in 1093, after the death of Vsevolod, he became the elder of the dynasty and prince of Kiev. Sviatopolk II (1093-1113) some time earlier had paid homage to the Pope in Rome in the name of his father and brother and he brought from

there the title of King for his father. All his life he remained a decided Uniate and friend of the West, an ally of the Piasts. Metropolitan Ephraim (1090–1096), a cast-rate formerly at the court of Iziaslav, was also a Uniate.

An ultimate proof that remained indelible over centuries that the Ruthenian Church province was in union with Rome at the time can be seen till this day [1917] in every Russian household. That is the icon of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker placed always in an honourable position. Devotion to this saint, who was a bishop of Myra in Lycia, in Asia Minor in the IV<sup>th</sup> c., began in Europe towards the end of the XI<sup>th</sup> c. when in 1083 the relics of the saint were brought to Bari in Italy. On this occasion Pope Urban II introduced a Church feast on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May, which was not accepted by the schismatic Church of Greece. It was however adopted by Ephraim in the eparchies of his Metropolitan See. Nowhere has the cult of St. Nicholas spread so much as in the Eastern Slav lands thereby giving us evident historical proof. A second indicator attached to this is the limited cult of St. Andrew, the most cherished saint of the Byzantine Church.

During the days of Sviatopolk II the Metropolitan See was transferred from Pereyaslav to Kiev, under some circumstances about which Nestor preferred to remain silent and about which we know nothing.

The majority of princes were not concerned about this. The dynastic relationships were becoming tragic. The princes were caring most of all for the friendship of the Cumans so as to have them on their side in the confrontations with their rivals.

## **HR, vol. 1, p.173-174**

Neither the Church issue nor that of the Cumans was of greater importance to the princes than the blinding of

Vasil. This for them was an incident of the greatest importance and it affected them to the core. In Byzantium this form of exercising revenge was common and even it was considered "justice" to condemn someone to being blinded, particularly with respect to political prisoners. As many as 800 Varangians had experienced this Byzantine law when they were captured prisoners during the expedition of 1043. Corporal punishments and injuries had already moved from Byzantium to Western Europe including the wild "truncations", namely the cutting off of limbs. For a Varangian however, this was something unthinkable and so obnoxious that he reacted with horror and disgust. In the customary law of the Varangians and the Slavs there was no death penalty, nor the inflicting of physical injuries. Vladimir Monomakh, one of the most active princes of the time wrote down advice for his sons, urging them not to have recourse to the death penalty under any circumstances. But it is known that these princes hired bandits against one other! Had David killed Vasil secretly he would have become subject to the vendetta of the latter's relatives and the issue would have been settled thus. The family chronicles of Rurikids were already accustomed to such events. But blinding somebody happened for the first time and the entire dynasty became indignant seeing in this something worse than murder. David was recognised as a degenerate, an outcast from the family, a disgrace and violator not of the laws but of the very moral consciousness. It is difficult not to agree that in such a view there was a great deal of a healthy natural instinct.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 178-180**

Monomakh was the first diplomat and Sviatopolk II the first fiscalist, that is, a prince who wanted to introduce

a regular system of treasury earnings. Absolutely everywhere in Europe the onset of fiscal policy was handled by the Jews, for the very simple reason that only they among “the prince’s people” were prepared for the task. The same was in Kiev where there was no shortage of Jews. Old relationships with the Khazars forged their way and they became an essential factor in trade because they knew the languages of both East and West. Besides the first immigration of eastern Jews arriving from Persia, Armenia and the ancient Khazaria, already in the XI<sup>th</sup> c. there was a second wave of immigration from Hungary and Czech Prague as well from even further, from Germany. In Kiev a distinct Jewish neighbourhood was established and since this community could not belong to any local social organization, to any class or family, as everywhere in Europe, they were under the direct dependence and protection of the local rulers, as “the prince’s people”. Sviatopolk II employed them (probably the Jews from the West) to manage his treasury and they successfully increased his earnings. It seems that the tax on market trade was increased, a more strict control was imposed over the earnings of the townspeople, and tributes were exerted from incomes that previously were not taxed etc. This can be seen from the fact that the Kiev people started to hate the Jews, and as soon as Sviatopolk closed his eyes a pogrom of the Jewish district took place and their mansions were sacked.

Oleg Sviatoslavic, the legitimate heir of Kiev, being a pauper prince would have undoubtedly continued the fiscal policies introduced by Sviatopolk. The very rich Monomakh profited from the situation and promised that he would not look too closely into the pockets of the townspeople with the help of the Jews and that he would reduce taxes. As a consequence he was “invited” by the Kievan people to be their prince and rule. He had enough

strength to respond to this invitation. He did not expel the Jews from Kiev. The Jewish quarter remained as it was and we have evidence of this from the year 1124. This part of the city even grew since later (in the years 1146 and 1151) one of the city gates was referred to as the "Jewish gate". Monetary management developed in a comprehensive way in Kiev because as we know during the days of Monomakh [1113-1125] regulations about percentage interest were introduced and such a development of economic relationships was always accompanied by an increase of the Jewish element.

The second circumstance why Vladimir Monomakh was popular in the South and was invited to Kiev was the fact that from among all the princes he seemed to deal with the Cumans best. We know that this was the most important issue for Southern Ruthenia and for the city of Kiev this was a question of life and death. Monomakh was not a conqueror of the Cumans as it used to be said, praising him for having battled against them 83 times. If somebody has had to confront the same opponent so many times, the very number is proof that he did not ever beat them! He made peace with them 19 times. We have already discussed this issue above showing that the overpowering of the Mongolian nomads with the forces of Ruthenia alone was impossible. Even Monomakh could not help this. But he is credited with the merit that throughout his life he dealt with the issue and never remained indifferent to it. He did not restrict himself to defensive moves when attacked, but he also operated against them, considered and prevented their moves. He incorporated the Cuman issue into his policy. He took part in Cuman affairs, used diplomacy among the pagan princes and meddled in their internal conflicts, supporting some against others. At no time did he have the totality of the barbarians against himself. Always he

could rely on some friends among the steppes whom he could artfully use. Many times he took to the field two or three times in a year, being himself the attacker, but only against some specific Horde and as an ally of some other Horde. Not being able to expel the Cumans from his vicinity he did everything he could to weaken the potency of their pressure, and that was a historical achievement. He did not hesitate to marry one of his sons, Yuri (the Long Armed) [1132, 1134-1135, 1149-1151, 1155-1157[Do czego odnoszą się te daty? Do małżeństwa? Czy do walk? Jeśli do walk, to powinno być wyżej, ale Monomach zmarł w 1125.] with a Cuman princess<sup>7</sup> since his calculations at the time required this.

He was asked to rule over Kiev because the Kievan people felt most safe under him.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 187-189**

The sons of Iziaslav resigned from dealing with Ruthenian issues at a time when Western and Eastern influences were to combat one another fiercely. At issue was the question whether the Eastern Slav lands would maintain a link with Western Europe or whether they would separate themselves from the Latin civilization and even stand opposed to it. Only in the Pechersk Lavra the matter was already resolved, but the metropolitans and princes at times had different views. The issue was not lost so long as hatred and disdain of Rome had not passed on to the written texts. This aspect of Byzantinism was still absent in the writings of the monk Jacob

---

<sup>7</sup> Nestor reports this under the year 1107. At the same time also Oleg of Chernigov adopted a Cuman daughter-in-law. Marriages with the Cumans soon became common.

from the Lavra, in his story glorifying Olga and Vladimir (*Память и похвала*) [Memory and Praise] as well as in a second one glorifying Boris and Gleb (*Сказание у цтрадание и похвала*) [Legend and Suffering and Praise] from around the year 1080. This trend is also not to be seen in the description of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (*Паломник Иерусалимский*) [The Pilgrim of Jerusalem] of igumen Daniel from the beginning of the XII<sup>th</sup> c. But the historical writings of the Lavra were different. The monk Ikon finished in 1073 the compiling of the first "Kiev-Pechersk" annual and in 1095 a second *свод* [dome, vault] of the chronicle was ready, the one which until recently was considered to be the first and as such was given the title *начельный* [initial]. On the basis of it a dozen or so years later the *Повесть временных лет* [The tale of Bygone Years] was produced, (probably) by monk Nestor of the Lavra, which was ready in 1116 and which became difused later and is generally known under the name of *Chronicles of Nestor*. This work was decidedly hostile towards Rome and it has had a tremendous influence on the clergy and through the clergy, on the whole of Ruthenia. This was at a time when the relationships with Rome were not only lively but also friendly. At that time in Novgorod lived the pious Anthony, referred to as the Roman (he came from Rome) and he attained the status of a saint in spite of his "Romanism".

The *Chronicle* of Nestor promotes the highest contempt of Roman Catholicism. This can simultaneously serve as evidence that Catholicism must have had supporters in Ruthenia since it was necessary to combat them. All traces of a Church attachment of Ruthenia to Rome are erased to such an extent that had we had no other sources apart from the *Chronicle* of Nestor, we would have to erroneously hold that from the very beginning the whole of Ruthenia was consciously Orthodox,

in conscious opposition to Catholicism. The chronicler is full of support for the personal virtues of Iziaslav I, but he commiserates his hard luck that he had to “walk in foreign lands, wandering here and there” — concealing the fact that he travelled to the West and that in Rome he obtained the regal title. And so it is at every step. What sort of notions Nestor’s Chronicle spread about religion in general and about Catholicism in particular can be briefly shown citing only one fragment:

*Do not accept the teachings of the Latins, because their doctrine is erroneous. For when they enter the church, they do not venerate the icons, but they stand upright and only bow. Having done this, they trace a cross on the ground and then kiss it, but when they arise, they stand upon it. Thus while prostrate they kiss it, and yet upon arising they trample it underfoot... Furthermore, they call the earth their mother. If the earth is their mother, then heaven is their father. But, in the beginning God made heaven and earth. Why do they say, “Our Father who art in Heaven.” If, according to their understanding, the earth is the mother, why do you spit upon your mother? Once you kiss her and then pollute her?... They disseminate their teachings... holding on not to the same confession of faith, but to various ones. For some of these priests conduct services being married to one wife, and others being married to seven wives. There are diversities among them in many things. Avoid their doctrine; they absolve sins through indulgences, and this is the worst abuse of all<sup>8</sup>.*

In all places in the *Chronicle* of Nestor where issues of faith are mentioned, it is clear that the author did not

---

<sup>8</sup> [This is taken from the translation of Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor of 1930, p. 115–116, Harvard, USA].

know what differed the Eastern Church from the Western, because he totally lacked theological knowledge. He hated blindly and gathered his information from gossip like the one about the polygamy of Roman Catholic clergy. Writing this he must have remembered that in his younger days Metropolitan Georgi (after 1070) was compelled to issue a specific law requiring that a candidate for the priesthood who had a wife had to go through a Church wedding before he was ordained.

This *Chronicle* that spread worldwide from the Lavra and was transcribed and sent in all directions must have had a strong influence on minds. Its very origin from the Lavra gave to it with the mark, as if, of a Sacred Book.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 190-191**

In the days of Nestor there were 180 monks in the Lavra. They varied much and the monastery did not excel in discipline. Occasionally there were *крамолы* [seditions, rebellions] against the igumens. All were literate, but an excessive interest in books led to suspicion of heresy. Up to the Mongol invasion the Lavra produced only five writers. The worst possible heresy was "Latinism", but the purity of faith was guarded by the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople with which the Lavra maintained a close relationship taking advice from there.

The importance of the Lavra grew as the Rurikids were making new conquests in the North-East, on the Oka and Volga Rivers. The traders and Varangian troops were followed by monks from the Pechersk Lavra who often established branches of the mother monastery there. The Church cannot be accused that its missions showed the way for conquests. Church missionaries arrived only in places where earlier an armed Varangian warrior ap-

peared and has proven to be in charge. They did not convert the Cumans or the Bulgars, but restricted themselves to the watershed of Oka and upper Volga. The oldest mention of them in a region was always preceded by earlier information about the princes and their armed troops.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 192-194**

A pagan reaction immediately after more intensive missionary activity occurred in all countries and it is the most common historical phenomenon. Thus it is not strange in the history of the Eastern Church, but what is uncommon is that none of the missionaries, both Christian and pagan were finally victorious. Both propagandas were reconciled in a strange and even bizarre way in the Finnish mentality and what resulted was what is referred to in Russian as the *двоеверье* [dual faith]. This later passed onto the Russian mentality and it continues to be a typical Russian characteristic until our days, not only in the field of religion.

A Mari, Muromian and later Mordvin, Cheremis etc. would become a man of two faiths, of two moral faces, a spiritual Janus. He was a Christian because he believed in the divinity of Christ, worshipped the Most Holy Virgin and the saints. Sometimes he even received the sacraments, but he did not cease to be a pagan, maintaining not only the religious system of his *волхвы* [shamans] but developed it further under the influence of Christianity. The Gospel helped there to perfect a heathen system. Christian dogmas, the cult of the saints and a number of the so called sacramentals helped to generate new superstitions and the liturgy became as if a perfected form of incantations, evoking spirits and overpowering minds

with an even deeper belief in the potency of formulas. A "convert" adopted from Christianity only as much as he was able to paganise in his mind, assimilate it to the heathen level. If it was required of him that he abandon his former faith and this requirement was changed into a forced demand, an order imposed by violence, than he pretended to be a Christian in a church while in his soul he remained an even more stubborn heathen.

It is possible that a "dual faith", more or less evident, is a transitory state everywhere, wherever the evangelisation of heathens takes place. The history of conversions has not been treated ably so far, thus we cannot know anything for sure about the matter. Even if a dual faith should prove to be a common transitional state among all peoples, it remains a specifically and uniquely Russian phenomenon that this "transitional" state persists over centuries and till this day it has not yet ended. It is as if the intellectual development of the masses in the millions has been charmed at some point, changing a moment into eternity. It seems that the moving wave of life has suddenly been petrified, being unable to come to new life for further movement.

There can be only one reason for the "dual faith" and that is the missionary inefficiency of the Pechersk Lavra and of all its branches, in particular throughout the Orthodox Church in general. Obviously these missionaries taught religion in an inappropriate way. Unfortunately it has to be said that they taught what they themselves did not know properly. Lack of theological education was from the very beginning a characteristic of the clergy in the Eastern Slav lands. We never hear about clerical students being sent to Constantinople for training. Persons from the upper classes did not join the clergy. Initially higher ranking Varangians entered the monasteries as well as rich traders and even members of the dynasty.

But this ceased in the mid XI<sup>th</sup> c. and from then on the entire clergy was recruited only from the common people. The constitution of the whole Orthodox Church system manifested strange inadequacies. The issue of marriages of the clergy was not understood at all. Even according to the Greek Church canons a priest cannot marry. Only a married man may become a priest, married before his ordination. In consequence a widowed priest cannot remarry. But in the Eastern Slav lands it was a frequent practice that a priest who received ordination as a celibate later married and it was only during the times of the Metropolitan Peter [1308–1326] a ruling was made that widowed priests were to enter monasteries. Also the Orthodox Church lacked a proper organisation. A bishopric was where the prince wanted it to be and the Metropolitan was as if absent. Over all these times only twice did the Metropolitan act as a superior of the bishops. This was in 1055 and a second time a hundred years later in 1156 and in both cases at issue was a civil, not an ecclesial matter. The luminaries of the Church, the bishops were completely dependent on the princes, the more so, since they did not set up any unified corporate body under the head of the Metropolitan, and so they had no means of striving for independence from the secular power. In fact the Pechersk Lavra stood at the head of the Church and it impressed upon it its own theological ignorance. Christianity was at too low a level to be able to attain a full moral victory over paganism and thus the “dual faith” resulted.

Just as the bishops did not maintain any link with the Metropolitan, so also the Metropolitans did not care about having a relationship with the Patriarch. Almost never did they travel to Constantinople. Throughout the whole period under discussion we know of only two such visits, in 1073 and in 1145.

For the Rurikids the confessional schism was still an indifferent issue, completely ignored by them. They remembered well that they were not a Slav clan and they continued to consider themselves as true members of the Scandinavian-Norman society, scattered over the whole of Europe, but not losing the consciousness that Scandinavia was their real fatherland.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 204-205**

Kuchko, a trading magnate was not happy about the arrival of a prince of his own faith and clan. He managed well for so many years without a native ruler. He needed no help or defence from him. He was losing by the fact that his prince arrived. He was reduced to second rank and obliged to pay the prince a tribute or tax. He was of the opinion that he was losing morally and materially by the appearance of Yuri the Long Armed [1132, 1134-1135, 1149-1151, 1155-1157 Znowu nie wiadomo co to cyfry oznaczają? Nie pojawiają się w tekście polskim. To są daty, czy strony?] and so he stood in sharp opposition to him.

As a rule history provides us with examples how immigrants are glad when a native ruler takes over the country in which they settled. As a rule they strive for this as much as they can. There, however, on the Moscow and Klyazma Rivers, these two were in mutual opposition, a representative of society and private initiative Kuchko and a representative of state authority, Yuri the Long Armed.

Apparently the local conditions were such that the prince could not manage without Kuchko. In order to appease his opposition the princely arrival married into the family of the trading immigrant. On the memorable

day of 28<sup>th</sup> of March 1147 there occurred “a banquet in Moscow” that was emphatically recorded in the historical sources. Yuri the Long Armed married his son Andrei, (later known by the sobriquet Bogolyubsky) with Kuchko’s daughter. This did not help in the crux of the issue. The relationships had an inexorable logic. Kuchko continued to oppose the prince until the conflict was resolved by murder. Kuchko was killed and his possessions were confiscated by the prince.

Such were the beginnings of Moscow. The name “Kuchkovo” annoyed the prince, now the ruler and owner of the settlement. It was therefore not used, and the place was called only a “settlement on the River Moscow”, later shortened to “Moscow”. The original name, by the will of the prince, was forgotten.

Kuchkovo was needed just as much by the trader and the prince, by the representative of society and the ruler of the state. Was there no place on Kuchko’s possessions where a princely garrison could be established? Was there no place next to the prince for private property and private enterprise?

“Beyond the forest” [*Залесье, Zalesye*] a New Ruthenia was developing and it took over the original sin of Old Ruthenia in the Eastern Slav lands: a divergence of the ways of society and that of the state.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 207**

The son of Yuri the Long Armed, Andrei Bogolyubsky [1169-1174] considered Kiev not worth the bother. He was the first prince for whom Kiev did not represent a *pretium affectionis* [the price of affection]. Clear-headed, and born and brought up in Suzdal, he realized that Kiev was more of a ballast than a benefit and that

"Zalesye", safe from nomads, inhabited by a peaceful Finnish population and already endowed plentifully with garrisons and forts that allowed for the domination of the crossroads for great and profitable trade routes, was much better suited as a site for dynastic potency.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 215-216**

There were absolutely no Byzantine influences on public life. The notion of autocracy died out even in the Orthodox Church. The Church had too little knowledge to be able to lead society. It ceased to rise above it.

A clear proof that the idea of autocracy was alien even to the Church is given in the fact that chroniclers, men of the cloth, did not consider the Kiev prince as being superior, higher than the other princes. There was no such thing as a Kievan Grand Prince! Until the middle of XI<sup>th</sup> c. we meet this title in chronicles very rarely and this only on special occasions as a ceremonial title for example when honourably describing the funeral of a prince. The title of the Grand Prince began to be used not in the South, but in Zalesye, in New Ruthenia. The so called *Nikonov Chronicle* which was written in the Suzdal region used the title profusely and the first prince who was honoured with it as referring also to the South was Andrei Bogolyubsky. He was the first who demanded that he be so called, and it was he who did not want to be the prince of Kiev. This title proves that he aimed for superiority over the Rurikids wanting to pass on to his descendants the idea of hegemony.

**HR, vol. 1, p. 219**

It ceased to be important who was prince in Kiev, provided that he did not oppose the “Grand Prince” of Zalesye.

Gradually his hegemony was being accepted as if as a prize for having demoted Kiev. Novgorod, having defended itself from his rapacity, made an alliance with him against Kiev and it accepted as a prince for itself a son of Bogolyubsky.

There was opposition only in one place, there on the Moscow River, in the centre of his rule. The spirit of Kuchkovo was still persisting. We do not know the details. All we know is that Andrei ordered one of the Kuchko sons to be beheaded as a consequence of which he fell victim of the wrath of another son, who organized a plot and did not relent till the prince was killed on June 29<sup>th</sup> 1174 while staying in his favourite place called Bogolyubovo.

The last act of the first Grand Prince was to organize a renewed expedition against the Volga Bulgars in the winter of 1172. In spite of the unfavourable season further advances were made. The delta of Oka River was taken for good. In the next generation this proved to be of great significance as a site for the later Nizhny Novgorod! In the days of Bogolyubsky it was not yet understood that in 1172 in fact the construction of a transverse route and its various branches was completed and at issue was only the question whether the following “Grand Princes” will remain lords over this route.

Since the days of Andrei Bogolyubsky the title of Grand Prince became permanent and thus the claim of superiority over other members of the dynasty.

## HR, vol. 1, p. 220-222

If under "Rus" [Ruthenia] we were to understand only a dynastic community it would have to be said that Andrei Bogolyubsky terminated the Rus.

The northern lands of Zalesye over which he ruled were not considered part of Ruthenia and he did not want them to be treated as such because he did not want that they would serve as an extension of the dynastic community.

A visible sign of the separation of Zalesye from Ruthenia was to be the severing of Church ties. Bogolyubsky wanted to have his own Metropolitan, designating Vladimir on Klyazma as his See. In this connection in 1162 he sent to Luke Chrysoberges, the Patriarch of Constantinople, a certain Feodor (Theodore) whom he designated as candidate for the office of the Metropolitan. He failed to achieve anything in Constantinople and as a result the whole Ruthenian Orthodox Church became annoyed by this action. So he nominated this Feodor as bishop of Rostov bypassing the Kiev Metropolitan and sent him to Constantinople for ordination. The Chroniclers wrote very negatively about this Feodor so much so that he is remembered by posterity as the *совершенный злодей* [the perfect villain]. The clergy started to rebel but this ended with the closing of all churches. Cyril, the bishop of Turov was constantly preaching to Bogolyubsky and he was the first to excommunicate Feodor. This was followed by other bishops until finally the prince succumbed to the Church and he sent Feodor to be judged by the Kiev Metropolitan. There Feodor had his tongue and right hand amputated and his eyes were gouged out. In this way the Orthodox Church avenged the attempt of severing from Ruthenia.

Andrei Bogolyubsky was hoping to set up his own personal state severing all dependence on the clan law. All the Rurikids would be willing to claim their rights to the most profitable province, but he intended to abolish all these rights. He used every opportunity to stress that he does not consider himself superior over his relatives on account of his title of origin, as “father” of the family among “younger” brothers — this they were prepared to accept — but he considered them as his subjects, regardless of family ties. This was the political thinking of Andrei which would have led to the establishment of a state out of the realms of the Rurikids had the idea been continued. But this was a question of political might. Andrei failed to impose this principle upon his relatives. When the Smolensk prince Mstislav the Brave severely offended Andrei’s legates by shaving off their beards and sending them back so disfigured, thereby showing that he was no subject of Bogolyubsky, the latter failed with his revenge on time. The issue of the new title of Grand Prince got stuck mid-way, and the title did not acquire clout.

Andrei did not link any town with his title. This was also a novelty. He was not the Grand Prince of Rostov, or Suzdal, or Vladimir but equally of all the forts that he had under his dominion. The official title was *Великий Князь всея ростовские земли* [Grand Prince of the whole Rostov land] and this involved the equality of all the forts of the land towards the prince. The land was named after the oldest fort, but no special rights were attributed to Rostov.

This was contrary to all contemporary notions and the whole social order of the Eastern Slav lands. Bogolyubsky was too progressive for his times, and so he did not generate any political current that would follow up his plans, neither among the princes nor in society at large.

The contemporaries profited from his sudden death to vehemently obliterate all signs of his activities.

### **HR, vol. 1, p. 231**

For such a ship carpenter it was necessary to wait until... Peter the Great, who when he was practicing shipbuilding did not know that he was referring back to the lost traditions of the olden times in the days of Andrei Bogolyubsky, when the "window to Europe" was already opened but then walled up by him and his successors. Novgorod could not maintain its maritime plans, because it had to use all its energy to defend itself against "the Grand Princes of the whole Rostov land" who wanted to block its hinterland and access to goods coming from the northeast.

### **HR, vol. 1, p. 233**

The majority of princes did not rise to monarchic positions and they fell to the rank of individuals, for whom birth was linked with a profession, namely leading an armed unit. The princely power did not increase but was falling, declining in importance. Towards the end of the XII<sup>th</sup> and in the beginning of the XIII<sup>th</sup> century the vast majority of princes were small condottieri searching for employment at some town, as if at its service, defending the trading interests of the towns. Towns could not manage without them, because it was impossible to have trading security without an armed force. But when this force did not serve the town dwellers conflicts erupted which increasingly frequently ended with the expulsion of one prince and the replacement of him by another. The

prince had to be obedient towards the town and thus he was allowed to call himself prince of that town. The title was maintained even in Novgorod the Great where the *княжсене* [princely reign] ceased to be a true rule and was reduced only to the performance of certain public functions at the request of the city council.

The towns had their own interests and the princes had their own.

### **HR, vol. 1, p. 243**

The Kievan prince was already one of the weaker princes, but he did not want to recognise a Grand Prince above himself. Not having the force to oppose the lords of the Rostov land he found a different, simpler way. He too started to call himself a Grand Prince. Others did not want to be inferior, so this title appeared also in Smolensk and in Halych (and also in Novgorod as from 1272), and by this very fact the title ceased to have any political significance. The matter became absurd. Finally, only he who did not want to be one was not a Grand Prince.

An assembly in Novgorod in 1195 proclaimed that all princes are to be treated as equal to one another, and this was at a time when the Suzdal party was leading there.

### **HR, vol. 1, p. 244-247**

Meanwhile in Livonia the situation changed completely. The first German settlement further up the Western Dvina, called Odenpe was established around 1190 with full formal permission of the Polotsk "king" Volodar. But hardly, a few years later the illusion disappeared and

the German traders began to manage on their own. Seeing that the country was not under control of Ruthenia, they began organising their own state arrangements and started to rule politically over the country so as to assure economic domination for themselves. The conversion of the heathens was linked with subjugation and once the situation was under the control of a new bishop, the famous Albert (1199-1229), German settlement expanded quickly. In 1201 at the mouth of the Dvina River the city of Riga was established and a year later it had a permanent military garrison of the Livonian Brothers of the Sword. Thus the building of a new German state having a feudal system began. Having realised that they could not count on any "king" of Polotsk or on Novgorod the Great which had to defend itself from enemies on all sides, they took matters into their own hands and started to muster a sufficient force that was indispensable for the development of trade and later this force was to turn against Ruthenia.

Under such circumstances Novgorod made accords in Visby. Its envoys travelled to the "Goth shore" and there a project of a trade agreement for the years 1197-1199 was made. Thus the Novgorod people were the first to turn in the direction of the Varangians hoping for a return to the former relationships. The Gothlanders however were not in a hurry. Having obviously come to terms with the Germans they had the assurance of the supply of goods also via the Dvina River. It was only in the fall of 1201 that an extensive trade agreement was made between Novgorod the Great and the "Germans, Goths" and *с всеѣм латинскимъ языкомъ* [with all the Latin speaking peoples]. There was no longer any question of competing with Gotland or of dominating over the Baltic. The sea expeditions of the Novgorod people ended completely. Ruthenia withdrew from the sea. The

window to Europe was sealed by the presence of Germans in Livonia.

Novgorod could not tackle everything. It submitted to Gotland because in 1198 Polotsk joined forces with Lithuania and attacked Velikiye Luki. The invasive prowess of Lithuania was so sudden that within one generation it changed the political relationships in North-Eastern Europe. Around 1199 the princes of Ovruch and Pinsk found themselves at war with Lithuania, but they made a settlement with Lithuania and ceased to oppose their incursions. In 1209 Lithuania devastated the whole of Volhynia, from Cherven to Vladimir in Volhynia. Luck was on the side of the invaders so much so that throughout the decade (1200-1210) Lithuanian forces were defeated only twice. The fate of history changed and Ruthenia was decidedly losing with respect to Lithuania. Within a few years Mendog would appear on the historical scene.

Lithuania quickly organised itself into a state. Gone were the days of the primitive system when each region led its own life under its own minor prince. All the lands merged under the leadership of one ruler elected from among the small dynasts. In this manner the Grand Princes emerged of whom there were five in Lithuania and two in Samogitia.

“The Lithuania which 50 years earlier had hesitantly laid its first claims to Ruthenian lands, in the early XIII<sup>th</sup> c. was already a potent force to which single Ruthenian entities submit with trembling, being unable to face it even when several principdoms were united. While in the north Velikiye Luki and Pskov sustained the bold invaders with difficulty and sometimes had to succumb to them, at the other end of Ruthenia the principdom of Vladimir-Halych failed to show effective resistance.

A country scarcely 30 miles across was sending its military units for such distances in two different directions. One has to admire the expansiveness of Lithuania, the persistence of its soldiers and the inexhaustibility of its forces... The (Lithuanian) princes must have lived at peace among themselves and often acted jointly, because otherwise, Lithuania paralysed by internal strife would have been unable to operate so strongly on the outside and to grow so quickly into a significant power. What was needed was a strong individuality among the princes and the unification of Lithuania into a single state could come about."<sup>9</sup>

Mendog proved to be such an individual. Since 1219 he was one of the Grand Princes, the ruler of the southern part of Lithuania proper. Having enriched himself by the conquest of Black Ruthenia between the upper Niemen and Pripyat Rivers (it appears that the Lithuanians gave this name to the region because of its bogginess), he started to move against other Lithuanian rulers aiming for autocratic rule.

We do not hear about any social opposition against the encroachments of Lithuania into Black Ruthenia, even though it was a case when Christians were falling under the rule of pagans! Obviously they must have felt better under the new rule, because they were safer. They were freed from constant wars between the princes and so they had permanent internal peace. Soon they were to submit to Lithuania voluntarily! They preferred to have one strong ruler above them rather than a dozen who were permanently in conflict and lacking power were

---

<sup>9</sup> The last paragraph is a quotation from the paper "Mendog" by Juliusz Latkowski, in the *Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences, Historical-Philosophical Faculty*, series II, vol. 3, Kraków 1892, p. 308-309.

unable to assure safety to anyone under their rule. The people were beginning to be fed up with the debauchery of the Rurikids and so the stage was reached that they did not object to the fact that the ruler was a pagan.

At the same time the South-Western part of the lands of the Rurikids was passing under the supremacy of the Polish Piasts, and this referred not only to the former Cherven Towns [ethnically Polish] but also to the lands directly to the east and north of the region. In spite of division into provinces<sup>10</sup> and as a result of the consequent political weakening of Poland, and in spite of the fact that in the region the Orthodox Church prevailed, Polish influences operated there.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 249-250**

Up to the mid XIII<sup>th</sup> c. the villages in the Halych principality were Polish and the towns were Ruthenian. This was so because traders from Southern Ruthenia came and settled there enticed by trade in salt and with Hungary. They contributed to the formation of small townships. It seems that the indigenous population, as in the whole of Poland, did not deal in trade restricting itself to agriculture. Trade appeared as an initiative of the prince (after all it were the Rostislav progeny who organized the profitable trade in salt). The towns thus did not develop organically from the society and the trading class did not have a corporative spirit as happened in Ruthenia proper. There were no common traditions among the conglomeration of immigrant traders, at first alien towards one another and fully dependent on the favour of

---

<sup>10</sup> [In the years 1138-1320 Poland was divided into several provinces all ruled by members of the Piast dynasty].

the prince. Here the prince did not stand at the service of trade interests of the burgers, but he allowed some arrivals to participate in his own trade interests. Also in the land of the Lachs [Poles] there was no organisation of towns, there was no hierarchy among them and there were no *пригородов* [suburbs around the fort]. All municipal settlements were of equal stature, in the same manner dependent only on the prince, as was the case in Zalesye, in a region that ethnographically also was not Ruthenian. The land of the Cherven Towns till the mid XIII<sup>th</sup> c. was ethnographically even less Ruthenian than Zalesye [it was ethnographically Polish]. Traders, some (not much) clergy and the princely garrisons were settled in the forts and in more important trading centres so as to assure convoys for the transport of goods. Such was the immigration of the Eastern Slavs, and all three categories were elements of municipal settlement.

Besides the towns the whole country was of Western Slav type as is clearly indicated by its social relationships and a decidedly different role of the "boyars".

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 253-254**

The basic difference in the historical development of Eastern and Western Slav lands lies in the fact that in the former the burgers (trade) were in the forefront while in the latter the landowners (agriculture). There was something decidedly non-Ruthenian in the fact that the landed "boyars" decided about the fate of the princes in the Halych principedom. This was a decisively Polish phenomenon as if radically transferred not only from the Kraków region but also from as far as the Poznań region. The social structure was within the agricultural population, that is, among the vast majority of the popu-

lation, which was Polish, clan structured. Just as among other Polish peoples the landed property was considered the basic factor of the social order and public life. The Rurikids had brought in opposite views, thus as society developed they were increasingly hated. The privileges for foreign elements among the princely garrisons offended the society, the more so since in the neighbouring Sandomierz land and in the Mazovia princedoms only the landed gentry constituted the military class and princely garrisons. The Roscislavs were princes of traders, while the Piasts of farmers. Thus the population of the Halych princedom gravitated towards the Piasts, towards princes that supported the landed gentry. From Ruthenia came the notion of a *чмерѣ* [stinking peasant], who counted for nothing. From Poland came the notion of landed gentry on whom the whole state system was based. This was before the time of a national consciousness, but the very economic relationships and class interests drove the farmers of the Halych princedom towards Poland. This phenomenon would have taken place even if the area were not ethnographically Polish. Wherever Ruthenia met with Poland the agricultural people tended towards the Polish state as a state of farmers. The Polish ethnographic substratum is explained only by the fact that the landowners in the Halych princedom had a strong class consciousness and they developed into a political entity which remained in stark contrast to the system of all the other princedoms of the Rurikids. This was not a national — about this it is not possible to speak at the time — but a social function of being Polish that operated so strongly that in spite of everything the farmers had primacy over the burgers and the princely garrisons so much so that the prince became dependent on the gentry, just as in the Polish princedoms. Here every land owner belonged to the better class, everyone one was

a "boyar". Only in the Halych principedom and in Western Volhynia did the Ruthenian sources mention "boyars" as a class of landed gentry and it was only here that not the towns but the rural population expelled princes.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 263**

When Mstislav the Successful left Novgorod the Great the city supported a number of princes from various parts of Ruthenia one after the other. In the years 1218-1230 the princes changed twelve times, thus on average once a year. The position of the Rurikids was increasingly difficult there, because in 1218 the great city introduced the only *habeas corpus* [a writ requiring a person under arrest to be brought before a judge or into court] in Ruthenia. The prince was required to "kiss the cross" [make an oath] promising that no one would be deprived of property or freedom without proven guilt, thus the princely authority was formally restricted to the garrison. A citizen of Novgorod needed not to be concerned about the prince, to care for his favour or good humour, because so long as the Novgorod judiciary did not find any fault with him he was not subject to the power of the prince. Only after a conviction by the court it became the responsibility of the prince to execute the verdict. This is something quite simple and natural for today's Europeans but at the time in Ruthenia it seemed to be something akin to almost anarchy. In the Chronicles therefore, Novgorod people have an opinion of being almost criminals unable to respect the power of the princes. In fact the power was such that the competences of the princes were nowhere strictly defined and generally they were rather limited but everywhere the prince had the liberty to practice... self-will. From that moment however every

prince in Novgorod had to promise under oath that *без вины мужа не лишити* [without guilt a man would not be deprived] and that everything would run *на всей воле новгородской* [according to the will of Novgorod].

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 265.**

At that time, when the Eastern Slav lands finally had the main condition for unification: the possibility of centripetal communication (before it had only a peripheral one), they did not wish to make use of this and instead of conglomerating politically they began to disperse their forces. The Western part was gravitating towards Poland. Into the centre of Ruthenia Lithuania was wedging in ever more strongly. The North lost its links with the South. The North itself was divided by the Novgorod-Suzdal antagonism and the South was in fact dependent on the Mongols, namely the Cuman people. The Eastern Slav lands were disintegrating.

The dynasty did not operate in a concentric way. Even though the Rurikids were permanently on the move from one part of Ruthenia to another, none of them had the ideal of a total Ruthenia, as a unity not of the princely family but in a socio-political sense. Not one of them had even the ambition to be the lord of the whole of Ruthenia. The hegemonic idea of [Andrei] Bogolyubsky passed without an echo.

The whole of the Eastern Slav lands were united by the Orthodox Church with a single, common to all, Metropolitan See in Kiev.

## HR, vol. 1, p. 268-269

Thus the historical situation in the North changed completely by the fact that Novgorod did not reach the sea on time. When the relationships with the Germans in Livonia started to be hostile, there were no conditions for a successful Catholic propaganda from the side of Livonia and in the area an increasing opposition and even hatred towards "Latinism" developed considering it as "the German faith". Catholicism and Western European culture had some perspectives only in Southern Ruthenia.

The latter was separating itself culturally from the North not because of the greater ease of accepting Western influences but because of Mongolian influences. The cultural submission to the Cumans was so profound that even before the invasion of the Mongols some elements of a Mongolian-Slav culture can be discerned there. Cuman influences operated increasingly westwards. After all Mstislav the Successful on arrival in Halych above all considered it important to assure himself allies from among the Cumans and so he married the daughter of one of the Cuman princes, Kotyan, so as to have help from him against the Halych boyars<sup>11</sup>.

History knows of cases where society submits to the influences of some lower culture. This happens in the times of cultural deterioration when it is not known what to hold onto, because purposefulness in public life is weakened and society lacks serious leadership. To what extent Southern Ruthenia suffered from such infirmities

---

<sup>11</sup> The rebelling boyars claimed that he intended to deliver them to Kotyan. The leader of the boyars had a purely Polish name, Żyrośław.

can be judged from the whole course of its history until the mid XIII<sup>th</sup> c., that is, until the Mongolian invasion. It absorbed the Cuman culture, which was incomparably lower but much more consistent, in fact, brutally consistent. The Mongolian cult of physical might (needed for brigandage, so as to live at the expense of others) reached such a level that this force became an end in itself and when for lack of intellectual development it was not used for any deeper cause it degenerated into brutality, into the love of destruction for the very pleasure of destroying as evidence of physical superiority.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 271**

The Cumans started to feel very much at home in Ruthenia particularly since mixed marriages were becoming ever more frequent. The example came from above.

But the Cumans, the Torkil, Berendei and Black Klobuks [Karakalpaks] finally began to be baptized, that is, they added to their former deities three new ones, Christ, the Mother of God and St. Nicholas. From the South a new dual faith developed. Around 1220 we find steppe Khans with Christian names such as George and Daniel.

The Cumans had formal political hegemony over a major part of Southern Ruthenia. With their help Kiev was being conquered and grabbed from one another by the princes. One of the Pereyaslav princes, who was imprisoned by the Cumans returned to his principedom after he had married a daughter of a Cuman Khan. Only a formal manifestation of dependency was lacking, and this was only because the Cumans had no sense of a state.

Thus from two contrary sides completely different influences were being exerted on Southern Ruthenia.

The Polish influence was raising the culture, making the minds nobler and proof of this can be found in the agreement with Poland signed in 1229 specifying that unarmed prisoners are not to be taken during wars. This was the first in mediaeval history humanitarian international law dealing with wars. But the influence of Poland did not reach beyond the ethnically Polish lands that were ruled by the Rurikids. The Cuman influence was much stronger and it included human trafficking. The garrisons of the Halych princes fraternized with the Cumans. This influence was operating over the whole of Southern Ruthenia from Chernigov and Pereyaslav to the River Zbruch and it started encroaching on the Halych principedom to which Mstislav the Successful wanted to settle the Cumans.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 273-290**

Such was the state of the Eastern Slav lands in 1224 when the chroniclers recorded that "some venomous people have arrived in our lands, unheard of barbarians calling themselves Tatars"... "God only knows who they are and where they came from. Wise men who have knowledge of books know this well, but we do not know who they are and we have written this here for the memory of the Ruthenian princes and the hardships they have caused them". However there is never anything so evil that it would not bring some benefit because "the Cumans have been vanquished; just as they so far have been pillaging neighbouring peoples, now they have found their ruin".

There is no need to be surprised that the clerical chroniclers did not "have knowledge of books". Even until our days completely false opinions about these "ven-

omous" unwelcome guests are common. The universally repeated stories about "Mongolian Hordes" are pure myth, fancy tales. These were not invading Hordes but a very regular army which was followed by a very well organised... bureaucracy.

The peoples of Northern and Central Asia who were not Aryan or Semitic, not counting the Chinese, Indochina and India could be divided linguistically into four groups: the Finno-Ugrian, Turkish, Mongolian and Manchurian. All these languages (and there are several dozens of them) originated as monosyllabic and they are agglutinative, thus in this respect they are related to Chinese and Japanese. This differentiation however is purely linguistic, and other ethnographic features are not associated with it, and of course it is not possible to define them as nations or even as peoples that coalesce historically according to linguistic similarities.

Strictly political factors played a role in making the Asiatic societies, much more so and more decisively than in Europe. In fact, there was never any ethnographic Hun, Magyar, Turk, Mongolian or Manchurian society. There were political unions of peoples operating under these names but their ethnic composition was very irregular. The descendants of these Mongols who conquered Ruthenia in the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. speak as their ancestors in Turkish languages that are as different from Mongolian as French is different from German. Thus within the chaos of Asiatic peoples it is possible to group only languages, while the peoples themselves, wherever they have not petrified in primitive existence but have operated actively in history, are strictly political groups. And so in the VI<sup>th</sup> c. a part of the steppe peoples known as the Xiongnu Chinese coalesced into a political society known as Tu-Kiu, that is, the Turks. From the very beginning they had the feature of being deeply conscious of hierarchy

and discipline with bureaucracy being their civilizational ideal. In order to attain a rank and title they renounced freedom and readily became slaves.<sup>12</sup>

The group of Turkish languages is extremely far-flung. The Western group is composed of the Osmanli [Ottoman] (the language of the Balkan conquerors), the Azeri and Persian dialects. The Northern group is composed of the Yakut dialects. The Central group includes among others the Altai, the Kyrgyz, the language of the Karaites (a Jewish sect) in Crimea, Lithuania and eastern Galicia as well as the Tatar dialects of European Russia and Siberia. But the Kalmyks of Astrakhan belong to the Mongolian group and the Tunguzians to the Manchurian. Here is not the place to describe the histories of these peoples and how they were shaped by various influences, but an idea about this can be gathered from the fact that today within the strictly Turkish group of languages seven alphabets are in use (Arabic, Syro-Uyghur, Armenian, Greek, Hebrew, Chinese characters and Cyrillic transcriptions [today also the Latin alphabet has to be added to this list]). Turmoil has rolled across historical Asia for a much longer period, and they were more severe, wide and frequent than in Europe. Asiatic societies have been transformed, remodelled, split and united again in a new form through great perturbations, compared to which the revolutions of Europe and the modifications of our states appear to be only minimal alterations, un-touching the matter in its essence.

The rallying calls under which societies were formed in Asia were religious and economic, but among the peoples of whom we speak here they operated much more strongly than among the Aryans or Semites. A race that

---

<sup>12</sup> Leon Cahun, 1896, *Introduction a l'histoire de l'Asie. Turcs et Mongols des origines a 1405*, Paris.

is designated by European science as Mongolian succumbed partly to Islamic fanaticism, which is of Semitic (Arabic) origin, when this combined with strong economic considerations of a kind of struggle for existence that was known in Europe only in miniature, whereas in this part of the world it became a first order creative factor for societies and states. This consisted in finding subsistence in the military profession. In consequence this led to permanent, systematic conquests that were the supreme reason for existence. Asiatic societies flourish through conquests. They fall and even disintegrate and disappear when they cease to make conquests. The fullness of life consists in living as much as possible at somebody else's expense. Imagine condottierism and hired armies overpowering entire nations and this will be half (or possibly more) of the history of Asia. This manner of the struggle for existence formed entire civilizations in Asia, whereas in Europe it served only as the basis of merely second order local dynasties. Even trade had a secondary role in Asia in comparison with this bloated condottierism. But trade was also important. After all, it is a factor that is in operation everywhere and always, as a rule without exceptions.

On the Asiatic continent *la route de soie* [the Silk Road] was particularly important bringing the precious textile from China to Asia Minor and Constantinople. The struggle over silk had a decisive influence on the working out of political relationships in Asia already in the VI<sup>th</sup> c., when the Persian Sassanids refused free passage for Turkish caravans from China through Turkestan and Transoxiana, as a result of which the Khagans allied with the Byzantine Empire. This led to further relationships of the Turks with Europe, to their alliance with the Caliphate and finally to the espousing of Islam by the Turks that proved so catastrophic for Europe. Up

to the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. the caravans from China were forbidden to go beyond Turkestan, because there a certain trade sphere ended and this was maintained by the rulers for seven centuries until finally a right of free passage for his people was obtained from the Sultan of Khwarezm (Khiva) by the same Mongolian Genghis Khan who invaded Ruthenia, Poland and Hungary. The Mongolian invasion brought a trade rapprochement between Europe and China leaving only one intermediary namely the Mongols who traded directly with the Venetian colonies on Crimea. The Mongolian invasion meant the introduction of silk into Italy and a strengthening of the basis of Venetian power.

Having seemingly moved far away from the main theme, at the occasion of a newly appearing topic we met with a word that resounds certain echoes connected with the establishment of Christianity in Ruthenia, namely the word "Khagan". After all, Vladimir was so titled who was considered "equal with the Apostles" and so was Yaroslav "the Wise"! The title came from the Khazars who belonged to the Finno-Ugric group of peoples that was closest in affinity to the Turkish. Thus we have reached the fatherland of the Khagante. A Turkic Khagan was a military entrepreneur turned into a ruler. When fortune would fail him and he was not longer capable of paying his subjects, that is, his soldiers, he disbanded them and these people would search for maintenance under some new banner. These peoples were regiments. Often they took the name of their leaders. The fortunes of war, the shining or declining star of a condottiere determined the formation and disappearance of peoples, particularly those of Turkic origin who were most likely to adopt this course and were most prominent in this.

At the beginning of the XII<sup>th</sup> c. one of the many minor princes of the Turkic Keraites, from between Dzungaria

(Kulia) and the Irtysh River, one Yesugei, with the nickname Baghatur organised such a people composed of regiments and he led it to China as a hired army where at the time there was a long lasting war against the Manchurians (who conquered Peking in 1120). He had five sons. Among the Turks and Mongols the main inheritor was the youngest son and he became the heir of family land (the elder brothers owned the herds, while eldest held the horses). The eldest son was destined to search for some achievement in the world on his own. The eldest son of Yesugei, Temüjin, (born 1162) followed his father and having gathered an armed following he began conquests among neighbouring Turkic tribes. In 1189 he became the Khagan of the Arlads. He beat the Taijins and by 1193 all the Turkic, Mongol and Tatar tribes north of Gobi desert. Having already at his disposal a large army he placed it at the service of the Emperor in Peking in 1193 and he repeated this in 1205. Probably his intention was to ensure that the army would never be idle and that it be fed not from his own resources when he himself was unable to make conquests. But every now and again he detached himself from the Chinese and made war in the West. In 1202 he ruled already from Lake Baykal to the Chinese wall and after having conquered Karakorum he demanded that he be called the "Khagan of Khagans", a Genghis Khan by the 45 peoples subjected by him and all organised in military fashion. The political society organised in this manner by him was named by him the Blue Mongols. The term meant that they were the chosen people. In 1215 he became the master of Peking. Having left a governor in China, he continued to make conquests in the West and around the year 1220 he was the ruler of Asia from Korea to Turkestan.

Temüjin was not only a conqueror but also an organiser and an administrator. By no means was he a primi-

tive ruler over wild Hordes. A simpleton would not have been able to unite politically so many peoples, who earlier were constantly at war with one another, or to maintain in check such a multilingual mass. Temüjin was educated in the Chinese civilization and the level of this education was obviously high since he held the learned Chinese title of *tai-ming*. He readily accepted the Chinese as administrators in his whole state and he had many of them at hand. He organized two administrative capitals, one in Peking and the other in Kohistan (in the mountains south of Samarkand). There he gathered around him his advisors, who were pagan, Muslim, Buddhist and Christian. He had many Christians in his state, various factions of Nestorian Christianity. Nestorian Christianity was widespread in Asia, much more so than is generally held. A major part of Temüjin's tribesmen, the Turkic Keraites, were Christians. A Nestorian prince Tegrul was the best ally of his father Yesugei and Christians eagerly supported the conquests of Temüjin seeing in his state a defence against Islamic expansion. Temüjin himself was a-religious. He treated religions from the political point of view as an important organizational tool that is useful in the maintaining of discipline. He understood the might that may persist in a religion and so he cared to ensure that none was against him. Not being in solidarity with any he supported them all to the point of preventing them from fighting one another — this he strictly forbade. The Mongol state had freedom of conscience and equal rights for all religions but under an a-religious government. It was only when his grandson Kublai adopted Buddhism the relationships changed.

Temüjin originated from the pagan Keraites. It appears that the paganism of Asiatic peoples did not develop into a religious system and was basically a-religious. About the ancient Turks it is known only that just

as the original Chinese they worshiped five elements: land, water, fire, wood and ores, and they imagined that the order of the world required that these elements be incarnated in five rulers designated according to colours. They presumed a black ruler from the North, a red one from the South, a blue one from the East, a white one from the West and in the very Middle of the world they saw a yellow ruler, within the Chinese "state of the centre". Later on there was some muddled dualism of the Earth and the Sky. However before they could work out some religious system, ready and developed foreign religions managed to come in.

Temüjin, who treated religion as a political tool, tried himself to invent a political religion for his pagan subjects, one that would be strictly connected with the Genghis Khan. The intent was to derive his person and authority from heaven. The very circumstances of life led him to adopt such an idea. He owed much to his mother who on becoming a widow devoted herself entirely to assure her son a Khagan career and very early on she sought allies for him even when he was only seven. For this purpose she married again with Munglik, a very influential person among the Turkic tribes because he had the opinion of being a saint. His son Koktchu was considered a miracle maker. Temüjin owed much to the help of his stepfather and stepbrother. Without their influence on the minds of men he would not have been able to accept already in 1189 the title of Sutu Bogdo which means no less than an incarnation of God! From the cult of the elements they moved to the notion of a God encompassing all the elements and the person of Temüjin was weaved into the beliefs of the newly forming religion. Various legends abounded about his earlier life until finally he was credited with having a divine origin. The

Turkic "saints" pondered about the beginnings and origin of peoples. They helped themselves with news drawn from the Nestorians, about the deluge, Noah and his sons, the forefathers of a new humanity. They agreed that the Turkic tribes and all the peoples they might be interested in originated from Japheth. He had several sons and the eldest was Turk. His descendant in the fourth generation had twins, Tatar and Mongol. One of the Mongolian rulers, Burte Chene (which means a Gray Wolf) had a daughter Alangoy (Luminous Doe) who conceived a child miraculously, having been impregnated by some miraculous light coming from an unknown source which hung over the home of her mother and penetrated the roof. Temüjin was said to be a descendant of Alangoy in the tenth generation. Such a legend about him was spread. This was to change even more in favour of the Genghis Khan after conquest of the West and of Ruthenia.

By adopting the title *Sutu Bogdo Temüjin* proclaimed that he accepted the importance of originating from a miraculous light that gave him a force which could help him organize the military society of the "Blue" Mongols. He did not fail to care for physical strength which was to expand the scope of his legend. He was a genial commander. As a soldier he merits to stand besides Alexander the Great, Caesar and particularly Napoleon. Just as the Corsican he knew how to inspire others with his genius and he produced a whole school of commanders deserving highest respect from the military point of view. He himself became a great warrior and conqueror by the fact that he developed a new tactic and a new organisation for armies. When he started his career the best warriors of the time, the Manchurians, considered a group of 50 horsemen as a regiment, arranged in five rows with 10 riders each. Out of this detachments of 500 and a corps

of 5000 men were formed. Under Temüjin we find this arrangement only in supplementary armies formed from subjugated tribes that were still backward. The "Blue" tribes, the permanent army of Temüjin, which he himself organised, stood to battle with a front that was doubly elongated, having five rows of 20 riders each. A group of 100 became a military unit, detachments (*hazar*, *mingghan*) had a 1000 and a corps (*tumen*) 10 000 men. Three corps constituted an army. In principle there was no higher commander than the head of a *tumen*. It was the rule that an army was led by some prince of the dynasty. Temüjin however offered this post not to his relatives because he had exceptionally able commanders many of whom while assisting the nominal leader, a prince of blood, were in fact the true single leaders bearing full responsibility and having also almost unlimited authorization. Such commanders were referred to as *erlek* and there were only nine of them in all the numerous wars that Temüjin waged. Later on such officers were not appointed and the rank disappeared.

Having gathered under his rule the Asiatic world from Korea to Turkestan, Temüjin judged that he had achieved only half of his task. His central administrative bureau in Kohistan discovered that sites of Turkic peoples extend further westward, beyond the Urals, as far as the River Don. All the Mongols and Turks should be under the command of the "chosen", the "Blue" Mongols. The information passed by the bureau was correct, because the entire ethnographic Finno-Ugric group, the Ugric peoples, the extensive Yugra about which we spoke earlier and which extended even further than the Mongolian expeditions were to reach, as far as Finland and even further to Lapland were all related to the Turks. Also in the Caucasus there were tribes speaking in languages developed on the basis of the ancient Kabardian language, also

belonging to the Finno-Ugric group. And most closely related were the steppe peoples from the lower Volga region to the Don. These were the Cumans, Black Klobuks [Karakalpaks], Torkil and Berendei, all members of the Turkic group, a simple extension of the Asiatic Kirgiz. For all of these western steppe people there was one general ethnic term: "Oghuz". Another term was also adopted, more a geographic than an ethnographic one, and it was assigned to the enormous steppe region by the Persians, namely "Kipchak". This meant steppe people, living loosely, not organized properly, in contrast to the Uyghurs, the civilized ones who had a state organisation, such as the Blue Mongols.

It appears that among the Kirgiz and in Kipchak there were many fugitives from tribes already beaten by the Genghis Khan and these fugitives showed the way for further military conquests. From the Uyghurs, the civilization of the Genghis Khan, many fled westwards not wishing to be part of the great army constantly transferred from China to Transoxiana. They preferred to breed horses in the old fashion, feed on mare's milk and restrict themselves to small wars looting their nearest neighbours. Fleeing from the main branch of one's own tribe was part of an old Turkic-Mongol tradition and every tribe had its own libertines-émigrés who did not want to submit to their home authority. They went wandering in the wide world having taken with themselves some herds and horses. There was even a special term to describe such lovers of freedom; they were compared somewhat kindly and somewhat contemptuously with an animal that had fled from the herd. Both the animals and such men were called in Turkic: "Kazakh". We all know this term from our childhood<sup>13</sup>, thus we do not depart

---

<sup>13</sup> [In the Polish language "kozak" refers to someone bold enough to do something different].

from the topic. The entire Kirgiz people were formed of such Kazakhs (Cossacks), fugitives, who proliferated on the steppe not being subject to any Khagan.

The freedom of the western steppes was to be curtailed. The Cossacks and Kipchak were to be transformed into something akin to the Tatars. After all among the Uyghurs there were many tribes permanently wandering over meadows and referred to simply as the "meadow people" who accepted the Genghis Khan order and supplied recruits for the army. *Tatir-tartar* in Turkish means a meadow and a type of life, and not an association with some tribe. There have been Tatars in various places, both Turkic and Mongol. When an expedition was announced to the limitless "meadows" of the West enthusiasm was born among the "people of the meadows" and whole tribes filled the "Blue" army to such an extent that it acquired its name from them. For this reason we read in Ruthenian chronicles about the invasion of a people "known as the Tatars". (In Western Latin sources the name was modified into *Tartari* meaning literally "people from hell". Apparently St. Louis of France first called them Tartars.)

The expedition to Kipchak was somewhat delayed because of the first campaign against Persia and because of an uprising in China. In 1220 the outstanding commander Subutai, one of the *erleks*, "the four dogs of Temüjin", was called out of China and sent to the Caucasus having with him (nominally above him) the eldest son of the Genghis Khan, Jochi, for whom the Kipchak was to be taken. Capturing Tbilisi was the introduction. From there a whole crowd of agents was sent to find their kin among the Kipchak. Offering generous gifts they were looking for friends and inspiring their imagination by speaking about the descendant of the "Luminous Doe". It was only after them that Subutai followed with

25 000 horsemen beating consecutively the Alans, the Cherkases and the Lezginis taking their capital Terek on the River Terek. Some accepted the Genghis Khan while others fled further westwards to their kin among the Cumans in the Kipchak over the River Don. While chasing them Subutai held up for a while to make an excursion into Crimea where he destroyed the Genoese trading post and their main settlement, Sudak. He did not however touch the Venetian settlements because the Venetian traders were already agents of the Mongols alongside with the Armenians. After this "excursion" the army moved into the steppes of the Cumans. The khan of these peoples, called Kotyan sought help from his [Ruthenian] son-in-law, Mstislav the Successful.

Temüjin wanted to unite politically all the Mongol-Turkic peoples and nothing more. The instruction given to Subutai concerned only Kipchak. His military mission was to end between the Don and Dnieper Rivers. He did not suspect that he would have to deal with alien peoples who could not be expected to believe in the "Luminous Doe" and whom he had no intention to subdue or even accost. And so the Mongolian invasion would have bypassed Kiev along the southern steppes road, just as the earlier invasion of the Magyars had done, even when 20 years later they were chasing the Cumans all the way to Hungary. But the issues of the Cumans at the time were already so closely linked with Ruthenia politically and culturally that it was impossible to separate them.

The Cumans were primitives in comparison with the army of Subutai arriving in regular corps of excellent discipline, with great food supplies and a train of administrators, the majority of whom were Chinese, who immediately after victory were introducing a new administration in the name of the Genghis Khan. These Mongols were introducing an Asiatic civilization, but nevertheless

a civilization, while the Europeans they met had none, because they were not organized in a religious or political sense. It was only under the threat of an invasion, fearing the Uyghurs, that they decided to unite so as to resist them and for the first time they chose a Khagan from among their tribal leaders. Thus out of necessity they changed from a conglomerate of tribes into a temporary people being conscious at least for this one occasion of having common interests — yet this was too late.

Kotian, the father-in-law of Mstislav the Successful was chosen, very likely because of this connection. The Khan immediately sent delegations to the princes of Ruthenia with gifts persuading them to come and help because “today the Tatars have overrun our land and tomorrow they will destroy yours. If you do not help us we shall be beaten today and tomorrow you.” The argumentation used by the Khan was false, and consciously so. From the agents of the “Blue” army, always sent before an invasion, the Cumans knew that Temüjin wanted to unite politically all the Mongol and Turkic peoples and that he was not interested in peoples that could not be drawn into the religious cult of the Genghis Khan. He was after the Cumans, the Bulgars, he would occupy the whole of Yugra, but Ruthenia was not part of his original plans and it would never have been included were it not for the fact that the Ruthenian princes attacked him themselves.

Mstislav the Successful counting on the help of the Cumans against his boyars organized for his father-in-law so prominent a relief that never in the South has there been so much zeal and militancy as on this occasion to defend the Cumans. What sort of agreements were made between the Khans of the nomads and the Rurikids, what benefits were expected in case of victory, we do not know and probably we shall never know. At

a consultation conducted with the Cumans in Kiev six Rurikids took part: Mstislav Romanovich of Kiev with his son Vsevolod, Mstislav Svyatoslavich of Chernigov with his nephew Michael Vsevolodovich, Mstislav the Successful of Halych and Daniel Romanovich from Vladimir of Volhynia — thus only princes of Southern Ruthenia constantly engaged in private interests with the Cumans, needing their help, sometimes for no other reason than against one another. It was decided to move onto the steppes, to face the enemy who was considered a common foe to all. Subutai sent emissaries declaring that he had no plans of military action against Ruthenia. These emissaries were killed. Subutai sent emissaries again. These at least were sent back alive, but with no reply. The front guard of the Tatars stood beyond the River Dnieper, far to the south of Kiev. Mstislav the Successful managed to beat it, and this victory, to the one who had no understanding of a great war, seemed to prove that he was superior over the enemy. Thus he dared to chase, as it seemed to them, over the steppes. After eight days they again met a small reconnaissance unit positioned on River Kalka, a tributary of the Azov Sea. After a small skirmish this unit retreated. It was only on June 16<sup>th</sup> 1224 that the full army of the Tatars appeared, commanded by iron discipline. It faced the Ruthenian princes who even here continued their own private conflicts, undermining the authority of one another even in the midst of the military confrontation. For example Mstislav the Successful having recognized a movement of the enemy ordered his units to stand ready, but he failed to notify his two namesakes because "he could not stand them". A condottiere from Novgorod and Halych, a successful victor against the front guard obviously arrived at the conclusion that his own units together with the Cumans will be sufficient to win a major battle and it was only

about this that he thought so as not to have to share the fruits of the victory with the princes of Kiev and Chernigov; and should anything unpleasant happen to them during the battle, so much the better! The Cumans however fled causing much confusion in the Ruthenian camp during their escape the result of which was a general panic and flight. The decisive onslaught on a stony hill over the Kalka hit Mstislav of Kiev. He quickly entrenched himself. Being left alone by everyone he stood ground for three days against a Tatar unit, while the rest of Subutai's army hastened to the Dnieper River. The result of the confrontation was tragic, and of the pursuit even more so. On the battle field the following were killed: Mstislav of Kiev with his son-in-law (or the husband of his sister) Andrew and Alexander, a minor prince of Dubrovica in the Pinsk region; in the pursuit between the Kalka and the Dnieper the following were killed: George of Nieświerz, Sviatoslav from Shumsk in Volhynia, Iziaslav Ingvarovich of the Luck line, some Sviatoslav "Yanevsky" impossible to define more precisely and also Mstislav of Chernigov with his son. Only Mstislav the Successful and two princes, Mstislav the Dumb of Luck and Oleg of Kursk who only later joined the expedition into the steppes survived unhurt. Young Daniel Romanovich returned wounded. All these details indicate that the entire expedition to help the Cumans was the work of only three most important princes, those of Halych, Kiev and Chernigov. They were accompanied by minor prices of no political significance. The fact that there was no battle between the Kalka and the Dnieper and yet the princes were killed indicates that the flight was haphazard, that each unit ran blindly and that the Tatars managed to catch up with them and eliminate any one they encountered. They did not catch the originator of the expedition. Mstislav the Successful must have

been the first to reach the River Dnieper. Subutai did not go any further because his instructions were to conquer the Kipchak. Having achieved this he returned using the northern road, over the Volga and Kama Rivers conquering the state of the Bulgars in the process. Also here in the North he did not approach the princedoms of the Rurikids. He spoke the genuine truth when twice he assured Ruthenia that it needs not to fear anything from him. But now the situation could change. Temüjin could demand revenge.

Most of the Cumans fled abandoning their steppes. They followed the well known traditional route of the nomads to Hungary, to their kin, the Magyars, the direct brothers of the "wild Cumans". This emigration decided about the further Tatar invasions. Just as the fleeing Kazakhs became a signpost for Temüjin onto the Kipchak, so the fleeing Cumans showed the chancellery of the Genghis Khan further Western regions, where unexpectedly they discovered new blood-brothers, the Magyars who deserved and should be included in the state of the "Blue" Mongols. If the plan of Temüjin to have all the Finno-Ugric, Turkic, Mongol and Manchurian peoples united was to be completed an expedition onto Hungary was only a question of time. This plan carried no danger for Ruthenia, because it was possible, as has happened often in the past, to traverse the steppes south of Kiev without affecting Ruthenia. The Mongolian onslaught would have taken this route were it not for the operation of Mstislav the Successful, were it not necessary to execute revenge for Mstislav's intervention, one that was essential for the Genghis Khan's pride.

Temüjin died in 1227, during his travels over China. In that year also Jochi, Temüjin's son for whom the Kipchak was won, died in his new capital Sarai on the Akhtuba, one of the tributaries of the Volga delta. Thus

Kipchak passed onto Temüjin's grandson (son of Jochi), called Batu, while the rank of the Genghis Khan passed onto the youngest son of Temüjin, Tolui. The conquest of China however, resulted in centrifugal reactions. The "Blue" Mongols suppressed the Chinese uprisings, but they were submitting to the old and high culture so that soon they themselves admitted that China had the privilege of being the "centre" state. The Turkic-Mongol ruler of China, Ögedei soon started to prefer peace rather than conquests in Western Asia and beyond the Urals. Within the Genghis Khan Empire two parties appeared: the Chinese-Buddhist one which was peace oriented and the Turkic-Islamic-Christian one which was pugnacious wanting further conquests. It was led by the Nestorians, who had extending as far as Southern Siberia that ethnographically belonged to the Turks and Mongols. The wife of Tolui, Sorghaghtani Beki was a Christian, having significant influence on the affairs of the state. Persia was occupied after the suppression of the dangerous uprising of Jalal ad-Din. The occupation of Transoxiana was confirmed. The Caliphate was abolished so that not a stone of it survived. But Islam as such was not affected. Maintaining religious equality became a duty of the government which took care of each religion. This very Sorghaghtani was the foundress of a great college in Bukhara for Islamic youth studying the Quran. Noticeable is the fact that the Muslims, who had just been beaten, entered the warmongering faction and supported the conquests of the "Blue" Mongols! Finally the youngest line, the one privileged in the clan, moved to China. The son of Tolui (who died of drunkenness in 1232), Kublai became only the Emperor of China. He adopted Buddhism. The rank of the Genghis Khan remained with his uncle Ögedei, who died in 1241, also of drunkenness. Officially he was the ruler of the world

from the Dnieper River to Korea, but in fact, he had no influence on the Chinese countries. For this very reason, the office of the Genghis Khan became the centre of the warring spirit eager to make further conquests. It was the supreme authority of a state based on militarism that wanted its society to be organized in a military fashion. This was an ideal that for China was too backward and primitive.

The Genghis Khan religion was also primitive. It could be spread only among the least civilized peoples of the enormous state, and so in the West, in the direction of Europe. In the development of its basic principles the hand of the government can be seen. Thus the oldest governmental religion in the world was formed, and it was a Tatar invention. The central administrative bureau of the Genghis Khan took into account the information gathered in Kipchak that there are two rivers by the name of Tuna (Don and Danube) and that on the other Tuna there is another Kipchak. It also treated the need to take revenge on Ruthenia as a "state necessity". Whoever dared to pick up arms against the descendant of the Luminous Doe had to be his subject. After the battle on the Kalka it was contrived that Japheth, the ancient ancestor of the "Doe" and of all the "Blue" Mongols, having left Noah's ark, settled on the River Ural (Yaik) and then even further West on the Volga (Atil) and that among his eight sons there was one called Rus. This meant that Ruthenia was to be conquered also.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 303-306.**

Southern Ruthenia and Zalesye remained under Mongolian domination in such a way that the Rurikids became deputies of the Khagan responsible to him personally.

Thus it was the same kind of system that the Khazar Khagans had maintained when they ruled over the middle Dnieper regions, but it was perfected by the Chinese method. The prince had to guarantee designated earnings for the Khagan. Otherwise he would risk his position and the principedom could be subjected to a plundering invasion and he knew that he would cease to be the prince. Thus from this time onwards the Rurikids knew that they were princes only thanks to the grace of the Great Khan of Sarai, and completely dependent upon him. They knew that they were viewed by him in a friendly manner and therefore were more certain of their own ruling position the more efficient they were as extortionists in their own principedom.

Until then there was a divergence between society and the state, but from now on these two entities of historical life were in constant antagonism. The statehood managed to function under Mongol supremacy through the oppression of society, and society to defend itself had to destroy the state organization and thus to step back in its historical development. Such were the consequences of the "Tatar captivity" and the tragic background of the next historical period.

Were we to analyse these issues only from the theoretical point of view, it would have to be said that Ruthenia gained as a result of the Tatar captivity. Undoubtedly the Chinese-Tatar culture was a progress in comparison with Cuman culture under the influence of which Southern Ruthenia had been previously and also there is no doubt that it was the Tatar administration that transformed the loose authority of the Rurikids into a state. As regards to what we refer to as state order, it is difficult not to admit that it was the Tatars who introduced it. But this does not mean that the Tatar yoke was a historical benefit. Definitely it was a curse. Here History, the Teacher of life

shows that the state as such is not to be treated in the abstract, strictly theoretically. It cannot be considered as an end in itself. It has to be only a means towards the development of society. Were we to regard statehood as the highest historical criterion we would as a consequence have to consider the Tatars as benefactors and civilizers of the Eastern Slav lands.

Wherever the black and white flags of the Mongols were permanently positioned, there came a *daroga*, the governor of the district administration together with Chinese and Uyghur bureaucrats, who set up a state office, the *yamen*, which had to ensure that everything was "in order" according to the rules of the *ясак* [*yasak*, tribute], the Mongolian law. (Later also in Ruthenia the *яссавул* [*jassavul*, captain] or *ассавул* [*Assavul*, Kazak name] were known). The communication between *yamens* was regular based on a dense network of post stations called *yam* from which in Russian there is the word *ямущик* [coachman]. Every traveller had to report at the *yamens* and show his passport. Those travelling on governmental service had to show silver and golden tablets on which it was written what was their mission. These were called *найса* (piece). Great dignitaries had with them an official document given them ceremonially that was called the *ярлик* [*yarlyk*, certificate]. In Kipchak and in the Southern Slav lands the *darogas* were called by the Turkish name *баскак* [*baskak*]. The purpose of the administration was the securing of the needs of the state, that is, the supply of soldiers and revenue, both as money and in natural goods — in other words it served the army and the treasury. A *baskak* had extensive powers so that he could extort from the population what was due to the state. He could even destroy a town because he always had a military executive at his disposal.

The Turks and Mongols supplied the Genghis Khan and the Khagans with one man per family, but probably the notion of the “family” was much wider than in Europe. To control recruitment in his enormous state Temüjin introduced a census of the male population, from age 10 onwards, as well as a counting of the horses and mules, because these were subject to state requisition. The taxation system came from China: per smoke [a household with one chimney], a third of the grain and silk production, a tenth of the wine production and from herds one piece from every hundred. In some parts of the state variations of the system were introduced. Among the “Kazakh” people, they also took a hundredth from the sheep and the camels. They also discovered among the “Kazakhs” of Kipchak a new and most lucrative source of income: from 1235 they sold Kipchak youth in wholesale manner to the Venetians in Crimea, who then exported them to Egypt as “Mameluks” [slaves]. This is the origin of the later *ясыр* [*yassir*, captivity], the hunting and trafficking of people, extended in time also to include women.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 306-307**

To have to deal with seven princes over an area that for them was relatively small was bothersome for the Tatars. On the other hand, the weakening of the dynasty because of this fragmentation of realms was according to them beneficial. The *yamen* of Zalesye took a middle ground. It designated one prince as an elder and he was made responsible for them all. According to Mongolian legal notions the first place was to be given to the youngest of Vsevolod’s sons (prince of Starodub), but they conceded to the local custom and permitted that Yaroslav be con-

sidered the elder. He was the one who had to travel to Sarai in order to obtain a *yarlyk* [the Khagan's formal certificate] which permitted him to wear the honorary caftan. (The name of this caftan was taken in Ruthenia for the document itself). Thus one of the Rurikids became a dignitary of the Mongol bureaucracy in respect to the Khagan and even more so he was a slave of the Genghis Khan, but in fact he was the true superior of the other princes because in case of disobedience he could execute things through the Tatar might.

It was a terrible irony of fate that in this way the ideal of hegemony of Andrei Bogolyubsky was achieved. The title of Grand Prince was changed into real power.

From the very beginning there was rivalry to obtain this position and power. The princes intrigued against one another, excelling in their servility and willingness to render services, so as to wrench the certificate (*yarlyk*) of Grand Prince from one another. As a result they were imposing a greater fiscal oppression on the people.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 308**

Simultaneously severe instructions were given how to exploit the Rurikid princedoms. From John of Plano Carpini<sup>14</sup> we learn that Güyük [The Genghis Khan] ordered that all adult unmarried men be recruited with the restriction that where there were three or more brothers, even if all were married, one of them would be taken. Also all unmarried women were to be taken and only a Church wedding was considered valid. Furthermore all those who did not have a means of support were to

---

<sup>14</sup> [One of the first Europeans in the court of the Genghis Khan, who wrote of a book on the history of the Mongols.]

be taken. All of this was a form of recruitment for the army and at the same time a supply of slaves for sale in Crimea. This is all we know about the tribute that was paid to the Tatars, that is, about the duties of the Grand Prince. As a consequence of this regulation the custom of very early marriages was introduced. This shows the foresight of the Chinese-Tatar bureaucracy, concerned about the growth of the population so as to have a good supply of recruits and slaves.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 314-316**

In 1255 Batu [Khan] died. In these years Hulagu was the Genghis Khan. He was the son of the Nestorian Sorghaghtani and he was married to Princess Doquz Khatun, also a Nestorian. Thus a Christian period of Mongolian policy ensued, the times of the Mongolian crusades, which were incomparably greater and more successful than the European Catholic crusades. In 1252 the Caliphate of Baghdad fell, but full freedom of religion was left to the Muslims. At the head of the army against the Caliphate was Kitbuqa Noyan, a Nestorian, who was inspired no less than the European knights by the desire to take the Holy Land from the hands of the infidels. After many efforts, he managed to be sent to conquer Palestine. Also the Chinese court was involved in this. In spite of the fact that Kublai, the Emperor of China had adopted Buddhism, he was eagerly interested in the cause of the Holy Land and he wanted to act in accord and jointly with St. Louis, the French King, offering him in advance control over the whole of Syria.

The Holy See knew about these combinations, but inaccurately, and St. Louis considered the Mongols a band of heathens and so had no intention to profit from the of-

ferred alliance. It would be difficult to assume, that even having the most accurate information they would agree to cooperate with Christians of a different denomination. The unsuccessful contrivances ended with a defeat of both the Catholics and the Nestorians. At the head of the Muslim in Asia stood the victorious Baibars Bunduqdar (a slave from Kipchak who learnt military art among the Egyptian Mameluks). He gave the Mongols their first defeat at the "Springs of Goliath" (Ain-Jalut) near Jerusalem (3<sup>rd</sup> Sept. 1260). Kitbuqa was killed in the battle and Baibars ordered that all the churches be demolished. This same Baibars was also the victor of St. Louis as he took the remaining Christian strongholds in Asia Minor. His agents spread Islam among the Mongols and the Genghis Khans wavered. Sartaq, the son and successor of Batu as commander over Kipchak was a Nestorian, but his younger brother and successor, Berek adopted Islam in 1262. Asia entered a period of conflict between the Mongolian and Islamic law, between the *yasak* and the *sharia*.

If these events and circumstances of major Mongolian policies could have had an impact on the cause of Daniel [first King of Ruthenia 1253-1264], they did so in an unfavourable way. When information reached Rome about the good intentions of the Genghis Khan, there were thoughts about sending a mission there that would convert the Nestorian Mongols to Catholicism and not about a crusade against the Mongols. In fact great missions resulted from these considerations reaching even China.

Meanwhile Daniel negotiated with Mendog [the Lithuanian prince] against the *baskaks* and they began a war in 1258, which was successful until major forces came from Kipchak under the leadership of Buronday. Sartaq decided to conquer Hungary, thus Buronday had

such a large army at his disposal that Daniel could not have had the least chance of success. Abandoning everything, he fled. Burunday called on him to return, offering him an unreduced reign under the condition that he would not keep forts anywhere except in his capital, in Chełmno. Thus the forts in Vladimir, Luck, Halych, Krzemieniec and Lviv were demolished. The other condition that the regiments of Daniel would be available for Tatar needs was obvious. In this manner "the King of Ruthenia" not only participated in the Mongol invasion into Lesser Poland in 1259, but he was also accused of being the "guide" leading the Tatars, because among the Mongols the front guards were always composed of accessory units. Hungary was being encircled from the north just as in 1242 and yet again it was necessary to recall the army to Asia because the war with Baibars was beginning.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 321**

In this way inadvertently circumstances led to a split within the Eastern Slav lands. Around 1260 they were divided into six parts: the Polish-Ruthenian, the Lithuanian, the Novgorod-Smolensk, Zalesye, the directly Tatar part and the Kiev-Chernigov part. Each had its own separate destinies.

Were the Eastern Slav lands splitting up into distinct nations? There are no traces of such an evolution and there was no consciousness whatsoever of any national unity<sup>15</sup>. This issue did not exist. After all in Poland the national idea first appeared in the XIV<sup>th</sup> c.

---

<sup>15</sup> The original names of the peoples disappeared without trace. The name of the Vyatichs persisted longest, but it disappeared in the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. This was due to the primacy of

The evolution of the Eastern Slav lands occurred on a political and economic basis with a considerable contribution of the opposition of Orthodoxy to Islam and Catholicism. All of this was not yet decisive as to whether several or only one nation will be formed. The Lithuanian conquests had no significance here. They did not result in the domination of the Lithuanian ethnic element over the Ruthenian. It was only a change of the ruling dynasty and nothing more. No one was becoming Lithuanian, whereas the princes were becoming Ruthenian. The conquests were made on the realms of the Rurikids, but not over Ruthenian society which readily submitted to Lithuanian princes not being subjected to any change other than that of the prince. Even the principedoms themselves remained without change just as they were found by the Lithuanian conquerors. Some consequences of having Lithuanian dynasts in place of the Rurikids were to appear in later times.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 337-344**

The Tatar invasion it seemed endangered the organization of the Eastern Slav Church, because it affected mostly Southern Ruthenia, the Kiev lands. There were no princes in the South at the time and as a result two social classes were derailed, the military crews and the higher clergy. Shortly after the Tatar invasion two bishoprics near Kiev disappear, that of Yuryev and of Kaniv. Soon even the existence of the Metropolitan See was being questioned. On the most part the bishops and certainly the Metropolitans were always foreigners, Greeks,

---

the towns. The regions were termed after the most important forts.

that is, not the fathers but the stepfathers of the Ruthenian Church. After the first sacking of Kiev by the Tatars in 1240, the Metropolitan Joseph of Nicaea fled and he did not return to Ruthenia so he did not care about the Church of which he was head. Actually in the same years (1240-1243) there was no Patriarch and even though a new Patriarch was chosen in 1243 nothing was done for the extensive province of the Eastern Church. It has to be stressed that this was the time of the Latin Empire; the Patriarchs themselves were in exile in Nicaea. No one cared for the Ruthenian Metropolitan See.

Daniel of Halych took care of it. The vast majority of the immigrants from the Kiev land (the "better people") came to his principedom, having full respect for the traditions of the Metropolitan See and they must have had an appropriate influence on the prince. Daniel designated his chancellor Cyril as the Metropolitan and sent him to Nicaea where he was ordained bishop in 1249. Meanwhile Daniel changed his policy, aiming for union with Rome [the Pope gave him the title of King] and so he had no need for Cyril any more. Cyril had no intention of staying in the poor destroyed Kiev not having any means of support there. Profiting from the fact that in Vladimir on Klyazma there was a vacancy in the bishopric, which was unoccupied since 1238, after bishop Mitrophan had been killed by the Mongols, he travelled northwards in 1250 in order to occupy this See. The inhabitants of Vladimir were happy to see among them a Metropolitan "of all Ruthenia" as bishop, because this suggested that their town was a capital.

The former chancellor of Halych became a reorganizer of the Orthodox Church and has a distinguished place in its history. The proper development of canon law in Ruthenia began with him. The Greek nomo-canon was not suitable in everything for the Eastern Slav lands and

not everywhere was it followed. Not only the civil regulations that were different from the customary laws in Ruthenia were ignored, but also things that should have remained unchangeable as "canons" were adapted to the local conditions. Even in the liturgy, there was chaos, with local differences, particularly since the Greek text was rarely available (and only few knew the Greek language). Cyril imported from Bulgaria the Slav "Steering Book", a translation of the first Serbian archbishop, St. Sava, and this *кормчая книга* [driving book] propagated by him as from 1262 became in 1274 (at the Vladimir synod) the basis of Ruthenian Church law. From then onwards began the tendency to extend Church jurisdiction over family and inheritance law as well as on all issues pertaining to "the people of the Church", i.e. not only the clergy but also lay people living on Church property. The Church was raising its head, wanting to be an authority equivalent to that of the prince.

The Metropolitan found support from the Tatar Horde. The Mongolian rule greatly contributed to the extension of the laws of the Church. Thanks to the certificates — *yarlyks* of the Khan the Church had not only an immunity of its faith and rituals, laws and property, but also full freedom from imposed donations and taxes and finally the desired judicial authority over the "Church people" in all civil and criminal cases. This was a considerable dent in the power of the princes. It is precisely for this reason that the Khans favoured religious tolerance adding to it a far going tutelage over the Church, becoming its benefactors, because this was against the princes. Thus in the conflict as to whether it was permissible to ordain men who were from the prince's personnel, i.e. directly dependent on him and from whom the prince had revenue, the certificate (*yarlyk*) decided against the interests of the prince's treasury. The rivalry between the secular

and Church authorities was resolved in the court of the Khans.

Metropolitan Cyril adopted this Church policy and all his successors eagerly followed him. His namesake, the bishop of Rostov could not have travelled to Sarai in 1252 without the Metropolitan's consent where he asked that the Khan would permit the use of one annual tribute from the Rostov and Yaroslav princedoms for the "house of the Purest Mother of God". The mission was successful. The princes had to pay the Tatar tribute, but in favour of the bishopric. The prince lost, the bishop gained — and so it was in everything throughout the duration of the Tatar captivity. Metropolitan Cyril organized a permanent Church embassy at the court of the Khan. In 1261 a Sarai bishopric was erected and this bishop travelled with the Khan's court. The Metropolitan did not resuscitate the cathedral in Southern Pereyaslav that had been abolished after the Tatar invasion, but only attached the diocese to the nomadic one of Sarai in 1266.

The exceptional success of the interests of the clergy under Tatar domination is all the more striking, because the rule of the *baskaks* soon degenerated into the anarchy of lawlessness and violence. The Church suffered from the Tatars only during wartime, during invasions, when all laws were suspended. But the princes and the population suffered wartime conditions non stop.

Very soon the features of Mongol domination over Ruthenia changed. Raw, often severe but pedantic Uyghur rule with a Chinese bureaucracy persisted only for a short time on contact with the Eastern Slav lands. But changes occurred and they went very deep.

Soon after falling under Mongol dependency favourable circumstances occurred and the shackles could have been broken if the Rurikids had any sense of political solidarity, if within the entire Eastern Slav lands

some consciousness of public duty and social responsibility had sprouted somewhere. But there was no trace of this anywhere. Nobody ever thought about anything else than about himself. The favourable circumstances were exploited with full force but not so as to search through some united effort the common good. Instead with utter fury the occasion was used so as to achieve individually some personal benefit. This was understood in a very primitive way, namely as the constant and systematic working towards the detriment of the neighbour. Our story reaches the phase when all the princes, all the towns, all social classes were permanently engaged in the concern how to harm one another and they used for these purposes the various crises that occurred among the Mongols. This explains why Ruthenia itself was strengthening the shackles of bondage precisely in the moment when they could liberate themselves of them.

Already in 1260 the enormous state of Temüjin started to disintegrate, when there was a sharp rivalry between the four branches of his clan and furthermore within each of these, there was competition between individual lines. According to the Mongol law the rank of the Genghis Khan belonged to the youngest line, that of Tolui, and within it to the youngest of the brothers Ariq Böke. An older brother Möngke was deceitfully and illegally chosen and he had to use force to support his new claim and this war set at variance all the dynasts. There were not only personal quarrels there, but also other factors that are more powerful than the greatest dynastic might and the dynasts submitting to them became the divided tools of the natural differences of countries and peoples. Already Möngke removed himself to China and did not participate much in the affairs of Central Asia and the western "Tatar" state. His younger

brother Kublai having adopted Buddhism became the founder of a Mongolian dynasty in China and he based his policies uniquely on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. He waged great wars against Japan (unsuccessfully in 1274), Burma, Siam and Java. These issues could have only an indirect connection with the interests of the second and third generation of the "Blue Mongols". This was because the native Chinese were not fighting at the time and wars were waged through mercenaries imported by Kublai from the West. The Mongolian soldier could not sustain the southern climate and as a result after a few years the regiments had to return to their native steppes. There was a permanent temporary move of the Mongols to southern China and further south for pecuniary gain and with arms in hand, but there was never any Mongolian settlement there. The increase in population had to seek an outlet in the West. Thus only some of the dynasts had interests in China. The military interests of armed Mongols tended in the opposite direction, to regions where they could settle and become lords, not only mercenaries. Only three elder branches of the clan of Temüjin could be representatives of the Mongols, after his three sons: Jochi, Ögedei and Chagatai. It was among them that the struggle for the rank of the Genghis Khan ensued, whereas Kublai and his descendants lost contact with the Mongolian traditions and become only Chinese Emperors. Thus the domain of the Genghis Khan was reduced by the whole of China. It lost half of its territory and a half of its force, but the struggle for the office of the Genghis Khan increased and became even more complex when one of the sons of Tolui (his third), Hulagu, not seeing any future for himself in the East also turned to the West where he arose above the branches of Ögedei and Chagatai from the moment that he started to exploit the fruits of his victories over the Caliphate. The rank

of the Genghis Khan did not stick to the clan of Ögedei. When his step-son Güyük lost it, his son Kaidu saw no other way out in his struggles against the men of Chagatai and against Hulagu than to become a "Kazakh" himself together with his military dependents. In this way a whole branch of the clan of Temüjin disappeared in the steppes. During these wars three provinces of the Genghis Khanate: Transoxiana, Persia and Kipchak became completely independent states, oblivious towards any rivalry for the Genghis Khanate whose power in spite of the high rank was on the decline.

The universal Asiatic state was disintegrating due to religion. Hulagu, the son of the Nestorian Sorghaghtani married Doquz Khatun, also a Nestorian, and was opposed to Islam. An Armenian historian places them on par with Constantine the Great and Helen. In Nestorian churches funeral services were held for the peace of the soul of Hulagu in spite of the fact that he was not baptized (he died in 1264). From among his sons Abaqa was the Christian candidate for the Khanate of Persia and for the office of the Genghis Khan. He was a supporter of the strict *yasak*. In this he was followed by his youngest brother Tekunder. Nestorianism was triumphant because Tekunder was a Nestorian officially, openly Christian and baptized. This sparked a reaction of the conquered Islam, the religion that cannot accept tolerance and dies out when it is given only equal rights. Tekunder therefore converted to Islam. His successor Arghun returned to the *yasak* and equal rights of religions (1289). He sent a delegation to the Pope, to England and to France proposing an alliance against the Muslims that were encroaching from Egypt. Also Gaykhatu (1291-1295) held onto [the Buddhist] *yasak* but his successor and son of Arghun, Ghazan decided

for political reasons to adopt Islam. It seemed that after his death (1304) Nestorianism would return to the helm because his successor Oljeitu was baptized in his childhood, but this was the end of the hesitation. The dynasty submitted to the stronger current in its state. Oljeitu abandoned Christianity (1295) and initiated a whole line of Shiite rulers<sup>16</sup>. Persia became fully Islamic and the Mongol-Turkic elements dissolved in the political and religious sense within the autochthonous Iranians. All tradition pertaining to the "Blue" Mongols vanished. Abaqa was the last in this line of Mongolian dynasts, who was concerned about the Genghis Khanate. Already around 1275 the Persian lands were not longer a part of it.

Transoxiana and Turkestan took a similar path. The grandson of Jagatai, Kara Hulagu held onto the *yasak*. His widow, Argana was faced with the necessity of choosing between Buddhism and Islam. Initially Buddhism seemed stronger and a younger brother of her husband, Algu adopted it. Argana married him (in spite of being 20 years older) but then wishing to assure rule for her son she raised him as a Muslim so that even his Mongol name Mubarek Shah did not enter into history. For a while there was a *yasak* revival, but around 1320 Islam started to spread as far as China.

The Quran subverted the Genghis Khan notion of a universal state. Once in a while some ruler would recall the dynastic tradition and wanting to gain support from the Emperor of China would accept the superiority of the youngest line, and strictly according to the *yasak*, would recognize the Genghis Khan not in Turkestan, nor in Persia or Bukhara but in Peking. Thus on occasions tributes were paid to Peking and from there help would

---

<sup>16</sup> This is a Persian heresy among the Muslim. The Shiites do not recognize the so called tradition besides the Quran.

come... in the days of famine, but the line of Kublai did not interfere in the wars about central Asia, Persia and Kipchak. Soon Persia and Turkestan ceased to meddle in one another's wars between various dynasts and in this stage it was impossible to tell where the Genghis Khan was to be sought. If some Chinese Emperor theoretically wanted to hold the title, no one would protest, because around the year 1280 there was no Genghis Khan.

The conflict between the *sharia* law and the *yasak*, between Islam and the Genghis Khan culture entered also the steppes of Kipchak. Also here at first it seemed that the third party, Christianity, would benefit from the conflict between the two.

Nestorianism was spreading in Kipchak and generally it was not distinguished from Orthodoxy. After all, Asiatic sources considered Ruthenia to be directly Nestorian. This favoured the spread of Orthodox propaganda which for a long time met with no hindrance, even in Sarai itself. Even monastic vocations occurred among the Tatars. In 1252 a nephew of the Khan arrived in Rostov, he was baptized and took on the name of Peter. He settled there and later established the monastery of Saints Peter and Paul endowing it generously. Finally he himself became a monk. In these years a Mongolian official, Buga, famous for his violent nature, received baptism in Ustyug. He married a local town girl and later (after 1262) used his fortune to establish a monastery near Ustyug. In the Ryazan region there were more such baptized Tatar immigrants. In the princes' service there were numerous descendants of the ancient Cuman leaders, who preferred to integrate with Ruthenia rather than with the Uygurs.

At the turn of the XIII<sup>th</sup> and XIV<sup>th</sup> c. in the Mestchersk region on the Volga, a Christian-Tatar principedom was formed. Bamhet, the son of Hussein, rebelling against

the Khan transferred to this region in 1298 and he ruled there over his улус [nomadic people] while the local people were simultaneously subject to their own prince of Mestchersk. The son of this, Bamhet, Beklemish received baptism (taking on the name of Michael) and he set up a Christian Tatar principedom on the Rivers Tsna and Moksha. Whether Beklemish was Orthodox or Nestorian is unknown.

This was the time when Rome was hoping to come to terms with Nestorianism so as to have influence over the Mongolian rulers of Asia in this way.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 346-350**

There was strong opposition against Islam among the Tatars. When Berke, a fervent follower of the Prophet allied with the Mameluks of Egypt against Hulagu, this resulted in the weakening of his own state. Kipchak was divided on the issue and finally broke into two. At the head of the opposition, in the name of the *yasak* stood Nogai and numerous Tatar units associated with him so he managed to form them into a new society which according to the old custom took its name from the leader. Thus we have the Nogai Tatars or the Nogais. At times the Nogai recognized the superior authority of Berke, becoming together with his people his condottiere, yet at other times he operated independently until finally he declared himself to be the Khan. The divided Kipchak broke apart into two states, the Khanate of the "Golden Horde" on the Volga and the Khanate of the Nogais between the Black and Caspian Seas. Neither cared about the Genghis Khanate in Asia and none of the Kipchak Khans adopted the title of the Genghis Khan. The steppe Khanates became distinct and completely isolated state entities.

These were organisms of a lower order than the state of Batu Khan, not to mention that of Temüjin, not only because they were only a small fragment of its territory and former military potency. After all Kipchak from the very beginning was the least "Uyghurish", the least civilized part within the Genghis Khanate culture. It maintained it longest, but only in the most inferior form. This was rather a caricature of the Genghis Khanate tradition.

The military system remained, but it was warped because since the war between Berke and Hulagu no major war was waged. There were expeditions to China so as to serve as mercenaries,<sup>17</sup> but no one from Kipchak held any significant military position there. The military profession became purely a means of subsistence. There were no wider horizons or higher aims or even reaching out to further distances. Thus the military prowess of the Tatars declined and very rapidly, because for them, it was sufficient to have adequate strength to be able to make plundering raids against neighbours and to demand ransom or tribute from those who were much weaker. Gradually the situation returned to the condition before Temüjin.

There was an even more backward movement in the field of state administration. The Tatars themselves had almost no need for it at all, having abandoned the idea of a great state and so they did not organize anything apart from military units. Patriarchal authorities originating from clan consciousness sufficed, plus a military hierarchy. The Chinese bureaucracy vanished without trace, once the ties between the Khanates and the Genghis Khanate were broken. There was no superior administrative office. The court of the Khan was everything and

---

<sup>17</sup> Sometimes auxiliary units from Ruthenia were taken there. The last mention of them in the Chinese chronicles dates from 1334.

courtiers ruled in Kipchak and Ruthenia. The regular *ямен* [*yamen* — Chinese administrative office] that had visited the Rurikid princedoms did not last for long. Even the *baskaks* were not always and everywhere present in the princedoms. If they were there, they ceased to be officials initiated in bureaucratic discipline, and instead they became troublemakers whom the favours of the court, frequently female favours, offered them some princedom as a spoil. Often the position of the *baskak* was vacant and the task of collecting the tribute was sold to some Mongol trader or speculator who increased it freely as much as he could. The Tatars, separated from the Uyghur root and left to themselves, were becoming savages. The pejorative term “Horde” given to their societies by the Persians and meaning the same as the Turkic term “Kazakh” was adopted and it stuck to them. They did not feel or understand the pejorative contemptuous notion within the term. It is characteristic that they themselves adopted this term “Horde” for their groupings<sup>18</sup>.

The *baskaks* sent from Sarai were Kipchak Tatars, who on arrival in Ruthenia entered a country that had a higher culture. They accepted the greater conveniences and easier life to enjoy as long as possible, until some intrigue would not recall them back to a yurt in the steppes. Thus it was never possible to know what they would demand. Ruthenia was handed over to them as a spoil, because only occasionally was it possible to find justice at the Khan’s court against their extortion or violence. The road to Sarai was long, costly and uncertain. Not always would one return from it, and frequently this

---

<sup>18</sup> This probably happened through the mediation of Armenian traders. It indicates at the same time that some civilizational influences from Persia were present in Kipchak.

was with some mortal disease or poison in the organism. In any case only a prince could travel there with some complaint, but he had to prove that a *baskak* by his behaviour was reducing the proceeds of the Khan. Thus he had to promise to provide more than was flowing into the Khan's treasury from the *baskak*. This was possible only when the Tatar representative exaggerated in sharing the proceeds with the Khan and too much of what he collected remained in his own pocket. It also happened that the prince decided to become the extortionist himself, offering to bring to the Khan more than the Tatar, just to get rid of him.

A *baskak* did not arrive alone, but with a whole court and train of people of both sexes. He brought along with him relatives and friends who were hoping for an easy life. Furthermore at his side a Tatar trading station was set up, of course on privileged trading conditions. Thus a gang arrived, which had to be supplied with everything it asked for. Occasionally those who arrived were more honest hoping only for enrichment through trade. But even the righteous ones became demoralized when they saw that a Tatar was allowed to do whatever he wished. The majority of these immigrants stayed not for long, just to collect riches and to return to live among their kin. Some however became accustomed to the sedentary life and they preferred to stay. Tatar blood started to mix with the Slav already in the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. It needs to be pointed out that Tatar women experienced full freedom not being hindered by the rules of life in a harem which were brought in only much later. Following the princes there were family ties with the Tatars the more so because when this happened, the Slav family entered the privileged class, that of the *baskaks*. Various place names derived from the term *baskak* found in the Rostov region testify to the links between the settlers and the

Tatar administration. Tatar settlements were extended on this route, all the way to the River Vyatka<sup>19</sup>.

The position of each Tatar in Ruthenia was exalted above any laws to such an extent that among the common people the term Tatar became identified with a prince. Every Tatar was a prince! Not to mention the *baskak* himself! For example, the *baskak* in Kursk established rural settlements on other people's land on his own authority. When there were complaints he dealt with them in a very simple way: he ordered that those who complained be hanged. He set up as if a statelet of his own in which he was the unlimited master of the life and property of all the people. In fact all the *baskaks* had such power and the population was satisfied when he used his authority with "moderation".

The savagery of the Tatars brought to the people of the Rurikids the arbitrary lawlessness of those in command, fiscal extortion, the flourishing of the slave trade and all the other plagues of anarchy. But it also gave them the possibility of shedding this yoke. The Rurikids themselves however tightened the shackles of their own subjection and symptoms of this phenomenon that is unique in history began immediately after the death of Alexander Nevsky [1263].

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 351-352**

The second culprit [after Andrew who accepted the *yarlyk* certificate for Vladimir from the Khan] was Yaroslav Yaroslavich, prince of Tver, the younger brother

---

<sup>19</sup> As examples of marriages of Ruthenian princes with Tatar princesses one can mention Gleb of Beloozero (1257), Feodor Black of Mozhaisk (c. 1270) and George of Moscow (after 1300).

of Andrew [both brothers of Alexander Nevsky]. While the older brother was engaged in taking over Vladimir, Yaroslav discreetly sent message to the Khan asking for a certificate for himself, and he received it. He obtained primacy in the eyes of the Tatar overlords by the fact that he asked, while at the same time Andrew fell into disfavour as the one who did not ask for a certificate and thus the *yarlyk* for the Grand Princedom went to the younger brother. Since then the local laws had no significance in the eyes of the Khan. His arbitrary will, in practice that of the *baskaks*, was now the only law. Were it not for the insidious move of Yaroslav, the certificate could have fallen to the rank of a mere symbol, given always to whoever was the head of the Rurikids of Zalesye and the law of the land would have been decisive, as it was already recognized when Alexander Nevsky was raised to the dignity of Grand Prince on the principle of seniority. This could have happened without any formalities. But Yaroslav himself showed the court of the Khan how the dynasty could be restrained by the introduction of the principle that first it was necessary to obtain the certificate for Grand Princedom from the Khan and that this could be given to anyone. This issue became a bone of contention that demoralized and incapacitated the dynasty. From this moment, the dynasty was not composed of allies ready to help one another but of a loose grouping of personal enemies. The first condition for the shedding of the Tatar domination was lost, that of the solidarity of the princes in respect to the Khan. The Horde noticed that it had to deal not with an entire dynasty but with individual princes one after the other and the Khans did not hesitate to draw a conclusion from this. Soon the principle was established that each prince must have a *yarlyk* certificate for his princedom, and so it was the will of Khan that determined who was to be appointed

to the provinces. Thus all the princes were to become Tatar dignitaries, each one personally dependent on the Horde. As a result all the princes competed for the favour of the Khan's court weakening one another's position and working through intrigues, bribery, servile cajolery and voluntary propositions to increase the tribute.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 366-370**

After all Novgorod as a rule was forced to be on the defensive side. It managed to come out of difficulties either through the intervention of the Hanseatic League or thanks to help of the Khan. In vain, in the richest society of Ruthenia would one seek any policy of a wider perspective. This was in the years when in the lands of the Rurikids, two Hordes, the Toktai and the Nogai were in rival competition. The obvious conclusion is that the Rurikids could have gained precedence over both Hordes, had they all stood in solidarity alternatively on the side of one or the other, helping them to be victorious in their mutual war. Thus they would face both Hordes as an equal partner in the struggle, thereby making both Hordes dependent on them. But they did not do this and they split into supporters of both Hordes. Who failed to receive a *yarlyk* certificate in one Horde ran to the other asking for it.

Kipchak ceased to be invincible, even when both Hordes operated jointly. Only one generation had elapsed since the death of Batu Khan and the Tatars were experiencing defeats in Poland and even in Ruthenia their raids were resisted successfully, but only in those regions where the Lithuanian dynasts were in command. The Tatars were dangerous as robbers to the highest degree, much higher than any other conqueror because

they captured people for sale as slaves, but they lost their ability to rule over their neighbours and Ruthenia could have liberated itself from them were it not for the fact that they were proposing themselves to the Hordes in bondage. Already in 1274, when Leo of Halych, the son of Daniel asked for Tatar help against the Lithuanians, he did not gain anything by this, but rather he lost, because also his own principedom was plundered. Nothing remained of the former discipline of Temüjin's army. There were regular armies in China, but the savage Kipchak did not take food reserves on expeditions and so requisitions were conducted in such a way that every Tatar unit was allowed to rob what it could. The lack of any quartermasters or supply commissariat meant that the Tatars plundered the lands of the enemy and those of an ally equally. Since there was no plan for a campaign, expeditions changed into simple plundering raids incapable of bringing any permanent gains and unable to occupy a country. Leo had no benefit in this for his reign and the power of Lithuania was not diminished. The operation of Nogai in 1277 in the same region was no better. In 1280 Leo for a third time tried to expand his realm with the help of the Tatars. This time this was against the Piasts [Polish dynasty] at the expense of the Sandomierz principedom. Having crossed the Vistula with the Tatars, already in Goślewiec, two miles from Sandomierz Leo met with an army of Leszek the Black, and was defeated. As a result Leszek moved into the Halych principedom and reached as far as Lviv, and on his way back he occupied Przeworsk. Soon (in 1301 or 1302) Lublin returned to the realm of the Piasts (it had been occupied by Daniel in 1245). The alliance with the Tatars did not prevent Leo from losing border regions.

Two years later it was remembered in the Hordes that once under Temüjin Hungary had been conquered but

they failed to occupy the country for good. Both Hordes joined forces to complete this great national endeavour, but the mode of operation turned the project into something of a caricature. The princes of Southern Ruthenia were ordered to provide assistance with which Nogai and Talabuga came only to the borders of Hungary. There in the Carpathian gorges they were soundly defeated. Five years later, in 1287 a new Tatar invasion passed through Southern Ruthenia onto Poland (Leo and Mstislav, the sons of Daniel formed the front guard). Many people were taken captive (this time primarily girls were taken), but the Tatars were no longer supreme in military encounters. Sandomierz and Kraków managed to defend themselves this time and near Sącz they were defeated in battle on an open field. They reached far, going with their units as far as the land of Sieradz, but they stayed there not for long, only sufficiently to collect captives and escape with them. When they attacked Poland for the fourth time in the winter of 1293/94 they failed to reach beyond Sandomierz and this was their last invasion. From now on they moved only into territories where they met with no resistance, where they found allies welcoming their arrival and inviting their assistance against some relatives or neighbours, and so they restricted themselves to Ruthenia. Ruthenia did not offer the slightest resistance.

Only in the next generation, under the grandchildren of Daniel in the lands of the Cherven Towns appeared the idea that perhaps the Mongol yoke could be shed,<sup>20</sup> but

---

<sup>20</sup> Leo I died in 1301. His son George died in 1308. (He joined the Halych and Vladimir princedoms). The sons of George, Andrew of Vladimir and Leo II of Halych (1308-1324) again made ties with the West and took up the struggle against the Tatars.

there was no echo of this beyond this Polish-Ruthenian territory.

Southern and Northern Ruthenia by now lost even the feeble dynastic consciousness that earlier had sometimes bonded them to a degree. There were no ties between the Rurikids of the North and of the South, not even an accidental connection can be found in the available sources. No one among the Rurikids was able to embrace the totality of the clan that had multiplied so greatly over the vast territories. Towards the end of XIII<sup>th</sup> c. the princely state had about 200 male members. It was only possible to speak of a clan consciousness within some branches of the Rurikid family, and this only in exceptional circumstances. The most capable expert in the genealogy of his clan would not have been able to explain the degree of kinship. After all there were lines which even though they originated from the older branches went into oblivion suffering poverty in some minuscule and deprived provinces. The Rostov branch, which was not very numerous ceased to have contact with the relatives of other branches and the "large nest" was completely isolated. Around 1300 the political fragmentation was complete. There was no sign of any political consciousness of community between the dynasties of the South and the North. They were not even united in the face a common enemy, the Mongol *baskaks*.

They were not also bonded by the existence of a Metropolitan See of the "Whole of Ruthenia", because in 1303 the South severed away, establishing for themselves a separate Metropolitan See in Halych.

Metropolitan Cyril, the former chancellor at Halych, tried to maintain ecclesial unity in Ruthenia, but he had more successes in the field of Church reforms than in attributing to the Church some political influence as a factor that could unify all the Eastern Slav lands. The

synod that he organized in 1274 at Vladimir on Klyazma gave excellent results as regards to internal Church affairs. The level of the Eastern Church would have risen substantially were the "rules" of Cyril followed as regards the conditions for priestly ordination<sup>21</sup>, as well as pertaining to the relationships between the higher and lower clergy<sup>22</sup>. From the very beginning, however, there were doubts as to whether the synod concerns the whole Church province of Kiev, because only Northern bishops took part (those of Rostov, Novgorod, Polotsk and Sarai). In that same year the Metropolitan made a trip to the South and he stayed in Kiev, but he did not manage to convince any bishop from the South to accept the decisions of the synod. Kiev and its surroundings started to improve economically again and probably it was again

---

<sup>21</sup> 25 years of age for deacons, 30 for priests, the witness of good life, a recommendation by seven priests and several years of trial.

<sup>22</sup> This relationship consisted in simony and exploitation. Following the custom taken over from Byzantium the superior sold lower ecclesiastical positions that were dependent upon him to the one who paid more. The taxes for appointments had deteriorated so far. Who had no cash could pay by doing physical labour in the home or field of the superior; after all even slaves were ordained. Cyril fought against these excesses with much energy. He was unable to eradicate the taxes, the more so since the majority of the hierarchy came from Greece. At least, he wanted to determine their maximal value and so he referred to the decrees of the Byzantine Emperors Isaac Komnen (1057-59) and Alexy (1080-1118); these taxes were considered proper in the beginning of the XII<sup>th</sup> c. and were probably low at the end of the XIII<sup>th</sup> because the currency had devaluated. The custom of paying such taxes passed on also to Rome and caused much scandal and sharp opposition. Apart from the Roman Curia taxes were not taken from clergy anywhere in the Western Church.

possible to draw revenues from the estates of the Kiev Metropolitan See, because Cyril renounced in this year his bishopric at Vladimir and ordained an archimandrite from the Pecherska Lavra for the diocese. He regulated the relationships with the Horde personally and obtained in Sarai in 1279 the first certificate (*yarlyk*) assuring the safety of Church property, and primarily the inviolability of the property of the Metropolitan of Kiev. He even settled again in Kiev. This was paid for by the acceptance of Tatar supremacy over the Metropolitan See. Through the example that he gave — this time a bad one — it was required of his successors that they be recognized by the Khan and they had to personally pay him homage for a certificate — *yarlyk*. Later this was even required of the bishops.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 375-376**

In Southern Ruthenia there were no princes, and their soldiers, the true "Rus" were deprived. They were losing their sense of existence as well as its material basis. Since they had no land, they had nothing to live off. In contrast to Novgorod, in the South they remained as a distinct social class living in the forts at the expense of the princes. Only exceptionally some one would establish a village and also they did not take up the urban professions. When there were no longer any princes and when the Tatars had destroyed the forts, they had to emigrate looking for service with some other prince. Some went westwards to the Halych principedom, others went to Zalesye. Many remained awaiting for a change of the situation, but as matters became worse, even they finally had to emigrate. The Moscow prince profited from the situation and recruited them placing them under his

command. This must have required efforts that lasted several years until some 2000-3000 soldiers scattered over extensive areas could be called, united and organized anew. The agreement was precise, with all the details arranged in advance because the soldiers did not come to Moscow individually or in groups of a few or a dozen or even in scores. They came in regiments, meaning in those days, as whole armies.

This emigration decided about the final decline of the forts in Southern Ruthenia. More and more it became a rural country while Northern Ruthenia remained a country of towns. Being completely deprived of industrious people who had some tradition and ambition and were capable of serving in the army must have had a very negative effect of the psyche of the remaining population. Passivity, apathetic purposelessness and the lack of courage so as to attempt the improvement of life became for many years the sad feature of Kiev and Chernigov Ruthenia. Everything that was more positive in the country went to the West or to the North.

Rodion Nestorovych and Pleshchayev with his companions followed the route that was well known since the days of Yuri the Long Armed, and they went to the land of Suzdal where at least half (if not more) of the Slav population had a Southern origin. This is indicated by the geographic names of forts and rivers that were transferred from the Kiev land onto the lands of the Mordvin and Mari people. This local population was strengthened by the plentiful new arrivals. In the days and conditions of the time where the population was sparse the coming of two or three thousand people made a big difference. The valley of the River Moscow was becoming the most Slavic out of all the "Rostov lands"<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>23</sup> Only one region in the valley maintained its Mordvin character.

A prince who wanted to maintain such a large garrison had to wage wars. Otherwise the new arrivals would have dispersed, because he would not have the means of supporting them and the main and most welcome part of this support were the spoils. They did not come here from afar to lead a peaceful and modest life. Thus, both sides were happy, the Moscow princes who had invited the soldiers because they wanted to make conquests at the expense of neighbours, and the arrivals who were enticed by the prospect of gaining spoils. The mutual arrangements and promises were maintained. Plunder was practiced on a grand scale and so the power of the Moscow princes grew.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 384-389**

At one stage the introduction of Mongolian administration was the beginning of state management in Ruthenia. In time, however the political culture of Kipchak declined so much that the verb "to govern" started to mean "plunder". By the beginning of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. only the fiscal agents, tax collectors, supervisors and the state mail remained from the entire Chinese-Temüjin administration. There was no taxation system whatsoever. The only principle was: take under any pretence, on the condition that this was often and in large amounts. The entire state function was reduced to fiscalism. The voluntary confirmation of the Tatar yoke above them not only did not develop a higher Ruthenian statehood, but it also suppressed any ambition for government among the princes. They did not even try to have any power. All they were after was to enrich themselves. For this purpose they had to enter into agreement with the Tatar supervisors, controllers, commissioners etc. They had to be bribed,

introduced into corrupt gangster actions and it was necessary to be blind to their excesses<sup>24</sup>. The Rurikid princes were going through a fatal schooling in the system in which administration and human wrongs were one and the same thing.

There was still no state consciousness at all. Only new taxes appeared. The tax per “smoke” was changed to a tax per head. The census of the population was introduced. At each counting each individual tried to reduce the number of his children and servants if he was unable to hide during the listings. Soon a distinction was introduced between the “listed” and the “unlisted” people. Those “listed” were considered a better category because no one from among the landowners or house owners could remain unknown<sup>25</sup>. After a short time the per-head taxation was maintained and there was a return to taxes per “smoke” and so the census listings of the population served to increase the burden of taxation imposed upon the farmers. It was difficult to count the ards or ploughs in Zalesye (which was most subservient to the Tatars and for the longest time) a region that from the very beginning was more agricultural than Old Ruthenia.

---

<sup>24</sup> Not only the *baskaks*, but the whole bureaucracy of Kipchak was always present, constantly adjacent to the person of the Grand Prince himself. This is indicated by the Tatar seals next to those of the Grand Princes. In all the major towns Tatar officials were present also in the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. Proof of this could be found in the fact that the “Goths” and all other foreigners who were making trade deals with the towns of Northern Ruthenia required that their houses be free of quarters for the Tatars. Such an arrangement was recorded in Smolensk.

<sup>25</sup> At the time property without the possession of real estate was unknown. Each independent person lived in his own house.

The principle was therefore adopted that every "smoke" beyond the fort was the home of farmers and one plough was counted for two adult men<sup>26</sup> (from which later developed the notion of a *тягло* [harness tax]) and from such an ideal plough, the tax in 1275 was equivalent to "half a fine" and later that was doubled (as the plough tax).

For traders there was the *тамга*, that is, a seal, which was used by the municipal scales when goods were weighed. Without the imprint of the seal no merchandise could be sold. Each market was under control. The traders at the time did not consider smuggling to be a sin and so the officials had a way of making extra earnings that was just as good as quarrelling about the number of "heads" in a "smoke" or harnessed to a plough.

A second type of tax imposed upon the traders was the "bridge tax" from which the *мыто* [customs duty] derived. Before the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. the whole of Ruthenia knew the "road tax" which was collected regardless whether it was necessary anywhere to improve the road.

In Ruthenia there was no occasion for the taxing of mines and vineyards and at the time the forest yielded no profits. But the establishment and maintenance of a settlement was taxed from its very beginning and furthermore there was an extra tax for each barn.

The prince helped the *baskak* and the *baskak* helped the prince and so new fees appeared that had been unknown in previous generations, and they were meant

---

<sup>26</sup> One was harnessed to the plough and the other walked behind it. Later on difficult soils three people were counted per *тягло* (harness). As the use of horses increased (cattle was used on the land much later) the harnessing of men ended and finally the memory of the previous practice vanished. It is a completely false notion that the harnessing of the peasant to the plough was a sign of deliberate torture of slaves. Everywhere, agriculture began with the harnessing of people.

for the prince's treasury. Also payments in kind were introduced (for example in honey or beaver's meat) depending on the local conditions. There were many abuses in respect to the postal services<sup>27</sup>. Judicial payments did not expand and they remained on the same level as before. This was the only source of revenue that the Tatars did not place their hands on. Apart from that the oppressive Tatar taxation was on the increase in many directions and the princes benefited from this and thus in the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. their revenues grew substantially.

The Tatar officials were performing only the role of caretakers and the princes obtained by the grace of the Khans the right to personally collect the Tatar tribute. In each region therefore there was a tax-collector who gradually became the representative of the princely authority. Among the Germans such a village tax-collector of a feudal lord was referred to as the *Hauptmann*. German traders used the same term when dealing with the princely tax-collectors in Ruthenia and it was this term that was adopted in an assimilated form as the *атаман* (ataman, chieftain). It completely replaced the native term *ноборщиков*<sup>28</sup>. Already in 1293 the atamans-

---

<sup>27</sup> Not only the supply of carts, food for the prince's messengers (*корм* [feed]), all possible services for state travellers at the postal stations (*стан* [camp]), but also the obligation to make the roads passable (*нпомоп* [priming]), the treading and smoothing of snow after blizzards, the trying of soggy roads and the search for the driest route after the Spring thaws, and the overall repair of roads through padding etc. All of this was introduced by the *baskaks*, however the Rurikids willingly accepted all this and even expanded it universally.

<sup>28</sup> Already under Alexander Nevsky such tax-collectors travelled far to the frozen North where the Tatar officials did not want to travel. Were they already referred to as atamans, is

collectors were travelling from market to market along the Northern Dvina River and imposing carts-services and feed on the authority of the prince.

The ataman paid a tribute to the prince, the prince paid it to the Grand Prince, i.e. the most important prince in the region (such as in the lands of Tver, Ryazansk, Smolensk etc.) and finally he paid it to the main treasurer of the Khan who was the Grand Prince in Moscow. With respect to the Khan the princes were "grand, medium and small". The most important was the one who was charged with care for the greatest revenues and with respect to the Sarai he became the Grand Prince of the whole of Tatar Ruthenia. This was not a state authority, but fiscal power changes most easily into every other. For the moment the masters of Moscow surpassed all the other Rurikids in terms of wealth. It was very enriching to be the treasurer of the Khan.

Some native notions of a state existed in the specific system of administrative division of the Ruthenian lands. It was based upon the main (senior) forts. Each one had a subordinate region consisting of some lands. Each region of the main fort governed over its *пригороды* [suburbs] and its lands. The senior fort, the dominating one, was a federation of suburbs each of which ruled autonomously over its town neighbourhood but for external purposes they acted in solidarity. This native state law did not develop equally everywhere. In Novgorod the Great (where there were five suburbs, the so called *концы* [ends]), the entire *воласть* [authority] of the city was divided into five *пятины* [fifths — districts]. In time

---

not known. All presumed presence in these times of some atamans of the *великокняжески ватаг* [grand duke's military units] or even *ходящих на море* [sea-fearing] flows from the attribution to the term "ataman" (chieftain) a meaning that it acquired only in the XVII<sup>th</sup> c.

it happened that every "end" [district] had the right to call its own prince. The prince who ruled in the senior district had to be a Grand Prince in respect to the princes of the suburbs. In the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. this occurred increasingly frequently due to the overabundance of people belonging to the princely caste. These Grand Princes however failed to become superiors of the princes ruling in the minor forts of the same region. It can be said that due to the multiplication of the Rurikids, the number of princely seats increased with the result being that any hamlet with its surroundings became a "princedom". As a result of the loosening of the dependence of the suburbs towards the senior forts the beginnings of a native state law disappeared.

The hierarchy of the princes did not lead therefore to any state system. None of the princes wanted to see any state authority above them. Even the Khan's treasurer did not want this. Due to the instability of relationships and uncertainty of the future no one had any interest in this. Not even the prince of Moscow wanted this, because at any moment he could have been subjected to the authority of his hated rival in Tver. Also within the society there was no initiative leading to the forming of a state authority. At the time no one in Ruthenia wanted to see strong princes.

Among the various notions from which the type of a social and state system develops and also the entire structure of public life, the notions of the sanctity and of land ownership have a primary role. Since a peasant and a prince had the same right to unclaimed land, the Ruthenian princes were only competitors who were hindering others in the process of executing this right to take over no man's land. Thus they were restricting the scope of private settlements, but at the same time they did not lead to the appearance of any state property.

There was a saying that it was better not to be a neighbour of a prince.

The princedoms were becoming enterprises of the members of the princely caste. "In his district the prince was not really a ruler but the owner of land. He did not govern over it but he exploited it". "A regional prince of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. had little consciousness of the country as such and even less sense of civil duties. In this way he was more of a barbarian than his ancestors from the South, as for example any of the younger Yaroslaviches of the XII<sup>th</sup> c." Within a princedom of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. the public law did not meet with the private one. Instead there was the encounter of the private law of the person of the princely caste meeting with the identical private law of other individuals. Thus not only was there no development of public law relationships, but Ruthenia was retreating backwards towards the condition which it had in the days of the second edition of the *Русская Правда* [Ruthenian Truth] — Ruthenia Law<sup>29</sup>. The word *государь* [sovereign] implied only personal rule, of a free man over a subject or over someone who was personally dependant on him. Thus compared with anybody else, a prince considered himself to be sovereign only towards his retinue. The wars between princes consisted in trying to change the dependency of as many people on the neighbour's territory to one's own dependency. Later when peace was agreed to, this was frequently revoked.

---

<sup>29</sup> [The Ruthenian Law of Kiev was first edited under Yaroslav the Wise in early XI<sup>th</sup> c. later to be reedited in the days of his sons, the Yaroslavoviches in 1054].

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 407 (subscript 1)**

The example of Uzbek (Öz Beg Khan) shows how the name of a people or society may derive from the name of its organizer, and thus the so called *heros eponymos* is not necessarily a legendary person. Even today there are Uzbek nomads roaming across Turkestan and Afghanistan<sup>30</sup>. Uzbek was the last Khan of Kipchak who acknowledged the sovereignty of the Mongolian Genghis Khans in Peking. Their rule was coming to an end. The last one of them, Chun-Ti sent a delegation to the Pope in 1338 by way of Sarai. Uzbek would send him soldiers to Peking for his guard, also from Ruthenia. In 1320 we have information that the Ruthenian guards were given 20 *kings* of land north of Peking. In 1334 we have the last mention about Ruthenian soldiers in China, namely about general Bayan, the commander of the Mongolian Kipchak and Ruthenian guard. The state over which Uzbek ruled was divided by the Kyrgyz<sup>31</sup> steppe.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 408-410**

The prince [Simeon the Proud] who established the foundations for the future hegemony of Moscow did not think about this; he had no political thought at all.

Throughout Ruthenia there was no sign of any superior native state authority. None of the expressions

---

<sup>30</sup> [In 1924 there the Uzbek Socialist Soviet Republic was established within the USSR, and since 1991 it has become the independent Uzbekistan].

<sup>31</sup> [Kirghyzia was incorporated into Russia in 1876. In 1936 it became the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic and in 1991 it attained independence as Kyrgyzstan].

found in the surviving princely agreements "indicates any state relationships". No one thought about this in Moscow and they limited themselves to the assurance of financial supremacy. Even Kalita did not establish the Grand Princedom, as he made sure in his will that his sons would be treated equally.

Of the three Moscow princes, Ivanoviches, the certificate (*yarlyk*) of Grand Prince of All Ruthenia was given to Simeon (1340-1353). Monastic chronicles disfigured him by calling him "the Proud" for his fondness for expensive buildings decorated in luxury that until his time were unknown in Zalesye. They saw in this a symptom of pride and nothing else. While Ivan Kalita during his 20 years rule visited the Horde three times, Simeon the Proud went there five times during his 12 years rule, so as to litigate, negotiate, accuse others (something that the others responded to mutually), gain something for himself in the *выход* [travel] and hold onto the role of the treasurer for the whole of Ruthenia.

He enriched himself, as did his father, on *закладничество* [mortgage]. In this way he took over the princedom of Vyazma.

His task was facilitated by the compliance of his brothers. Thus the internal peace of the region fortified it on the outside, while the princes of the Tver district in these years (1342-1353) weakened themselves through their permanent quarrels (between Tver and Kholm, Kholm and Kashin etc.). The same thing was happening among the small princedoms of the Grand Princedom of Ryazan. In fact Simeon wanted peace with Tver and he confirmed it by mutual marriages.

Circumstances became favourable for Moscow in respect to Lithuania when Jaunutis, the successor of Gediminas [the Grand Duke of Lithuania] had to flee from his nephews Algirdas and Kęstutis in 1345, and he found

refuge in Moscow. Both sides sought Tatar support, but Dzhanibeg Khan had no intention of being involved in Lithuanian issues. And thus Algirdas, the new supreme ruler of Lithuania asked for peace with Moscow. He became related to Simeon in 1349<sup>32</sup> and till the end of his rule maintained friendly relationships with him.

Algirdas was concerned that Simeon would not oppose his alliance with Novgorod against the Teutonic Knights who wanted to occupy Pskov.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 415 (subscript, pertaining to the Turanian origins of Turkey.)**

In the beginning of the XIII<sup>th</sup> c., before the Mongolian invasion, an Islamic horde of 50000 Oghuz Turks under the leadership of Suleyman Shah fled westwards from the land of Makham in Turanian Khorasanto Armenia. At that time Asia Minor was ruled by the Seljuqs who set up several states there. The youngest son of Suleyman, Ertuğrul (1231–1288), served as a mercenary in the largest of these states, Iconium. Fighting with a part of his Oghuz forces against the Greeks, he carved for himself the land between Angora and Brussa as a fief of Iconium. His son Osman (1288–1326) expanded these possessions at the cost of the Greeks. In 1299 he declared himself Sultan and became initiator of a militaristic state of the “Osman Turks” (Osmanli, Ottomans). His successor Orhan (1326–1356) conquered the whole coastline of the Aegean, Marmara and Black Seas. In 1354 he conquered Gallipolis on the European coast and began establishing fiefdoms on the basis of military law. He

---

<sup>32</sup> After being widowed from a Vitebsk princess, he married Juliana of Tver the sister of Simeon’s third wife.

began the janissaries (guards composed of Balkan Christians turned into Turks). Fighting in the Balkans Turkish rule gradually expanded in Europe in particular when after the death of Stefan Dušan (1355) the state of Serbia disintegrated. It has to be pointed out that Turkish domination originally was tolerant and by no means fiscal and so it was accepted willingly. The son of Orhan, Murad I (1359-1389), captured Adrianople in 1361 and made it a capital of Turkey. He imposed a tribute on the Byzantine Empire in 1365. He won a major victory on the Maritsa River against the Serbs in 1371, after which the Christian princes of Macedonia and Albania submitted to him voluntarily. In 1386 he beat the Seljuqs and occupied the whole of Asia Minor. In 1389 he gave the final blow to the Serbs in the battle on the Kosovo Field, but he himself was killed in the battle. Immediately, on the battlefield his son Bayezid I (1389-1403) was declared Sultan. He allied with Tamerlane (Timur) from whom he received the title of Kaissar i Rum [Sultan-i Rum], i.e. the Roman (Byzantine) Emperor. The allies soon parted and in the battle near Angora [Ankara] in April 1402 Bayezid was taken prisoner of Tamerlane. In spite of this the Turkish state survived, because soon afterwards Tamerlane turned towards China where he died in 1405. The Empire that he had established fell apart in 1468, while Turkey became the main force of the Islamic world.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 419-422**

Such second order provinces, just like what Moscow was originally, were generally passed on from hand to hand, from one branch of the Rurikids to another. Moscow was an exception in that on its basis a new serious branch of the dynasty appeared, in time the strongest. We have

pointed out first the economic reasons for this fact, because they are the deepest foundation of the Moscow edifice. But there were other reasons of a moral nature that were always more or less tied to the question of the Moscow dynastic treasury and the wellbeing of the people.

It is noticeable that wills were written down primarily by those princes that were under the direct influence of the Metropolitans, namely the Moscow ones. A written will is unnecessary, if the will of the testator follows customary law. The general acceptance of written wills manifests a change of notions, an advance in respect to the original law, a change that was obtained through the influence of the Church. This beneficial influence was undoubtedly strongest in the principedom of Moscow. It was here also that the greatest development of the Ruthenian private law, pertaining to the family and inheritance took place. Should we not consider it as an epoch making fact that the rights of orphans were accepted without any opposition from the stronger competitors? And this fact, elevating highly the value of the society was introduced in the Moscow line under the supervision of the Metropolitans. When after the death of Andrew, the brother of Simeon the Proud, an inheritor was born named Vladimir, the child was taken care of with great diligence by Simeon the Proud and by Ivan Ivanovich. Also a province was reserved for him in Serpukhov thereby establishing two Moscow lines<sup>33</sup>. There

---

<sup>33</sup> The current of recognizing the rights of orphans came from above, from the Metropolitan, and thus from Moscow, but it failed to encompass the whole society. That it did not win as a principle can be judged by the opinion of Ivan Ivanovich made by his contemporary chroniclers who claimed that the prince was "weak". A prince who was the first to attack

could have been a third one because Ivan Ivanovich had left two sons, of which, the elder Dmitry (later known as Donskoy) was nine while their cousin Vladimir Andreyevich of Serpukhov was six years old. Ivan Ivanovich did not seek a guardian for them among the neighbouring princes, who would be quite willing to fragment the developed Moscow lands. He left these three children, two sons and a nephew, under God's protection, nominating Metropolitan Alexius as the guardian<sup>34</sup>.

We know nothing at all about the Church activity of this Metropolitan, but we know a great deal about his political activities. Metropolitan Alexius represents a chapter of its own in Russian history, one that is decisive. He was the behind the statehood of Muscovy.

He drew an example from Lithuania. He was the first to consider why a society having a higher culture — and there is no doubt that Ruthenia had a higher culture than Lithuania at the time — for a hundred years was submitting to pressures of a state that was based on a decidedly lower culture. There was no shortage of Ruthenian cultural influences on Lithuania. Through the Lithuanian dynasty itself the Ruthenian custom prevailed there, including Ruthenian writings and Ruthenian notions about private law. But there was no Ruthenian public law and in this Ruthenia submitted to Lithuanian influences.

The mutual interpenetration of a different private law and public law moving in two opposite directions became the main substance of the history of this part of Europe.

---

Lithuania was weak?! He must have been considered weak because he was not a plunderer. At a certain level of culture the notion of energy is linked to brutality (not only in the Middle Ages and not only in Russia).

<sup>34</sup> Dmitry's younger brother Ivan soon died and has no place in history.

A cultural synthesis can happen only where private and public law are of the same species, that is, they derive from the same common source.

After all, the lack of a native statehood, the lack of a public law was a deficiency in Ruthenian culture and it was of such a kind that it was necessary to submit to any public law, even though one deriving from the barbarians. Metropolitan Alexius realized that the Rurikids are weaker in respect to the successors of Gediminas only because they are organized more poorly. Thus having recognized the Lithuanian dynastic law as being superior, he decided to introduce it in Zalesye for the benefit of Moscow.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 424-425**

The first visible sign of Metropolitan Alexius's effort towards the organization of statehood was in 1362 with the granting of state authority to the eldest Moscow prince, the first born Dmitry over his nephew (Vladimir of Serpukhov) since the Grand Prince of Moscow was said to be superior over a regional prince. This was the first legislative act pertaining to Moscow public law dressed in the native form of a *договор* [accord]. Vladimir renounced the right to conduct wars independently and promised Dmitry *служит без ослушаня* [to serve without disobedience], i.e. to join any expedition undertaken by him for which the latter promised *кормить по твоей службе* [to feed on your service] with the reservation that the *княжэне великое* [rule of the Grand Prince] had to be *держать честно и грозно* [held honestly and with severity]. Thus the political unity of the whole Grand Duchy of Moscow was to be maintained externally, because only the Grand Prince was permitted to conduct such a policy.

It has to be pointed out that the contracting sides were aged twelve and nine. The *dogovor* [accord] was of course exclusively the work of the Metropolitan who in this manner laid the first step in the direction of constructing his political edifice, and this was with the agreement of the boyars. They agreed to the setting up of this initial step of statehood making only an exception for themselves (as many reformers do) so that in the future there would be no state authority above them, so that they could continue to transfer at will from one prince to another. Metropolitan Alexius knew that they would remain attached to the Moscow princes' family if it provided them with more benefits than anybody else could do.

Relying on the support of boyars the Metropolitan, who is unknown for any Church activity, managed in 1363 to take over Starodub and Galich (thanks to which Moscow started to rule over the Klyazma River) and three years later he posited a deputy in Novgorod the Great in the name of the 16 years old Dmitry. The influence of Moscow was growing. The Metropolitan was also an arbitrator between the princes of Tver.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 427-431**

Meanwhile the Metropolitan acting as the Regent was strengthening the internal position of Moscow, expanding further its state structure. The second step of this issue came in 1371 with a new *dogovor* [accord] between the Moscow princes. This time it was their equality, established by Ivan Kalita that was completely abandoned. From this time onwards the condition for having a principdom within the Grand Duchy of Moscow was "service" for the Grand Prince whose dignity and power

was to be connected with the primogeniture of the line of Dmitry Ivanovich. Vladimir of Serpukhov recognized himself not only as a subordinate of Dmitry but also of his (eventual) eldest son. He also promised not to seek the title of Grand Prince of the whole of Ruthenia against any sons of Dmitry. In this accord for the first time appeared the term *старший брат* [elder brother]. At the same time it was added that Vladimir had to serve Dmitry, i.e. make his garrisons available should Dmitry need them.

At this stage Dmitry (Donskoy) was already 21 years old and Vladimir 18. Even the younger partner knew what was included in the accord, what he promised and what he renounced. And we know that he did this reluctantly, under some kind of compulsion the nature of which and circumstances we do not know. With the beginning of the next year (1372) he married Helen, the daughter of Algirdas [Lithuanian prince] which was a clear indication that an opposition was being formed. Some actions and preparations obviously must have been made, because two years later we see that Muscovy was divided.

Immediately after the wedding of the daughter of Algirdas, Lithuania intervened in the renewed struggle between Moscow and Tver, and also in the turmoil in Ryazan<sup>35</sup>. Initially Moscow was not successful, but when the military fortune turned<sup>36</sup> because Algirdas and Kęstutis had to retreat from eastern affairs due to the Teu-

---

<sup>35</sup> In the Ryazan region the following absurdity was reached: there were three Grand Princes of Ryazan, Oleg of Ryazan, Vladimir of Pron and Tit of Kozelsk. In the truce they agreed to during the Lithuanian-Moscow conflict of 1372 all three of them titled themselves Grand Princes of Ryazan.

<sup>36</sup> Kęstutis and Andrew the son of Algirdas had plundered the region of Pereyaslav and forced the prince of Kashin of the Tver province who was allied with Moscow to pay a tribute.

tonic Knights,<sup>37</sup> there occurred a division within Moscow itself.

The Regent-Metropolitan judged that time had come to make changes in the rights of the garrison members. Profiting from the death of Vasily Vasilyevich Veljaminov who commanded 1000 soldiers the Metropolitan advised Dmitry (Donskoy) not to replace the assignment which according to custom was hereditary. Thus the hereditary dignity of a representative of class self rule was abolished as well as the freedoms of the classes. From that time onwards the prince himself was to be the commander of the 1000 soldiers in Moscow. This was to be a beginning of a slow change of the free garrison soldiers into subjects of the prince. This was a brave attempt, truly with a dual-edged courage. Not only the son of the last commander of the 1000 men. Ivan objected together with a certain part of the descendants of Ruthenian Varangians, but also a part of the boyar city dwellers led by the trader Nekomat. The malcontents fled to Tver and they had such resources at their command that they were able to buy again in the Horde a certificate — *yarlyk* for Mikhail Aleksandrovich of Tver, and in fact this is what happened in 1375.

---

They expelled the prince of Pron from Ryazan who a few months earlier had been posited there by Moscow to rule and they brought back Oleg, who was allied with Algirdas, to take over. But in that same year 1372 the front guard of Algirdas was defeated near Lyubutsk. Sviatoslav of Smolensk abandoned Lithuania. Moscow was again conspiring with Kashin against Tver and Vladimir of Serpukhov serving diligently against his father-in-law was sent to Novgorod the Great to prepare an attack against Tver from that side.

<sup>37</sup> Shortly before, the Teutonic Knights had moved against Pskov, which was besieged in 1367 and 1369 and they caused conflicts with Novgorod the Great. Next, however they turned most of their forces against Lithuania.

Now Tver and Moscow were in a serious military conflict — without any intervention coming from Lithuania. The whole of Zalesye, except for Ryazan, the Smolensk land and Novgorod the Great stood on the side of Moscow<sup>38</sup>. Mikhail Aleksandrovich, exhausted in the siege of Tver (5.VIII — 3.IX.1375) by Dmitry of Moscow who attacked together with ten other Rurikids finally had to accept humiliating conditions for peace. These are the founding stone of Moscow's hegemony over Zalesye. The "Grand Prince" of Tver (so titled alongside his conqueror) recognized himself to be a subject of the Grand Prince of Moscow and so he took upon himself the same obligations as the prince of Serpukhov did in 1371. Also the territory of the Tver principedom was reduced. Kashin became part of Muscovy and from that time onwards it sent its Tatar tribute to Moscow. It was mentioned separately in the accord that the Grand Prince of Tver was obliged to fight Algirdas on every call of the Moscow Dmitry should Lithuania attack Moscow or Smolensk. Thus also Sviatoslav Ivanovich of Smolensk broke completely his links with Lithuania and joined the Moscow camp.

It is obvious that the peace treaty of Tver forbade Mikhail Aleksandrovich to have any direct relationships with the Horde. But it was a novelty of great significance that the Tver regiments were to take part in every military expedition undertaken by Moscow, even if it were to be against the Tatars. It was spelled out and predicted in

---

<sup>38</sup> In these years there was agitation coming from all sides. In 1375, a church of St. Timofey [Dovmont] was blessed in Novgorod the Great; thus the new local saint of the Novgorod eparchy was Dovmont, the heroic Lithuanian prince who had such merit in the history of the city. However, in spite of the new church the Lithuanian-Tver party was defeated in Novgorod.

the accord that Dmitry of Moscow could give the tribute to the "Tsar" or refuse giving it, and that he could even wage war against him, and that Tver was to comply in this with the policy of Moscow. Thus, it can be clearly seen that there was an attempt to ensure that only the Grand Prince of Moscow would lead the policies in the name of the whole of Zalesye while the other princes were to deal only with local issues, just as was the case in Lithuania.

The peace of Tver of 1375 introduced many changes, significant ones, but as of old it had to confirm the abominable from the view of any statehood right of soldiers to freely move from one prince to another<sup>39</sup>.

When in Moscow there was rejoicing due to the subjection of Tver Algirdas attained a major triumph in another issue more important than the field of battle. In 1376 it was decided in the Patriarchate that Kiev, which at the time was under Lithuania would be the only Metropolitan See and the only one empowered to throw anathemas. It was enough to wait out until the end of the days of Alexius and then it would be possible to take up with renewed hope the conquest of the rest of Ruthenia by subduing Moscow. But within several months, in 1377 the days of fame of Algirdas ended. Hardly a year later, in February 1378, Metropolitan Alexius, the father of Moscow statehood died. He was correctly referred to by the Patriarch of Constantinople as a "great man".

Algirdas and Alexius were opponents worthy of one another. It was thanks to them that Lithuania and Moscow did not mould into one. Alexius dreamt of the shedding of Tatar yoke, but he preferred Tatar domination rather than the Lithuanian. Were it only the issue

---

<sup>39</sup> Dmitry made only one exception with respect to Ivan of Veliaminov whose lands he confiscated.

of freeing from Tatar domination, then the shortest way out would be to submit Zalesye to Algirdas. But Alexius considered the struggle against Lithuania as more important than liberating Zalesye from Tatar dominance! Also Algirdas preferred to recede empty handed from the walls of the Moscow Kremlin and to expose his "Lithuanian Ruthenia" to a very dangerous test of fidelity rather than adopt Orthodoxy. Had Algirdas conquered Zalesye, and were the rule of the descendants of Gediminas to reach Nizhny Novgorod, would Lithuania have been able to become... Roman Catholic scarcely eight years after the death of Algirdas?<sup>40</sup> Strangely indeed do causes and effects intertwine in history!

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 448**

Moscow remained with the certificate (*yarlyk*) for the "whole of Ruthenia", even though it was victorious over the powerful Don Horde and thought of shedding the Sarai supremacy. It remained the seat of the only Metropolitan who was throwing anathemas on the subjects of the Lithuanian state. Itself it started to be a state that with success was expanding its statehood over Zalesye and being a centre of gravity for malcontents of the Lithuanian dynasty.

But the history of the Eastern Slav lands over many centuries is an uninterrupted enchanted thread of sudden, catastrophic changes. The battle of Kulikovo<sup>41</sup> was not to be an achievement of freedom or the basis for the

---

<sup>40</sup> [Lithuania became Catholic on bonding with Poland in 1385].

<sup>41</sup> [In 1380, for the first time Moscow defeated the Golden Horde on Kulikovo field near the River Don. From that time onwards Dmitry was referred to as Donskoy].

power of Moscow. Soon after it there was a period of decline, so much so that Nizhny Novgorod counted more than Moscow and again came to the fore in Zalesye. The entire Muscovite edifice was to last for only two years after the battle of Kulikovo and four years later the whole statehood of Muscovy came to ruin. But the foundations remained, on which later a new edifice was constructed and its basic elements have survived until today, even though later there were times when they were covered by ruins.

Thus it was necessary to stress in particular the years 1360-1380, when the foundations of a distinct Moscow statehood were set and for this reason these scarcely 20 years had to be treated as a distinct historical period.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 450-452**

Tamerlane was not only a new condottiere star of the East but also a new creative mind generating new societies on a confessional-military and therefore state basis. He began with a small regiment during the Persian Turkestan war in 1358, but after five years he had his own army and after a further six years he was the ruler over much of Asia. He was the inventor of a new art of government, a new statehood system. The secret of his success was his religious fanaticism and terror. He was a Shia Muslim. With his sword, he was propagating a pure Islam based uniquely upon the Quran that was opposed to the Sunnites who recognized also the tradition. In Khorasan he ordered that the canals in the lands of the Sunnites be filled with sand. He ravaged with utmost cruelty the Armenians and Northern India. He destroyed Delhi. He took Asia Minor and plundered Baghdad, Damascus and Aleppo. Within the systems of Islamic public,

civil and religious law (the *tazik* and *sharia*) he imposed the supremacy of those commentators who posited the rulers above the law treating their arbitrary will as the only source of civil law. Thus a system of oriental despotism was born, based upon a state religion and bound by the obligation to eradicate all those who did not want to follow it.

In the struggles for the domination of Kipchak, Tamerlane proposed his own candidate. His name was Tokhtamysh. Thanks to Tamerlane's support he defeated the Don Horde in 1381 in the battle on the River Kalka. He captured Mamai and took him to Crimea where he killed him. When subsequently Tokhtamysh settled in Sarai, as of old the Rurikids came to him for certificates *yarlyks* and for judicial decisions.

By the will of Tamerlane the whole of Kipchak was united again under the jurisdiction of Tokhtamysh. For many reasons this was undoubtedly convenient for Ruthenia, but it had also a serious unexpected economic danger. The political influences of the northern Hordes were declining and it was possible to impose a Ruthenian tax against them in Kazan on the Bulgarian trade. But Tokhtamysh totally forbade the Ruthenian traders to trade with the Volga Bulgars. Of course this prohibition was not respected and anyway the Ruthenian princes had no means or resources to assure the execution of this prohibition. As a result in 1382 Tokhtamysh confiscated all the goods held by Ruthenian traders, and this was a general catastrophe for the whole of Zalesye. Not satisfied with this, he moved against the princes of Zalesye Ruthenia in 1382.

The princes of Suzdal, who were most guilty in the issue of Bulgarian trade against the Sarai "Tsar", were the first not only to submit to him but they joined their troops to the further Tatar advance. In this operation the

following towns were pillaged: Serpukhov, Vladimir on Klyazma, Pereyaslav of Zalesye, Yuryev-Polsky, Zvenigorod, Mozhaisk, Borovsk, Ruza, Dmitrov, Kolomna and the whole of the Ryazan region even though the region had freely submitted to Tokhtamysh. With one move all the foundations and ties of the Muscovite statehood vanished. No one wanted to fight. In vain did Dmitry Donskoy try to gather some forces twice, in Pereyaslav and in Kostroma. After the treacherous guarantee of life and property security the Moscow Kremlin surrendered<sup>42</sup>, but on August 23rd 1384 there was a terrible slaughter of the garrison and town dwellers and the dynastic treasury set up by Ivan Kalita was taken by Tokhtamysh.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 456-457**

Moscow and the further regions of eastern Zalesye were free of sects, while the western part of the "whole Rostov land" as well as the whole of "St. Sophia's realm" together with the "younger bother" of Novgorod, Pskov were deeply involved in sectarianism. In Rostov there was iconoclasm supported even by their prince Alexander Constantinovich (†1404). In the hermitages of Beloozero it was taught that the monasteries do not need any land property and that widowers can be ordained

---

<sup>42</sup> Dmitry Donskoy was not in Moscow at the time, nor was there anyone of the princely family or of the secular and Church dignitaries. Under such circumstances an "assembly" was organized, the only one ever in the entire history of Moscow. This means that the remaining inhabitants of Moscow held a gathering under open air. This is a classical proof of the fact that this rally was not any public-legal body, but the most primitive of all common gatherings that is natural for all peoples at a low level of social organization.

priests but heretics should not be punished. Thus this was a religious tolerance of a specific kind restricted to ideas coming from the monasteries, but there was not a word about tolerance towards Catholicism! Unorthodox ideas about paradise on earth found a new location in Tver. Already in the first half of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. there appeared strange ideas about monastic life in Novgorod the Great and so many monks married (preceding thereby... the Germans). Hardly had these issues been dealt with, when new *рострыги* [uproars] erupted.

After 1371 the sect of the *стригольники* [Strigolniki] established by deacon Nikita Karp started to spread from Pskov. This was absolutely revolutionary. They did not want to pay any Church tributes, they denied the clergy a distinct Church judiciary, they completely rejected the hierarchy and all manifestations of Church organization and they declared that a sinful priest is to be deprived of all functions. (In this they preceded the Hussites.) This sect spread in the monasteries and the monks started to reject the sacraments. They insisted that confession is to be made "to the soil and not to a priest". One of the Novgorod igumens, Zakhar, did not receive Holy Communion for three years nor did he require this from his monks. When the bishop criticized him for this, he replied: "From whom am I to receive Communion?! The priests are appointed for money, and even the bishops are installed by the Metropolitan for money!" This was the consequence of abuses with taxes paid for ordinations. Not stopping there the sect moved further in its "development". The Strigolniki rejected also services for the deceased and all alms offered for the salvation of their souls. Soon their teaching allowed for the secularization of Church property and the calling of the clergy before civil courts.

Around 1382 the Patriarch of Constantinople Nilus sent a letter to Pskov in reaction to the Strigolniki, but he was only interested in the fact that the sectarians opposed the ordination fees.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 460**

The state of affairs in the whole of Eastern Europe was changing. Jagiełło<sup>43</sup> who was to rule over the most extensive territories in Europe [1385] became a true potentate. He had even more extensive plans because he did not renounce the plans of Algirdas concerning further Ruthenia. He could achieve this only by force, because by adopting Catholicism he generated strong alienation. In these circumstances the Catholic baptism of Lithuania became a salvation for the state of Muscovy and it is only due to the Union of Poland and Lithuania that Moscow attained its historical position. Had Moscow faced an Orthodox Vilnius it would descend into a third rank position, while facing a Catholic Vilnius it became the first plan moral centre of Orthodoxy and it was only a question of force whether Moscow would oppose the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. But the Catholicism of Lithuania could be assured only so long as the union with Poland would continue.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 474**

The German knights were not interested in converting the schismatics and the bishops of Riga and Dorpat had

---

<sup>43</sup> [Władysław Jagiełło was a Lithuanian prince who after being baptized in the Catholic Church in Kraków married St. Jadwiga (Hedwig), the Polish queen thereby becoming the King of Poland united with Lithuania].

no time or freedom to conduct missions because they were engaged in defending themselves against the rapacious Order of the Knights. Thus the Catholic influences from the north, from Livonia were only negative. The positive ones began only after 1386 and from the Lithuanian side. This was due to the total tolerance of Lithuania in respect to the Eastern confession<sup>44</sup>.

Jagiello ordered the [pagan] Lithuanians in 1386 to receive baptism in the Latin Church and in 1387 he enforced this directive prohibiting the Lithuanians from belonging to the Eastern Orthodox confession under pain of not having citizen's rights, which were available only to Catholic Lithuanians. Thus there was no equality of confessions throughout the Lithuanian state; this was restricted only to the Lithuanian Ruthenia and was not permitted among the native (ethnographic) Lithuanians. The Ruthenian had a free choice of confession, but a Lithuanian did not. The principle was propagated, one that Ruthenia held on to, that the Eastern confession was only for Ruthenia. In this way the equality of both confessions was maintained according to the notions of the time. After all Orthodoxy had full freedom, in spite of the "Kraków baptism". It was still publicly practiced even by the brothers of King Władysław Jagiełło, not only his step-brothers but also his two full brothers. This explains why for Novgorod Catholicism ceased to be the hated "German faith" and why the Novgorodians, in conflict with the Metropolitan and unhappy with the official

---

<sup>44</sup> It is possible that the short lasting goodwill towards Catholicism came as a reaction against revolutionary sectarianism. The civil authorities and the lower clergy moved sternly against the Strigolniki until finally beaten, they dispersed in all directions. Soon a new sect appeared in Novgorod the Great, the *жидовствующих* [Judaizers].

Eastern Church, started to treat the Latin faith as equal with the Greek one, as in times of old.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 482-485**

The reunification of Kipchak did not last long. The Turkish despotism of Tamerlane did not reform the slackened Tatar statehood, but it did have a tremendous social effect on all the lands of the Tatars. The inflow of Turkishness awakened the old traditions. It revived anew the Asiatic social instinct according to which society is a military entity, organised in a camp fashion for the needs of war and living off war. After all Tamerlane was the inventor of the twelve *чиньы*, twelve ranks, a dozen of divisions within which the entire society was to be locked and adapted to. Who did not have a rank in the court-camp-administration was outside of society as someone of no value. Tamerlane also invented uniforms<sup>45</sup>.

The Tatars organized into hierarchic ranks continued to rob and plunder their "infidel" neighbours<sup>46</sup>, but besides that increasingly frequently mercenary militarism occurred as a higher sort of socialization. The permanent

---

<sup>45</sup> The word *чин* [*chin* — rank] is probably of Chinese origin. It existed in the Tatar language for a long time meaning generally a class, a social group. From Tatars this concept moved to Zalesye. In a Nizhny Novgorod Chronicle already in the year 1371 we find information about a benefactor who bought out from slavery "people of various *chin* [rank].

<sup>46</sup> In only the Ryazan region there were seven Tatar raids in the years 1388-1402, an eighth one in 1413, a ninth in 1425, a tenth in 1437 and an eleventh in 1444. There were similar plunder raids in the vicinity of Yelets on the other side of the River Don in 1422, one in the vicinity of Odoyevo in 1424 and on Galich and Kostroma in 1428.

mercenaries were frequently becoming Cossacks in respect to their Horde, becoming as it were renegades of their own Khan. They hired themselves for service far in the east, but also in Ruthenia and Lithuania.

The relationships with the Tatars resumed after the next division of the Hordes in a similar way as earlier with the Cumans who had been introduced into Ruthenia by the Rurikids themselves. Much of both of these were intermixed with the Ruthenians. There were more of the Cumans in the South and of the Tatars in the North. Even as late as the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. the population of the Skwirsk region (in the Kiev governorate) referred to itself as Cumans and in the North in the Yaroslavl governorate there are 26 settlements that are known to be of Tatar origin.

The close relationships with the Muslim peoples of the Kipchak soon started to have an effect on the social structure of Zalesye. The Tamerlane culture brought more severity into the rather defunct Islam of Kipchak. For example, among the Tatars there was complete freedom for women in contrast to the situation among the Arabs, Persians and generally in Asia. Tamerlane's reform introduced the closing of harems throughout the Islamic world. This was accepted by the Tatars and from them before the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the rule moved into Tatar Ruthenia, among the most affluent classes that willed and were capable of following the "Tsar's" customs as the highest level of fashion.

Throughout the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the moral influence of Tatars was on the increase the more so since at the same time there was an increased immigration of the Tatars. The constant pressure of various Mongol steppe peoples prevented any settlements east of the Dnieper River with the result being that purely Slav blood can be found only west of the Kiev governorate.

From that time onwards the tribute imposed by the Tatars consisted not only in paying the *выход* [tax] in cash to the Khan's treasury. Something else was devised, namely the supply of upkeep for members of the Khan's family, various "Khanlets". Such a Tatar prince arrived with his whole *улус* (*ulus*-clan) and sometimes even with two or three *uluses*. He obtained for support a whole region usually inhabited more by the Yugra than by the Ruthenians (for example in Kashira near Serpukhov or in Kasimov on the Oka River), or a generally uninhabited territory and there were still plenty of them. This substantially reduced the care for the upkeep of the Horde people in the generally overpopulated steppes (overpopulated in respect to the space needs of the nomads) and reduced the dynastic problems within a given Khanate. For the "Khanlets" themselves there was no better life than in Zalesye, where the local princes did everything possible to satisfy them. Thus they eagerly tried to obtain such positions and many stayed there for good together with their progeny and that of their whole *ulus*. The Khans did not call for their return, glad that there are fewer competing branches in the dynastic struggles within the Horde. In this way entire regions emerged where the Tatar population is the original one.

It was obvious to all that the Tatar took part in any war that was waged around him, after all this was his element and spoils were the most welcome income. Fed at the expense of the local Zalesye prince the *ulus* was available for every military need of the prince. That was their duty and in the Ruthenian terminology they were referred to without hesitation as being "in service", because they were supplementary units of the Rurikids. According to our legal notions this relationship was rather servitude than service! There was something mercenary about this which gave a unique feature to the whole of

Ruthenia that was subservient to the Tatars. Could any of the Rurikids refuse the Khan the reception for “service” of the indicated “Khanlet”? Could he dare to give him notice? Rather he tried to gain his favour so that he would not be reported to the Horde. Thus these “Khanlets” to some extent were mercenaries but at the same time they were an occupying force imposed by a superior power. Such mercenary arrangements were linked in this case with a consciousness of domination. From the Tatar point of view this “service” did not mean any form of submission. They considered it as their right and not as an imposed obligation.

Such a “service” relationship could very easily turn out to be double-edged. One had to be careful, because after the battle on Vorskla [in 1399, which the Tatars won] the point of gravity in relationships with the Hordes increasingly rested on these “serving Khanlets”. The conduct of Tatar policy consisted in deciding from where, from which Horde, at what time someone was allowed to... make money and at the same time... was appointed as custodian of political allegiance towards the “Tsar”!

In each case with each “Khanlet” there was a separate agreement. The obligations of the princes towards the “in service Khanlets” varied causing true chaos because the alliances and the political situation among the Rurikids changed annually. The Tatars frequently changed sides in various conflicts.

This chaos did not last long. The Tatar units were introducing military supremacy because the Tatars continued to be superior to the Ruthenians in military art, to such an extent that they could beat an enemy even several times stronger in numbers. The Grand Dukes of Moscow made great efforts to ensure that the “Khanlets” would serve no one else but only them. And they achieved this monopoly! The economic superiority of Moscow proved

to be an immovable basis on which it was possible to safely construct all the endeavours of the state. From that time onwards Moscow could be sure that it will manage to dominate over the whole of Zalesye because it had a reliable military superiority thanks to the Tatar help. Also the "Khanlets" preferred to settle under the protection of the richest Rurikid.

Thus Tatar settlements grew in the lands dominated by the Rurikids, that is, in Ruthenia. This was unfavourable for the Slav settlements in Zalesye. Since they could not expand towards the South of the Volga, the Zalesye settlements extended towards the North.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 489-491**

The pauperisation of the princes forced them to try to transfer the cost of upkeep of the courtiers-administrators on the population. Thus the Rurikids adopted the Tatar principle (later also developed to the highest degree by the Turks) that the office itself was to support the official in such a way that he was to be paid for individually by anyone who had any contact with the office. The appointment of an official was also referred to as the giving of *кормление* [feeding] just as was the case when princes were hired in Novgorod the Great and offered support. Probably the technical term was drawn from there. At some stage all the mercenaries were supported by the prince, but now this was the case only for the *ocaða* [crew] while others were to be supported by the population, as was the case with the princes in Novgorod. The smaller the prince the more he had to think out new means of "feeding" if he wanted to have a military unit with him. After all, everyone who originated from an ancient family of soldiers had the right

of free *отъезд* [departure] from prince to prince, being free to arbitrarily choose a master for himself and go where he was offered more. How inventive financially a small prince had to be, to prevent his unit from dispersing as a result of which he would be nothing! At the beginning of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the Tver region was already divided into 9 principdoms, the Yaroslavl region into 6 and the Beloozersk region, itself not large, into 8. With such pauperization of the princes there was a wide field open for the oriental administrative system, the adoption of which proved to be the most negative of all the plagues coming from the Tatars in Zalesye Ruthenia.

## HR, vol. 1, p. 492-493

A principdom in Zalesye, apart from the forts was divided into the *волости* — *volosts* i.e groups of *деревни* — *derevni* [villages]. These divisions developed historically because settlements were organized in such groups and the princes made these groupings permanent by appointing their own *волостель* — *volostel* [supervisor of a rural municipality] for each *volost*. Frequently this was a boyar of such importance that he preferred not to trouble himself personally with this “service” and as a result he made a *тиун* — *tiun* [substitute] to stand in his place. The supervisor of a rural municipality represented the prince’s authority in all his peace time functions such as being a judge, tax collector and administrator. Besides them there were still *starosts*, representatives of the social organization, but these were disappearing so the prince would free persons and institutions such as monasteries from their subservience to the *starosts* without asking them for their opinion while in other cases he might impose on the *starosts* some functions of the prince.

There was a multitude of taxes and tributes under various names, but these were only a fiction. Since there was full freedom to depart, a prince would fear exploiting the population too much. Only the "Tatar tax" was an exception, because it was impossible to escape from it anywhere, except perhaps to Lithuania. Besides the multitude of types of taxes can be explained by the fact that service for the state (the fort and the prince) was rendered to a large extent in kind, in the form of products or labour and so depending on the type and purpose of such service its name was different.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 501-502**

Cyprian [the Metropolitan of Moscow] had a different issue to deal with in Tatar Ruthenia. There, on hearing that the Emperor in Constantinople considered reconciliation with Rome, Vasily Dmitriyevich [1389-1425] drew the conclusion that the Emperor had fallen into heresy and so he ordered that his name be deleted from the diptychs. In vain did Cyprian rebuke him for this, teaching him about the prerogatives of the Emperor. Vasily then declared that "we have the Church, but we do not have a Tsar and do not want one". He had in mind here the Byzantine Tsar. After all, he recognized a second Tsar, the one from Sarai as being above him. Thus two notions about a supreme monarchy, about the Eastern Empire clashed: the Church-Byzantine notion and the Moscow-Tatar notion, and the Metropolitan and Grand Prince diverged on this issue. Vasily recognized only the kind of Tsardom about which recently the Lithuanian Vytautas thought, and since this Tsardom could not pass into Christian hands, then so be it! It was necessary to recognize the Muslim one. After all, Vasily could not even

dream of achieving what such a potentate as Vytautas had failed to attain! Being too close with the Constantinople Empire would be seen badly in Sarai and so Vasily preferred to use the occasion to sever all ties with the Palaeologues, who might have requested military assistance against the Turkish onslaught. For this reason he spoke so radically about the Byzantine Tsardom.

Cyprian informed the Patriarch about the situation. Nothing came out of the letter of the Patriarch to Vasily Dmitriyevich sent in 1393 and his no less radical declaration that **there is no Church without a Tsar**. Unwittingly he thereby defined the essence of Byzantinism in one sentence. Also the Patriarch's claim that there was only one true Tsar in the whole world proved fruitless. For Vasily the Khan of Sarai was and remained the true Tsar. This whole conflict could have had only a theoretical significance. The Khan had to be the supreme lord because it was impossible to beat him, but the question remained whether Vasily recognized the dignity of the Byzantine Emperor? Politically the question could have been considered immaterial, but it had great cultural significance. By giving a negative answer to this question, Vasily was also formally making a break with Byzantine culture.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 507-509**

The situation was suddenly settled by the unexpected, short but very painful raid of the Tatars onto Zalesye under the leadership of Edigu. On hearing about the death of Tamerlane Vasily Dmitriyevich tried not to pay the tribute retaining it in his own treasury (even though he collected it as one rouble per plough pair). But Edigu arrived demanding the tribute that was due to the Tsar!

In the process he plundered the whole of Zalesye sparing only Moscow itself because it paid the demanded ransom (3000 roubles). Being thus ruined Vasily was prepared to make permanent peace with his father-in-law, the Lithuanian Vytautas, who also had no intention of trying military luck again. In September 1408 the forces of Vasily and Vytautas again stood facing one another on the River Ugra, but without drawing arms they sat down to negotiate a peace which proved to be permanent.

In exchange for the expulsion of Švitrigaila Vytautas renounced Kozelsk, Lyubutsk and Premysl of Zalesye. In the North, the River Ugra became the boundary and from that time onwards till the death of Vasily Dmitriyevich there was peace between Lithuania and Moscow.

Thus the same was achieved as in the days of Algirdas and Metropolitan Alexius. Vilnius and Moscow were to develop in parallel and independently of one another. This was the same as was confirmed by the Kraków events of 1386 [the baptism and marriage of Władysław Jagiełło with the Polish queen, St. Jadwiga]. The issue was: Vilnius or Moscow? And for a third time, in 1408, it was settled: both Vilnius and Moscow!

The question was to be raised again for a fourth time in 1426 and for a fifth time in 1440, so as to reach in 1449 the same result as during the earlier efforts. The issue of the never established Lithuanian Tsardom lingered for a much longer period, from 1382 to 1449, but before the baptism of Jagiełło this was only an introductory stage and after the peace on River Ugra it was a stage of political decline. The decisive moment was in the years 1380-1408, with the culminating point in 1399. It was clear at the time that the struggle was for the creation of an Eastern European Empire, a Vilnius Empire.

**HR, vol. 1, p. 512-520**

The most significant matter for the XV<sup>th</sup> c. in Eastern Europe was whether the service law would cross the borders of the Lithuanian state and pass onto Zalesye, thereby making the Eastern Slav lands a society with a common, more or less uniform social system, or whether the state border between Lithuanian Ruthenia and Tatar Ruthenia would become a frontier between two very different societies? Whether the peoples of the Eastern Slav lands would acquire the necessary condition for a common national consciousness that is the unity of culture (and fundamental for this are common legal notions), or whether the the unity or divergence would be restricted only to the ecclesial sphere? That is, whether in the territory of the Metropolitan See of “Kiev and all Ruthenia” there would vacillate — more or less along the border of the Lithuanian state — a frontier between two cultures? The question of this frontier line was the major issue during the battle on the River Vorskla [in 1399, when the Tatars defeated the Lithuanians] and from that time on it continued to encompass more and more, taking in constantly new factors and thus becoming ever more comprehensive.

It is easy to determine one of these cultures<sup>47</sup>. It was Latin, West European, Catholic, because the Church was its most important determinant of cultural currents. The second, the Eastern one that was budding in Zalesye could not be defined as yet in the XV<sup>th</sup> c. It did not have a clear expression. It was not yet sufficiently formed

---

<sup>47</sup> [Later on in his works Koneczny would refer to these as civilizations. He reserved the term “culture” for subdivisions of civilizations].

and its more distinct characteristics were acquired in the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. Meanwhile something was cooking there and taking shape, but it was not yet clear what would come out of the ferment. One thing is certain. No one had any national consciousness, nor did anyone think in such categories for the very simple reason that the notion of nationality was unknown there.

There is nothing more erroneous than the imagined claim that there was some national literature (Ruthenian or Russian!) in the Eastern Slav lands. One can speak of "literature" only if this term is extended to cover everything... that was written. After the *Chronicle of Nestor* there are only linguistic relics written in the Church context, usually in plain language not expressing ever any idea. The continuations of the Chronicles, written in several places manifest an atrocious intellectual regression. They are dry and increasingly of only strictly local interest. A noticeable exception is the *Halych-Volhynia Chronicle* of the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. which appeared where the culture was Polish. It was only slightly coloured by the Ruthenian language and was full of Polish expressions. Apart from that there were pastoral letters, Church "teachings". There were also some records of *паломничество* (walking with palm leaves in hand), i.e. religious pilgrimages and devotional *хождения* [processions]. These were not descriptions of travels because the authors were incapable of saying anything about foreign lands as they lacked not only observational skills but also that level of intelligence that is capable of becoming interested in comparisons and listing differences. Their only purpose was to recount miracles and wonders having in this the right to confabulate. There were some hagiographies but, these *житя* [lives] were generally weaker than the eulogies of the previous period and they were less and less original. Of note is the *Патерик печерский* [The

Pechersk (Cave) Paterikon], a collection of notes about the lives and deeds of the oldest monks of the Pecherska Lavra. It was a compilation of XIII<sup>th</sup> c. authors (Nestor, Simon and Polycarp) that was finally edited in 1462 by Cassian, a monk of this Lavra. The most original works of the Middle Ages is the *Моление* [Prayer] of Daniil Zatochnik written around 1225 and the *Слово о погибели рускыя земли* [Word about the Ruin of the Ruthenian Land] expressing sorrow that such a beautiful and rich land was subject to the destructive onslaughts of the Tatars. It was written in the XV<sup>th</sup> c. or possibly later.

Besides, there were only translations, occasionally from Greek, and as a rule from Bulgarian. These were canonical and historical compilations, theological-polemical discourses and apocryphal texts. These were the preferred readings of the clergy and there were so many apocrypha that obviously they smothered all other branches of this "literature". It was only towards the end of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. that they realized that not everything that dealt with holy matters belonged to the Sacred Scriptures. It was Metropolitan Cyprian [1376-1406] who introduced an index of forbidden books and took care to prepare a text *О книгах истинных и ложных* [About the True and False Books] which was to have several editions later on. But the effort was fruitless! Apocryphal texts remained in Ruthenia not only a source of leisure reading but also the means for theological education. There was also some secular fiction available connected with the pan-European content: stories about Troy, about Alexander the Great etc. These reached Ruthenia in Serbian and Bulgarian translations from Greek, but surprisingly late, at the turn of the XV<sup>th</sup> and XVI<sup>th</sup> c. even though these Serbian and Bulgarian versions were in existence since the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. The writings in Ruthenia were restricted to fragments and passages from Balkan Slav

sources, not covering them all, whereas Ruthenia itself was not expanding these works.

Thus there was no literature. There were only language exercises and these came to nothing because there was no exercising of the mind. The situation was much better among the Western Slav lands, where there were fewer native language productions but in the Latin texts there was much investigative thought and intellectual development! There was a completely no science in Ruthenia. That is why no literature emerged from the early and abundant written texts. Intellectual emptiness greatly delayed the appearance of literature and until the XIX<sup>th</sup> c. it was very meagre and had no link with the older local writings. The later literature was not based on these older writings because they were not even an introduction to it. Looking critically at the issue there was no literature from that period, there were only some written texts. Thus the most fervent defenders of a "national" literature restrict themselves to the claim that the translations were made in Ruthenia and that the manuscripts were not from outside Ruthenia.

There is no sign of science or knowledge of any kind. Towards the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the situation was such that as a rule the rural clergy were illiterate! There is no point in searching for science in Ruthenia of that time. It is enough to ask about the basic knowledge of elementary education the crown of which are the four initial arithmetic functions. It seems that arithmetic came from the Mongols and it only took on the Byzantine form, namely the writing of numbers with the letters of the alphabet. The calculations were made through splitting into factors and then calculating them separately, summing up finally the individual results. This is a method known today as "memory calculations" and it is used in our rural schools. Thus it was possible to avoid the reaching of

a common denominator treating the lowest fraction as a unit and then changing the problem into a calculation with whole numbers. Of course only the most learned knew how to do this. No one ever mentioned the multiplication tables<sup>48</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> The conducting of calculations through the help of splitting into factors is known by simple people everywhere, but only when calculating in the head. This is universal in the whole world as many things that depend upon common sense and do not require anything else. In Russia this method is used also when making calculations on paper. In Russia there is a method of multiplying on paper for which it is sufficient to know how to multiply and divide by 2. The knowledge of the multiplication table is unnecessary. The multiplicand is continually divided in half ignoring the residue until one reaches unity. At the same time the multiplier is multiplied by 2 for as many times as the previous operation. Then the column of the multiplier is added but only for the values for which in the multiplicand column there is an uneven number. This method has no relationship with the "algorithms". It does not belong to the Arabic (actually Hindu) history of mathematics. It is probably Mongolian (Chinese). Since there was no contact with European science a study of these things at the time cannot be made. Even Russian scientists cannot explain this!

Here is an example of such multiplication:

536 ·	247	uneven multiplicand	the same by
268 ·	494	occurs here:	our method:
134 ·	988	67 · 1976	<u>536 × 247</u>
67 ·	1976	33 · 3952	3752
33 ·	3952	1 · 126464	2144
16 ·	7904	<u>total: 132392</u>	1072
8 ·	15808		<u>132392</u>
4 ·	31616		
2 ·	63232		
1 ·	126464		

Thus the two methods give the same result.

The historical relics of writings do not contain any ideas that would be useful for a closer determination of the culture, because their content, almost exclusively ecclesial has no ethnographic information that would illustrate local life. Even having the *летописи* (Chronicles) in hand one cannot present even the most general state of mediaeval Ruthenia and on the basis of other "literature" this is quite impossible (even though there is an abundance of texts). There is nothing in this so called "literature" that would specify the culture and allow us to classify it.

Obviously the basic elements of this culture came from a different source than the writings. They did not come from Byzantium or from Bulgaria.

It cannot be said that Byzantine influences, apart from the Church, trickled into Ruthenia. As an example, it can be recalled how the bishops failed to convince the baptised St. Vladimir about the need for a state judiciary at least for crimes calling for the death penalty. It was only in mid XV<sup>th</sup> c. that such crimes were restricted to the competence of the prince's judiciary, but only in cases in which the prince released from his own competence. In the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the scope of these reservations grew. This began with murder, but soon the restriction for state judiciary only was expanded to include such issues as brigandage and theft.

The Byzantine influence of social and state affairs among the Eastern Slav lands in general and Zalesye in particular were so meagre that there is no basis for the inclusion of this part of the Slav lands into the Byzantine world. Not a single feature of the Eastern Slav societies can be explained by Byzantine influences. And whatever came to Ruthenia from the Balkans was neutralized in the cultural sense. This refers to the Church, the alphabet, the writings and the language of the writings

which was Macedonian-Ruthenian (a Ruthenian formed, or rather deformed, on the basis of the Bulgarian with the Macedonian dialect).

The written Eastern Slav language served equally well both cultures, the Western and the Eastern, without expressing any of them. It remained the official language on both sides of the Lithuanian border. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania retained the Ruthenian language until 1795<sup>49</sup> because no Lithuanian ever dreamt of eradicating it from public documents and introducing in its stead the Lithuanian language<sup>50</sup>. Eventually Lithuania adhered to the Western culture but this did not cut it off from the Eastern Slav language. This language migrated together with Lithuania westwards. The differentiation of the language took place under the influence of political facts. In Western Europe politics never have had such a great influence. In the East politics embraced everything and brought everything under its wings.

The Eastern Church turned out to be too weak to become (as the Catholic Church did) a determinant of some culture, its basis and fundamental axis. Soon it became obvious that belonging to the Orthodox Church meant that one had no cultural feature. Also the Eastern Church was neutralized in the cultural sense, because two cultures [civilizations] found a place within it, even though the religious division into the Union and its rejection was to take place as late as the turn of the XVI<sup>th</sup> and XVII<sup>th</sup> centuries [with the Union of Brest].

Uniate efforts in the beginning of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. yielded no fruits. During the Council held in Pisa in 1409, there

---

<sup>49</sup> [This was the date when Poland, together with the grand Duchy of Lithuania was partitioned by Prussia, Austria and Russia.]

<sup>50</sup> In Red Ruthenia, a part of the Kingdom of Poland, the official language was Latin.

were discussions about the union of the Churches in which Poland and Lithuania participated, but this came to nothing. It turned out that the haste of Cyprian and Tsamblak, of Vytautas and Jagiełło, were vain pre-emptive moves<sup>51</sup>.

The tactical misstep was accompanied by a basic error. Even had a union been achieved, Ruthenia would not have returned to Catholicism.

Ruthenia only vaguely and formally belonged to the Byzantine Church, that is, to a confession that is not a heresy in respect to Catholicism. The peoples of the Eastern Slav lands did not follow the Byzantine schism but their own *двоевѣрѣ* [dual faiths], the Northern and the Southern. These mechanical mixtures of various beliefs became increasingly entangled with the course of time. To Byzantinism, Nestorianism and various pagan beliefs, the three original components of the dual faiths, some further elements were added taken from the Mongolian state religion, from Islam and even something from Buddhism. Finally in the XV<sup>th</sup> c. Judaism also joined

---

<sup>51</sup> At the Council of Pisa there was an official Polish delegation led by the bishop of Kraków Piotr Wyszka and the Rector of the Kraków University Elias from Wąwelnica. These were the days of the papal Church schism. In Pisa both Popes were dethroned, the Roman Pope, Gregory XII and the Avignon Pope Benedict XIII and a new Pope was elected, Alexander V. He was a Franciscan who years back had been a missionary in Lithuanian Ruthenia. He knew the Ruthenian language and knew Jagiełło personally. It needs to be noted that the Polish Franciscan Province had missions in Lithuania since the days of Mindaugas, while Southern Ruthenia was the responsibility of the Dominicans. [Alexander V is regarded to be an Anti-Pope.]

in and then this whole mixture was to be covered by the Byzantine heresy of Bogomilism<sup>52</sup>.

Within the dual faith elements there were only contradictions, all of which were in principle mutually exclusive. Such a mixture cannot be touched with impunity. It is impossible to deepen thought on its basis, because all thinking or study can only lead to a further perplexity in the soul. Contradictory components of a dual faith can be arranged as a compromise, but only in the realm of the form and this is the source of whole nullity of theological knowledge in Ruthenia. The clergy themselves had to end with the glorification of forms, because only this gave internal peace to minds that had opted to stick uniquely to them and only the unity of form provided the Church with some kind of coherence. On the basis of the dual faith the systematic ignoring and neglecting of content with the exaggerated attachment to forms had to develop. The form became everything, because only the form could be common to all.

In the Eastern Slav lands two symbols of ecclesial religious life became most visible in Church, because they were most tangible and most appealing to the senses: the icons and the bells.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 538-541**

Vytautas saw a lucky occurrence in the fact that he was to take care of his grandson (after his daughter), who

---

<sup>52</sup> The local influences of Judaism deriving from the Khazars were always present in the regions of today's Tambov and Penza governorships, in the lands of the Burtas tribes. Bogomilism was known to some individuals in Ruthenia for a long time, but it had a significant, general and permanent influence, only in the late XV<sup>th</sup> c.

was the heir of Moscow. He saw this as a way that could bring about by peaceful means the convergence of Lithuania and Lithuanian Ruthenia with Zalesye, the Tatar Ruthenia. Thus the projects of Algirdas would have been attained without bloodshed, without a conquest but only through alliances and grades of state feudalism. The scarcely six-year Regency of Vytautas over Moscow (1425-1430) introduced feudal relationships among the princedoms of Zalesye.

It seemed that the road to the establishment of feudalism in Zalesye was wide open. After all there were Grand Princes and minor princes there and each Grand Prince had several princelets under him, for whom he was bound to pay the Tatar duty to the "Grand Prince of the whole of Ruthenia" who was closest to the "Tsar". The assigning of the use of villages and even the "feeding" itself were also elements from which some kind of feudalism could have developed. The feudal order did not however come about in Tatar Ruthenia. This was because the Khans as they gave the certificates, the *yarlyks* to whatever prince that asked for it, and as they required that all the more significant ones would report for them individually in Sarai, they imposed an equal rank to all the princes in respect to the Horde. Thus the hierarchy of the princes was restricted uniquely to fiscalism with the result being that the pompous title of "Grand Prince of the whole of Ruthenia" meant nothing, because its only function was to be the Khan's treasurer and the main collector of the Tatar tax.

The relationship of the prince to the descendants of the former garrison leaders, to those who were taxed and those who were free from taxation, and also to those who were in service, the courtiers and boyars in general, also had nothing in common with feudalism because each one of these subordinates had the right to change his master

if he so wished. The right of “free departure” excluded feudalism. The right to cancel a relationship and terminate services and dues on the wish of only one side is directly contrary to the whole notion of feudalism<sup>53</sup>.

Also the numerous accords made more or less willingly by the princes with their direct “Grand” princes had no features of feudalism. The basic feature and premise of all feudalism is the reciprocity of mutual services, rights and duties, whereas the accords made among the Rurikids usually registered only the duties of the weaker partner in respect to the stronger one. From the side of the stronger partner there was at most the granting of some favour for charitable reasons (*пожаловане* — compassion) but not as a duty<sup>54</sup>.

The principles of reciprocity and the recognition of the rights of the weaker partner were recorded clearly and officially for the first time in 1427 in the accord of Ivan Fedorovich of Ryazan with Vytautas as the guardian of Vasili Vasilovich. Ivan recognised the authority of Vytautas, to whom he *отдался на службу* [gave himself into service]<sup>55</sup> and in exchange he expected *обронит меня от всякаго* [that he would defend me from whoever]. On the basis of the same principle the princes

---

<sup>53</sup> No type of Varangian troops could lead to the feudal law in Ruthenia.

<sup>54</sup> It was no sign of feudalism when the stronger partner seized the province of the weaker and then received him into his service, returning to him a part of his realm (but never its totality) in the name of *пожаловане*, as a sign of mercy. This was outright violence and occupation and not a voluntary accord. The occupier preferred to offer subsistence to the victim in his own interest so that he would not ally with his opponents.

<sup>55</sup> This did not prevent both of them from titling themselves Grand Princes, one of Lithuania and the other of... Ryazan.

of Pereyaslav, Pronsk, Novosil'sk, Odoyev, Vorotynsk — minor dynastic Rurikid principedoms of Zalesye — were gathered together by Vytautas and then made dependent upon Muscovite hegemony.

The principle of a feudal hierarchy was clearly present in the accord with Boris of Tver<sup>56</sup> made in the same year 1427. Vytautas promised to defend Boris against anyone in exchange for his reciprocal help against any enemy. At the same time Vytautas recognised the superiority of Boris over the other princes in the Tver region, for whom Boris was the superior much the same as Vytautas was the superior of Boris.

Thus Vytautas imagined that the state system of Zalesye functioned in the form of hierarchic European fiefdoms. These were the only years when the Christian order of Lithuania was copied in Zalesye. This imitation, however was imposed from outside and it did not hold.

The state system imposed by Vytautas in Zalesye included in it also a second feature of feudalism, namely the obligation of peace between the vassals of a common superior. In these accords it was clear that the princes who agreed to serve under Vytautas, that is, to help him in times of war were not allowed to wage wars among themselves. Thus with Zalesye under the hegemony of Moscow and Moscow under the hegemony of Lithuania was to assure peace along the whole line from Vilnius to Nizhny Novgorod. This was the program of Vytautas.

The death of Vytautas on 27th October 1430 provided an excuse to abolish his whole program.

---

<sup>56</sup> This was the grandson of Ivan Michailovich of Tver who died a year earlier (1426). In the same year the son of Ivan, Alexander and also Alexander's son George died from the plague. Thus Boris, the younger brother of George succeeded in Tver.

**HR, vol. 1, p. 559-561**

Opposition against the unification efforts consolidated the Orthodox Church hierarchy around the program of Vasily the Blind [1425-1462]. In the eyes of the clergy only he represented the political totality of the Muscovite lands and the hegemony of Moscow. This was supported understanding that it was needed for the good and security of Orthodoxy.

Gradually these two issues combine into one, the purity of the faith and the leadership of Moscow. Basing himself upon this Vasily the Blind decided to take a step of first order of importance.

Having rejected the “new initiatives” of Isidore [the deposed Uniate Metropolitan of Moscow] it was declared that the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate had become uncertain in matters of faith, and so the new Metropolitan could not be ordained by the hands of a Uniate-Patriarch, because he would be infected by him. In the name of the purity of faith, it was decided that links with Constantinople, which in any case were weak and only formal, were to be severed and ignoring Isidore a new Metropolitan of local choice will be appointed. This had happened before in the history of the Ruthenian Metropolitans. They were fed up with foreign leaders of the Church; after all so far there were only six Metropolitans who were Ruthenians.

It was decided that a “Council” of bishops has the right to elect a Metropolitan from among themselves and ordain him and that a confirmation by the Patriarch was unnecessary. Vasily the Blind’s candidate was Jonah, the bishop of Ryazan, who had already been his candidate after the death of Photius. This choice met with no opposition among the episcopate of Zalesye. The question

was whether he would be recognised by Lithuania, and as a result inquiries were made in Vilnius.

It was at this time that the case of [the usurper] Shemyaka was placed before the Church court for his failure to fulfil an accord. The Metropolitan See was still vacant but the "Council" had met. Five bishops, a few archimandrites and some canonical experts had come. The whole issue was studied from the beginning, principally, and it was declared that the father of Shemyaka, Yury Dimitrievich having moved against his rightful ruler, Vasily Vasilyevich, had committed a sin akin to that of Adam who wanted to be equal with God (the sin of *равнобожество* [trying to be equal with God]). Does all universal history know of a more blunt comparison?!

At the same time the prince of Mozhaïsk presented in Vilnius the claim that it would be better if Moscow fell to him since such was the position of the Lithuanian side. He promised to cede to Lithuania Rzhev and Medyn for the given help. All of this was in vain! In that same year 1448 a peace delegation from Kazimir Jagiellon [King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania] arrived in Moscow at the court of Vasily the Blind; Shemyaka and Ivan of Mozhaïsk were left to themselves.

Now Vasily easily came to an accord with the Lithuanian ruler about Jonah. In December 1448 the new Metropolitan was ordained and he immediately proclaimed that in the past Metropolitans were received from Constantinople "so long as Orthodoxy was firm there", but now this was impossible. Without the least difficulty Jonah was accepted by the bishops of Lithuanian Ruthenia, who declared to his envoys that on issues of the Church "they follow the Grand Prince Vasily".

In this way the case of Shemyaka fell both in Lithuania and in Zalesye. Jonah warned that he would close churches everywhere wherever somebody else was

recognised as the Grand Prince of Moscow and all Ruthenia rather than Vasily the Blind. At the same time he moved to the the canonisation of Metropolitan Alexius, that originator of the statehood of Muscovy.

Thus the situation changed drastically in Zalesye and Kazimir Jagiellon through his passivity renounced and annihilated the coalition that not much earlier he himself had thought out and he even in an increasingly visible way facilitated the work of Vasily. In Vilnius something had drastically changed.

In 1449 the mystery was resolved. Kazimir was making a “permanent peace, an alliance and friendship” with Vasily the Blind. The accord recognized the hegemony of Moscow over Zalesye, Novgorod and Pskov. It was the complete liquidation not only of the program of the Gashtolds, but also a renunciation of the program of Vytautas and any remnants of the policies of Algirdas in any form whatsoever. Lithuania gave up all plans to further expand “Lithuanian Ruthenia”. At the same time a restriction was made concerning the expansion of Muscovy, but only a formal one. This concerned Ryazan and Novgorod the Great.

## **HR, vol. 1, p. 565-566**

The boundary between the states of Lithuania and Muscovy had to be changeable since the border princes would transfer their “service”, against the “service law” either onto this or onto the other side. In this connection it was often said that they were “fugitive” princes. And the escape went in both directions; in this neither Vilnius nor Moscow had anything to complain about. During the Moscow internal war the principedoms of Khlepen, Rogachev as well as Serensk and Kozelsk in the watershed

of the Oka River transferred to Lithuania, and a little later, in 1455 also Peremyshl on the Oka, somewhat to the south of Kaluga shifted. All these forts were held by uncertain border princes. In the days of Vasily the Blind the Obolensky and the Shuisky families moved to the Lithuanian side, while in 1446 Vasily had several Lithuanian fugitives on his side. In the Lithuanian border lieutenancies there were such families as the Drucki, who split into a Lithuanian and a Moscow branch, and the Trubecki who transferred to Moscow during the reign of Alexander Jagiellon.

Strictly speaking only the Lithuanians were fugitives and acted abusively, whereas the Rurikids were only exercising their right to transfer. They made this openly, quite formally, following the rules that had been sanctified by ages and so they were legally changing their Grand Prince.

These were obsolete customs, the final consequences of the old princely condition which necessarily made the border between Lithuania and any state of the Zalesye variable. This seems to be a paradox yet it is true to say that any permanent marking of the border would have been illegal. Since a state must above all have clear definitive borders, this shows how vague was the notion of statehood in Ruthenia as late as the mid XV<sup>th</sup> c. and how little impact had Byzantine notions on Ruthenia.



# Excerpts from vol. 2 of “Dzieje Rosji” [“The History of Russia”]

Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 2003

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 16-22**

The question as to where the border between Lithuania and Moscow was to be, lingered on in bloody conflicts over several centuries. This is an issue of universal history, because this state border involved factors that determine the frontier between two worlds, a marking line between two civilizations. As focal points there were two cities, Vilnius and Moscow, the capitals of two completely different political systems.

There were however confrontations calling for an abolition of the borders between Vilnius and Moscow. It was Algirdas who formulated the challenge: *tota Russia debet ad Lituanos pertinere* [the whole of Ruthenia should belong to the Lithuanians]. Twice he stood militarily close to Moscow, in 1368 and 1370. Later on Vytautas was working towards the establishment of a great Eastern Empire that was to cover the whole of Kipchak together with its subordinate Tatar “whole of Ruthenia”. He had no intention of moving the capital from Vilnius. He lost this great cause when he was beaten at the battle on the Vorskla River in 1399. In this dreamed up by Algirdas and later in changed circumstances by Vytautas great state, ethnic Lithuanians would have been a minuscule component, so small that the Tsar of Vilnius

would have decidedly been a Ruthenian and not a Lithuanian Tsar. What would have been the future of Lithuanian Catholicism, a feeble little plant, being scarcely 13 years old, within the Vilnius Tsardom whose would-be architect, Vytautas-Alexander received the schismatic baptism in the second half of the year 1384? The conquest of Moscow by the Vilnius state risked the abolition of everything that represented Vilnius's distinctiveness and after such a move there would have been no Lithuanian Catholicism or any Western civilization in ethnic Lithuania. And also today there would not have been no Lithuanian nationality had Vilnius embraced Moscow in the XIV<sup>th</sup> c.

Hardly one generation after the battle on the Vorskla serious doubts appeared as to whether the state of Muscovy would survive. The internal Moscow war (1432-1454) was in the political sense only an addendum to the turmoil through which the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was going. Ivan Andreevich of Mozhaisk was to become the ruler of Moscow under Lithuanian supremacy against Vasily the Blind. The Gashtold family that was in power in Lithuania at the time planned to break the state and legal tie with Poland. They in fact represented the last link of the long chain of actions in favour of the program of Algirdas according to which the whole of Ruthenia was to belong to Lithuania. Prince Kazimir Jagiellon, a 13-years old lad was to become the instrument of the Gashtold family when they declared him the Grand Prince of Lithuania in 1440. After the battle of Varna<sup>57</sup> in 1444 the Gashtolds forbade Kazimir to take the throne of Poland, breaking up even the pretence of union with Poland. According to them Moscow was worth more to Lithuania than Kraków.

---

<sup>57</sup> [There the Polish king, Władysław, Kazimir's brother was killed.]

Not all Lithuanians shared this view. Since the young Kazimir could act against the Gashtolds, he must have had the support of a group for which the tie with Kraków was preferable to a march on Moscow. There were diverse opinions about the relationships with Moscow in Lithuania. There was a war party and a peace party. The dynasts, the princes who were eager to have more princedoms pressed for an expansion eastwards so as to increase the number of princedoms for the descendants of Gedymin at the expense of the Rurikids, whereas the princes who had fairly rich provinces preferred peace with Moscow.

Sympathies towards one or the other civilization must have had an influence on the political program. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania was decidedly more Ruthenian than ethnic Lithuanian and the upper classes of Lithuania were under the impact of Ruthenian culture even before Jagiełło became King of Poland. From 1386 onwards there was indecision between Catholicism and Ruthenia, and this deepened after the Union of Horodło<sup>58</sup> in 1413. All the Lithuanian seals on the document of the Union of Horodło have inscriptions in Ruthenian, but the text of the Union was Polish, West European, written in Latin. The consequences of the agreement pressured the clans mentioned in the document towards Poland and Catholicism turned them in this direction. But even around the year 1440 the issue was not yet decided. In many respects the Ruthenian tradition was stronger and Catholicism was still weak. The Gashtold family stood

---

<sup>58</sup> [The Union of Poland and Lithuania signed in Horodło in 1413 declared the equality of the Polish and Lithuanian gentry. It decided that the Grand Prince of Lithuania would be appointed by the Polish King after consultation with the nobles of Lithuania.]

firmly with the Church, but they kept a distance from Poland so as to have free hands in their outreach towards the East.

Both in Lithuania and in Muscovy a class of higher landed gentry developed which by the strength of their numbers could be decisive in the choice between the programs of the princes and the nobility. In Zalesye Ruthenia, in the state of Muscovy, the nondescript status of the boyars was beginning to be defined with some precision only around the year 1480 (as shall be explained in the chronologically proper place). But in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania this was already clear in 1413. In the three acts of the Horodło Union the term *boyar* appeared many times in the Latin script but always translated in the same way as *armiger sive bojarin*. Thus in the Lithuanian state every *armiger* was a *boyar*, not only the head of the family as was the case according to custom law in the Eastern Slav lands. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania there was no legal distinction between the “children of the boyars” and the “sons of the boyars”. This was certain because it derived from the nature of things, namely that in Lithuanian Ruthenia the boyars were primarily descendants of the former troopers (the Rus soldiers [of Scandinavian origin]), who with time had acquired land property. But there was not many of them, because such troopers mainly emigrated en block to Moscow. The military element in Lithuanian Ruthenia had primarily a different origin. The princes tried to fill in the space left by the emigrating troopers, and this presented no problem in a society where since times immemorial the people were organized in military fashion, into “hundreds”. In ethnic Lithuania all who were permitted by the prince to have the use of land were obliged to military service and since 1387 this covered all the land owners. As a result in ethnic Lithuania there developed as if a repetition of the

Polish "military law" which was at the basis of the land ownership law. These influences moved onto Lithuanian Ruthenia in particular since 1434 when the Orthodox were admitted to the Polish clans having coats of arms. Land property became synonymous with the military profession and every *armiger* was a *boyar*. In Lithuanian Ruthenia however, being a boyar was not linked to any special privileges in military service or in the administration of the prince. Hierarchically being a boyar in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania meant less than in the state of Muscovy; but his rights continued to grow and he was becoming a citizen, while a Muscovite boyar, even having the highest office was increasingly becoming a serf or peasant in respect to the throne. The differing position of the boyars clearly manifests the civilizational difference between the two sides of the frontier.

While in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania members of the boyar class were gaining more personal and political freedom, in Zalesye Ruthenia the political power relied increasingly on the personal dependence of the inhabitants on the ruler, which combined with increasing readiness for war had the result that the state organization was penetrating all relationships and aspects of life. The influences of the Turanian civilization were constantly on the increase, in particular since the state was having more and more Turanian people within its borders extended onto the lands of the "multi-tribal Yugra". And also since the end of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. there was an increase in Tatar settlement. The Byzantine influences scarcely trickled in, while the Turanian ones were hitting with a strong wave. Unfortunately the influences of this Asiatic civilization were coming from its inferior levels. Since the revolution of Tamerlane (1380-1405) the system of oriental despotism was growing, as it was based upon the fanaticism of the governmental religion and on

terror. Moscow increasingly was being schooled by the lowest level of the Turanians.

In Lithuania the social structure was changing, becoming European, ever since Jagiełło, who initially was ready to receive baptism from the Orthodox Church, suddenly turned westwards. But in Lithuanian Ruthenia much of the earlier influences remained and they were to remain there for centuries exerting thereby a negative influence on the Catholic ethnic Lithuania. This can be seen in the conditions of existence of the non-boyar rural population. In Poland these people were lease-holders, who were becoming poorer, as they had half and quarter plots, but they had no other obligations except those that derive from lease law because the lease-holding was hereditary and the owner had no right to terminate it, while the lease-holder could decide to end it every year. But throughout the Eastern Slav lands since the mid XV<sup>th</sup> c. the rural population was in bondage. We do not know whether these relationships were in existence throughout the whole of the Lithuanian state, also in ethnic Lithuania, or whether they were only in Lithuanian Ruthenia. But in Poland who knew anything about the ethnic Lithuanians? Even in the XVIII<sup>th</sup> c. the Ruthenian language was termed "Lithuanian", because it was the official language of the whole Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

When in 1447 the University of Kraków received King Kazimir Jagiellon, Jan from Ludziska, a medical doctor prepared a welcoming speech about rural people and the social structure in general.

In this lecture there was vision and tremendous scope! Right up to the Union of Lublin [1569], Lithuania was given a series of ideas by the "fraternal Crown<sup>59</sup>", one af-

---

<sup>59</sup> [In the Polish-Lithuanian Union, Poland was referred to as the Crown.]

ter the other. Unfortunately, afterwards there was a terrifying, radical change in the direction of influences, and finally eastern ideas conquered Poland and led to its perdition.

What sorts of ideas were being generated in Moscow? All the so called historical ideas and "missions" of Moscow-Russia were invented by foreigners coming from outside Russia. They were imported and Russia was talked into them until finally they were received when they proved to be materially beneficial. When Metropolitan Cyprian, who was a Serb, dreamt about shedding the Tatar yoke and for this reason he wanted a strong Moscow, so that the whole of Zalesye would unite under its leadership with Vasily Dmitriyevich (1389-1425) at its head, recognizing the supremacy of the Greek Emperor, he was told by the Prince: "We have the Church, but we do not have a Tsar and do not want one". This meant that Vasily did not want to have the Byzantine Emperor above him, because he recognized the Sarai Tsar. The Patriarch's letter of 1393 that summarised the Byzantine doctrine in one sentence saying "there is no Church without a Tsar, and there is only one true Tsar" was rejected. For Vasily the Sarai Tsar of Kipchak remained the true Tsar. When later in 1498 Ivan III tried to become a Tsar, he understood this not as a succession of the Byzantine Emperor, but as a Tsardom on the mode of a Khan, the Tatar mode. But when later there were requests that Moscow would recognize itself as a successor of Byzantium, and when finally after many doubts it decided to accept this role, there were then attempts to derive the title from some ancient right, as if, from some mission that was innate to Moscow. Even later on, the same was said about the leadership of Russia within Orthodoxy and in recent times about its hegemony among the Slav coun-

tries and in European legitimism etc.<sup>60</sup> All these were foreign notions that were imported into Russia. Never, not even once, did Moscow come up with some great idea by itself.

Towards the mid XV<sup>th</sup> c. Moscow did not even have any idea about statehood, despite everything that was later claimed by the Moscow, official, legend. Ivan Kalita (d. 1340) that first Grand Prince of the “Whole of Ruthenia”, meaning the Tatar one devised the plan of dividing his realm in such a way so as to maintain equality among the inheriting princes as far as possible. Dmitry Donskoy introduced inequality in favour of the first born son, but even in the will of Ivan III the provinces were not abolished. In 1432 the principle of primogeniture was questioned and an internal war broke out in the name of the equality of the princes. This would have led anew to princely anarchy and simultaneously to the downfall of Muscovite hegemony in Zalesye.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 27**

In 1449, the year of Lithuania’s resignation of the eastward direction, it was clearly evident that the state border was to be a cultural one at the same time. On one side a branch of the Latin civilization was gradually developing and on the other there was some uncertain civilization, difficult as yet to define, and unformed. The main theme of this study will be to determine whether this uncertainty, this lack of defined face, will decline or increase and should consistency increase, to establish what kind of civilization emerged from this.

---

<sup>60</sup> [The same can be said about Russia’s leadership in the Communist movement.]

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 30-31**

The name "Kazakhs" (in writing: Cossacks) was known from the days of the first formations of Genghis Khan. It meant Tatars who had fled, or at least did not hold onto the main body and regular organization of the Horde. The meaning of the word was the same in mid XV<sup>th</sup> c. The Ryazan Cossacks were a formation of Tatar fugitives and their descendants that had settled in the wilderness of the whole of central Ruthenia from where it was possible to make raids in all directions at every possible occasion. This was not difficult given the constant strife among the Rurikids. Such Cossacks readily became mercenaries. They did not have the support of the Khan behind them, and so they operated on their own responsibility and at their own risk. They can be compared with the mercenaries of Western Europe. We must imprint this well into our minds that when the word "Cossack" first appeared in the history of the Eastern Slav lands it did not refer to any specific ethnic group, but only to a military profession as a mode of subsistence. Thus it only had an economic meaning, not an ethnographic one. From that time onwards it has to be noted whether the meaning of the word persisted or whether it changed, and when it changed, why did it do so and in what circumstances.

## **HR, vol. 2, p 40-41**

The internal organization of Novgorod the Great was different than that of Moscow. The neighbourhoods were positioned next to one another as they developed, and when the first circle was already closed, a new one was formed within a further circle expanding with time in

centrifugal direction, but not increasing the arch of its base from the side of initial precincts. This is the European way of town growth, of the establishment of new suburbs. Moscow was built up and expanded in the Turanian mode, according to models taken from the Khazars, Mongols and Tatars following in this the development of the Khan's Sarai. All the "towns", that is the more important camp-settlements of the Khazars, Avars, Mongols, Huns and Tatars were composed of several rather narrow centripetal belts. The town initially consisted of a central circle, around which new concentric belts were set up with an increasing radius from the centre. Thus the first new suburb circumscribed the whole town centre with a full new circle. After some time it was encircled by a next suburb, and then another after this, etc. Atil was composed of seven such concentric circles. The more distant was the suburb the larger was its circumference and at the same time it was narrower. Moving through the city from its centre in any direction always one passed through all the suburbs. This was the way how the historic Moscow expanded showing thereby its Tatar influence. At the same time Novgorod was under European influence, which reached it through the mediation of townspeople from Livonia.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 62-63**

A candidate for the priesthood learnt from a priest the external forms of the liturgy, everything that one sees or hears from the altar, without ever learning the alphabet and such a candidate in time became a priest.

What could such a pastor teach? Thus it is no surprise that from ten parishioners only one knew the "Our Father", not to mention the "I believe" or the Ten Com-

mandments. In Zalesye in that time prayer was considered to belong to too high sciences, appropriate for the Tsars, the Patriarchs and generally for the lords and clergy who had nothing else to do. It was not for the common people. There were complaints in the XV<sup>th</sup> c. that the priests not only did not read books but they also "hated those who teach". We hear of instances where an ignoramus priest baptized infants in the name of "three Fathers, three Sons and three Holy Spirits".

The Orthodox theology of Ruthenia was then mainly concerned with two complex questions, the kind of which and mode of presentation indicate clearly that this spiritual world had contacts with the oriental Asiatic world, with the distant Buddhism through some unresolved mediation of Nestorianism. These were the issue of the "Tabor light" and the subtle study whether the *Alleluia* should be *презубить* [repeated trice] or *сугубить* [repeated twice]. The minds of Western men were never bothered by doubts.

Towards the mid-XIV<sup>th</sup> c. the holy wise men from Mount Athos practiced devout contemplations in which they placed their chins on their chests and remained motionless for many hours whispering silently the Our Father. They remained in motionless delusions until they had some visions which were to be a seeing that which Christ saw on Mount Tabor. This was exactly the same as the ecstasy of Hindu holy men contemplating devoutly their navels. The analogy comes to mind inevitably; it may truly serve those who still believe in some "wisdom of the East". Several "Councils" very seriously dealt with the issue of the *фаворский свет* [Tabor light, emitted by Christ during the Transfiguration] throwing anathemas this way or that until finally in 1351 the teaching on this Tabor light was officially recognized and two Orthodox monks from Southern Italy, Barlaam, who had been

scandalized during his stay on Mount Athos and his disciple Akindin were condemned. Tabor ecstasies moved onto the "Whole of Ruthenia" as a legitimate practice of highest devotion and a source of further, ever higher theological education.

In those days there was a violent conflict over the issue whether in the verse "Alleluia, glory to You, o God" the word *Alleluia* was to be repeated trice or twice. This was described through the technical terms *tregubit alliluja* or *sugubit alliluja*. Conflict over this issue was to continue until the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. producing an abundant polemical theological literature.

In practice, such scholarship led to interesting discoveries in the application of theology to life. The conviction that became most common was that it was sinful to shave beards. In the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. one of the Archbishops, either from Novgorod or from Rostov wrote to some Rurikid prince: "You apply the cursed razor to your beard. Such a deed is alien to the Christian custom. This is what Latin sophistry consists in. I plead Your Highness to terminate this obnoxious practice which is abhorrent to God".

With the background of such an ecclesial mentality we should not be surprised to find that in Novgorod the Great the position of the Archbishop was settled by drawing lots.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 72**

Vasily the Blind had no idea of statehood and did not put one into practice. His policy was to secure the future for his children and nothing else. He wanted Moscow to be as potent as possible, because it was his Moscow. He wanted to amass under the supremacy of Moscow as

much land as possible, because this would serve his children. He reasoned and acted like a private landowner. His will indicates that he had nothing against the division of the state into independent provinces as long as they were held by his children! His state consciousness was restricted to the conservation of the law of primogeniture, which was his law, one over which he had to wage a severe internal war. Thus he stressed this law all the more in his will allotting to his eldest son more fiefs than to all the four younger ones taken together. But this is where his sense of statehood ended. He did not think about autocracy.

### **HR, vol. 2, p. 73**

It is improper to claim that Vasily the Blind aimed for autocracy as if he strived for the beginnings of some policy aiming at the shedding of the Tatar yoke. Vasily was prepared to pay the tribute in two directions rather than to have state-legal conflicts with the Khans.

### **HR, vol. 2, p. 74-75**

Vasily the Blind held onto a reasonable program, against wishful but doubtful attempts. First, he wanted to control the whole of Zalesye, the Tatar All Ruthenia and only later could this "All Ruthenia" lose the rank of a Tatar province.

Moscow was interested in maintaining the Tatar tribute on the administration of which it grew. Thus Moscow was interested in prolonging these relationships. So long as the Grand Princes of Moscow did not have control over the whole of Zalesye, the end of the dependency on the

Tatars would have been a tragedy for them. After all, it was the Khan who supported Moscow's hegemony. This statehood would have disintegrated were it to be prematurely released from Tatar bondage. Vasily the Blind was fully aware of the fact that "Moscow was a construct of the Khans"<sup>61</sup> and his son, co-ruler and disciple, Ivan III Vasilyevich followed this policy very closely during the long years of his rule.

Both father and son recognized the Tatar supremacy not only from necessity (because there were possibilities of shedding this yoke), but on purpose, so as to have the support of the Khans in the process of gathering more and more princedoms of Zalesye.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 78-79**

Delectation in cruelty was a common phenomenon in Suzdal Ruthenia, and this was true not only for the Suzdal region, but there it was most prominent. This was the heritage of the Cuman culture and of similar branches of the Turanian civilization. This heritage was not on the decline with time, but in fact it increased with some Tatar influences, particularly after the period of Tamerlane. Severity did not have a negative connotation in the ethical norms of this civilization<sup>62</sup>. Thus in the state notions of Moscow severity as it were advanced onto a higher pedestal, becoming an institution of public life. This was not a blind severity, a spontaneous reaction of some temperament, a response that derived from a mixture of stupidity and anger. This was a purposeful brutality, executed in cold blood for political ends. Such severity

---

<sup>61</sup> An expression of Karamzin.

<sup>62</sup> [Ivan III was referred to as "the Stern". This was not a negative description.]

was respected. New values were discovered in brutality and it was reformed as it were, perfected and raised to a higher level. There appeared the Turanian notion of beneficent severity, officially executed by those who had the right to do so, a right taken on selfishly from God. In this way also in the East it was possible to use the title "By the Grace of God"<sup>63</sup>. The divine favour entitled one to be severe. A severe prince was exactly as a prince should be. We frequently read in the written sources that the "ruling of the Grand Prince" should be *держатъ честно и грозно* [held honestly and menacingly]; the one could not manage without the other. Severity and menacing are the basic tools of the art of government. Who would not practice them would be neglecting the obligations of a ruler. In this way gradually and continuously the ideal of terror, as the zenith of governance was being reached. This idea and political invention did not derive from Ruthenia. It was Tamerlane's state idea that was taken over second hand, through the mediation of the Tatar "Tsars". Two things were intermingled inseparably in the minds. There is no Tsardom without brutality and there is no follower of Tsardom who would complain about its severity.

There is no follower of the Western European civilization who would not consider brutality as an outrage, as a disgrace. And so there was an increase in the number of observations pointing towards the fact that the state border [with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania] was also a true frontier of civilizations.

---

<sup>63</sup> It was used in Moscow for the first time in 1434.

**HR, vol. 2, p. 154-157**

[Zoe Palaiologina, the wife of Ivan III and niece of the last Byzantine Emperor, who lived in Rome since 1465] came to Moscow with an entourage of humanists. Suddenly Moscow was establishing contacts with the most advanced country in Europe. But Ivan III and his courtiers did not want anything from Italy apart from military cooperation. Thus there were to be a number of delegations to Italy under the pretence of an anti-Turkish league etc., but in fact their only task was to recruit various "craftsmen", who were imported in the greatest possible numbers, in particular gun-makers and engineers. As a result, towards the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. military art in Moscow was superior not only to that of the Tatars but also to that of Lithuania which allowed itself to be overtaken by Moscow in this respect.

The military superiority of Moscow in the East: this was the dowry of Zoe-Sophia. Besides that there were three other benefits:

In 1474 Ivan III allowed Zoe to recruit architects from Italy. Rudolf Fioravanti degli Alberti from Bologna was brought in, together with his son Andrew and their apprentice Peter. Later they wanted to escape from Moscow, but they were held and prevented from fleeing. They built brick churches in the Kremlin as well as a palace for the family of the Grand Prince and they fortified Moscow and Nizhny Novgorod. Later on, in 1490 Antonio Solari and Avisio built the famous churches of the Assumption, of Archangel Michael and of the Annunciation as well as a new palace that copied the castle in Milan. The Renaissance appeared in Moscow earlier than in Kraków. These Italians produced a fine, splendid

new variety of the Renaissance in Moscow, which should have become there the basis of art.

But this did not happen. The military lessons of the Italians were employed but only once, and not for a long time, because the Muscovites did not learn how to follow up what they received. The same has to be said about the field of art! No new style was born, only an architectural "dual faith" with contradicting lines and forms placed indifferently beside one another. This first attempt to produce a synthesis of the West and of the East in Moscow yielded poor results covered with an onion like dome. These same humanists who in Italy taught Homer and Plato, in Moscow were unable to teach anybody grammar.

Much is said about the introduction of the "Byzantine" ceremonial by Zoe. Ivan III was indeed becoming increasingly unapproachable, but it was not Zoe that made him so. He married a foreigner deliberately so as to facilitate his being unapproachable. The boyars blamed this on Zoe and so this opinion passed on to history. The gradual and continuous severing of links with the hitherto environment was decided upon before Zoe came to Moscow. Not only in the available sources there is not even the slightest suggestion of some introduction of the Byzantine ceremonial, but on the contrary, there are clear and numerous indications that a very complicated ceremonial was seeping into Moscow from the Tatar "Tsars". The customs of the Muscovite court of the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. are known in detail and there was nothing Byzantine in them. The complexity and buffooneries of this ceremonial are perfectly explained by the Tatar model.

The origin of Zoe generated many illusions in historiography whereas in fact in those days Byzantinism did not exert any influence on Moscow whatsoever. No one

even wanted even to learn the Greek language from the Byzantine entourage of Zoe! These Greeks served Ivan III to maintain relationships not with the Balkans but with Italy and with the Germans, as leaders of many delegations sent for the recruitment of “technicians”. Among these Greeks there were such notable figures as Perkantotes, Trakhaniotes, brothers Rhalelov and others.

Nor had Zoe brought any “Byzantine dowry” with her. The double headed eagle was her personal family seal. As late as in the times of Ivan the Terrible the crest of the state was that of St. George and we have definite proof of this in sphragistics.

Ivan III intended to be the successor of the Tsar-Khan of Kipchak, not that of Byzantium. He needed to have the best possible relationships with the Sultan-Caliph and so he never thought of claiming succession to the throne of Constantinople against the Turks.

By no means was Zoe an “heiress of Byzantium”. There were six male heirs claiming the title, namely her two brothers, an uncle and three cousins. Were females to have a right to the throne, the succession would have belonged not to Zoe but to her elder sister Helen, who married Lazar II of Serbia in 1446.

The mission of Moscow to “succeed Byzantium” is a pure invention, something about nobody ever dreamt of in Moscow.

Furthermore, the “eventual” succession was tainted by the fact that there were those who acquired the right to Byzantium in a most formal way by buying it from the undoubted who were closer to the heritage. This was particularly true in the case of Andrew the brother of Zoe, who found a rich source of revenue for himself as he traded his right to the throne. He was in Moscow twice, but Ivan did not buy any “rights” from him.

There are also no indications in the sources that Ivan was becoming more daring with respect to the Tatars, under the influence of Zoe. On the contrary, in the coming years he had to pay a double tribute! Ivan was not the type of prince who would allow his wife to meddle in politics. He allowed her to raise buildings and thanks to this, it was she who changed the grey-wooden Moscow into one shining with white stone.

### **HR, vol. 2, p. 174**

It is a first order fact in the history of Muscovite culture that Ivan III was greatly concerned about the *zocydapcmbo* [state]. His intent was to base his state authority [in Novgorod the Great] on his personal supremacy over all the inhabitants of the country. In this we see very clearly the Turanian notion of statehood, the Tatar ideal, as the prince wanted to be the successor of the Tsar-Khan. Even in Moscow itself Ivan did not as yet have such power! Novgorod was to supply an opportunity to progress onto a higher step in Turanianism, and should this prove possible in Novgorod, then it would be extended over other provinces. One had to start somewhere and in Novgorod it was easily possible to spark such an opportunity and there was the certainty that Zalesie would not fail to support the struggle against the city, the destruction of which was desired by all the Suzdal lands and by Moscow in particular.

### **HR, vol. 2, p. 177**

As a visible sign of the loss of independence [of Novgorod the Great] Ivan III ordered that the rally bell be handed

over and then transferred to Moscow. The administration was to be executed by officials of the Grand Prince and they were to begin by collecting a tax of half a *grivna* from a plough. When the details of the new order were specified in which "everything was to be as in Moscow" it turned out that the purpose of being the *zocydap* [manager] was to have the right to confiscate the property of the population and to forcibly displace the people at will.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 197-198**

As we study the reign of Ivan III we see that at every step he continuously increased his military prowess, as if he did not perceive any other obligation of the state. This task penetrated deeply every day of his rule, his every thought. With years this feature was becoming ever more evident, ever more at the fore of all his activities. Ivan III was concerned about the armed forces and in such a way that not only did he make out of Moscow the greatest after Turkey military power of the world, but he has also militarized society and in this Moscow was similar to Turkey. Both these states, the Muscovite and the Turkish followed in this the common Asiatic heritage, deriving from the tradition of Tamerlane (not to mention the even older tradition of the "blue" Mongols) but this was bifurcated into two routes: one led through the history and the achievements of the Seljuqs, while the other through the Tatar groups. Both developed as camp societies. Ivan III wanted to be as strong as the Khans employing their methods. In full consciousness he was imitating the Tatars so as to defeat them by their own method. No doubt he dreamt of this, knowing that at first it was unrealistic, but for which real means had to be accumulated so to use them in the future.

Since much earlier, Moscow was leading in the number of soldiers that had been changed into landed boyars. This social class multiplied with the acquisition of new provinces of Zalesye, because the garrison of each new province was incorporated into the Moscow military forces. In view of the fact that during the reign of Ivan III great territories were incorporated, also the number of those who were obliged to be recruited for any wartime needs, i.e. the descendants of former garrison members grew greatly. This obligations, however, by the force of existing relationships was becoming increasingly relative. It was never abolished, but should all the landed boyars be called to a single military expedition, immediately the main branch of state economy would crash, as agriculture would come to ruin.

Ivan III found a way out of the dilemma. He restricted military duty to only the younger generation, to the sons of the boyars, making however their military service absolutely compulsory. Thus, the "boyar children" formed a standing army. No doubt this solution needed many years before it was put into practice.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 201**

Not every member of a boyar family was a boyar. This position was reserved to the head of the home and clan, to the father of a family in a wider sense of the word. It was impossible for a father and son to be boyars simultaneously in spite of the fact that the son already was the father of a family. Only after the death of a father all his sons became boyars if they had completed their military service as "boyar children". Otherwise they would lose their right to be called boyars. In this way the so far undefined notion of a boyar [around 1490] started to acquire a strict meaning.

A boyar was a descendant of the garrison members, the Scandinavian Rus who was an owner of land property and who when young had served in the army. Later, he had the right to higher offices in the army, if he wanted to continue to serve there or possibly in service at the court or in the administration. One had to be born a boyar. One had to be a descendant of the servicemen from the times of the Varangian troops.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 204-209**

A general tax known as *ямскы* (*yamsky* tax) was an imitation of the old order imposed by the “blue” Mongols. Some permanent postal routes for the maintenance of relationships between the central state administration and subordinate provinces had been in existence for two centuries.

Initially these routes linked Karakorum with Moscow passing through Sarai. Later the eastern part of this network disappeared. Within the “whole of Ruthenia” the *baskaks* maintained some of these lines of communication, but they were gradually falling into neglect as the state order of the Tatars was declining. The duties abandoned by the Tatar superiors were often picked up by the Moscow princes, who imitated Tatar rule in many positive elements, learning from them the art of managing a state. Thus the *yamsk* system survived the fall of Tatar rule and was even expanded ever more directly under Moscow governance at the time when Tatar power was in decline and with difficulty it maintained Moscow under its tribute dependency. And so the communication network was in the hands of the Muscovites and not of the Tatar *yamskites*.

Not everything that Moscow inherited from the Tatars was bad, but the crumbs of positive elements were submerged in the magnitude of evil that came from imitating the Tatars and drawing the model of statehood from them.

Apart from militarism, Moscow inherited also the Tatar bureaucratic order. The Khan's treasury required written documentation the models of which were drawn from the ancient chancelleries of the *baskaks* and which were a caricature of the earlier Mongol bureaucracy run by Chinese officials<sup>64</sup>. In the past, the "blue" Mongol armies had Chinese scholars as administrators. A distant outbranch of these Chinese influences were... the Moscow *dyaks* [clerks].

This new class of people appeared under Vasily the Blind and they were to have a profound influence on the history of Moscow. A *dyak* was a person who could read and write, but he was a layman, used as a helper only due to his ability to read and write. He was a literate assistant, an official of the administration. To start with the *dyaks* served in the Church, for liturgical purposes that in the eastern rite required many servers who were not necessarily ordained priests; they were the whole crew of Church sacristans, acolytes and in particular singers. Later also princes followed the example of the priests and they held literate people in their chancelleries as

---

<sup>64</sup> In comparison with the whole world bureaucracy developed to the highest and most all-encompassing degree in China. It was not however invented by the Chinese, but by the Mongols, the conquerors of China. Later, with the decline of the Genghis Khan Empire, Mongolian bureaucracy also declined, whereas it continued to develop in China. At times it shrank, but the Manchurian rule assured it a new flourishing epoch — in fact a new epoch of decline of the Chinese civilization.

scribes and lecturers out of which at larger courts there developed what in Western Europe was referred to as secretariats and archives.

Vasily the Blind employed an increasing number of *dyaks* and allowed for a class of court *dyaks* to develop and thus the beginnings of the Moscow bureaucracy were formed. Already during his reign a hierarchy of *dyaks* was set up and at first it was necessary to be a *подьяк* [*sub-dyak*].

Every *dyak* knew how to read and write well. Indeed if this capability were to qualify the state of education, if culture, as many believe, consisted in it alone, then Moscow in the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. would have the highest educational standards in the whole of Europe! Muscovy could pride itself in the number of literate individuals, but... there was nothing to read there, apart from the rare copies of chroniclers, some devotional literature and administrative documents. The literacy of the *dyaks* did not derive from a desire to read, to learn anything, but exclusively from the desire to have a job in the administration.

Ivan III moved the organization of the *dyaks* a major step further by introducing specialization among them. He held close to himself the *dyaks* who were proficient in writings pertaining to the Scriptures, theology, law and history. He himself had an inclination towards theology, but he understood that also the other spheres could be used politically and changed into political tools. Thus Muscovite political learning developed, i.e. a learning that was cultivated and tolerated for immediate, at first political aims, and so from its onset, it was perverted, caricatured. It was this learning that was to block the way for science and to make it unwelcome in the Tsardom of Moscow.

With time antagonism between the clergy and the *dyaks* had to grow over influences in the court and state. The expanding bureaucracy and secular knowledge were moving out of the control of the Church, and so they were not welcomed by it. Hostility had to develop between one and the other.

After all, the bureaucracy promoted the art of reading and writing and in view of the illiteracy of the clergy this was of prime historical importance. The organization of the state and of society had to be related to the Church — at the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. this was already decided — but the question remained, what would be the essence of this order? Already in the days of Ivan III it became clear that the Muscovite mind will be headed not by the clergy but by the *dyaks*, the bureaucracy. Thus society having the Church in the background was to be led not by the Church but by the bureaucracy. This meant that the spiritual features of society would be provided not by the spiritual element, but by the factor of strength and power, based upon compulsion and physical force. Already in the days of Ivan III, a discrepancy was developing between the organization of the state and its spiritual focus. An organization having the Church in its background but which did not stand at the head of its mind would deteriorate into only a formal, shallow, deceptive body, because cultural developments would take place beyond the Church and in this case against it. Out of this, necessarily with time a fatal consequence for society had to result. On the one hand the organization was tugged by society, and on the other hand it faced the increasing terror of the state trying to maintain its endangered organization. The beginnings of such a state of affairs, which we shall have to discuss in detail further on, lie in this moment of history. They derived from

the expansive role of the literate *dyaks* and from the fact that the majority of the clergy were illiterate.

This entailed also something else. The bureaucracy did not exert a cultural influence in the proper understanding of the term; nowhere and never was the bureaucracy a factor that would build culture. The class of *dyaks* had not the slightest impact on literary production, it did not even hasten its development. Thus at the head of the Muscovite mind stood a factor that was anti-cultural, incapable of generating cultural needs. Already then, this endangered the Moscow state. Having noted this aspect of the issue, when describing the history of further generations, we shall be watching to see whether anything changed in this respect.

The bureaucracy wherever it appears, it always has political significance. The slogan that everywhere "everything should be as in Moscow" became in time, out of bureaucratic facility, also the program of the Muscovite society, its ambition, a sign of its domination, a prime feature of the state. All, beginning with the ruler supported the *dyaks* in this and in these circumstances they emerged as not only representatives of the state but also of society.

The model person for a Muscovite was not a priest or a boyar but a *dyak*. Both the priest and the boyar tried to imitate the *dyak*.

There were also *dyaks* in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. They worked in the chancellery of the Grand Duke as chancellery assistants, archivists etc. However, this was something quite different! Did the *dyaks* exert some influence on Lithuania or Lithuanian Ruthenia? They remained clerks in the chancellery having no influence in public life with no impact whatsoever. There was no antagonism between them and any other class in Lithuania, for the simple reason that they remained people with no

significance. In comparison with the clergy they were something so very low that it was a great favour for a *dyak* when a parish priest cared to notice him, not to mention the attitude of the higher clergy. The Lithuanian *dyaks* were individuals of so little significance that they never formed a legally sanctioned class and whoever among them made a name for himself, he used his capabilities and his *dyak* profession as a grade onto some "better" position. This was so because in Lithuania, thanks to Polish influences, the lords who had *dyaks* as assistants not only knew how to read and write on par with the chancellery officials, but they had a much higher level of education. What about the clergy? It would be ridiculous to dwell on the difference in intelligence of the Latin clergy compared to that of the *dyaks*.

In Lithuania it was the "lords", both ecclesiastic and secular who ruled, whereas in Moscow governance was passing into the hands of the *dyaks* who were hiding behind the backs of illiterate boyars. As a result, an incompetent element started to have an influence in state affairs.

It is a common feature throughout universal history that when public affairs are placed in the hands of incompetent people ochlocracy [mob rule] results. A government that remains in power in spite of lacking appropriate capabilities aligns with the mob, moving gradually, slowly but constantly in that direction. It bases itself on the sympathies of the lower classes, that is, of the classes that are intellectually, economically and ethically less developed. Such was the situation in Moscow already under Ivan III.

Both in Pskov and in Novgorod the Great, Moscow tried to gain the sympathies of the lower classes against the higher ones, hoping that they may prove very useful in causing disturbances and internal upheavals. Since

the main aim was to disqualify and abolish the institution of the rally, Muscovite influences were based on those who were not interested in calling rallies, because in any case they had no voice there and they were against those who comprised the rallies and relied on them. This was how the Moscow party was initiated in Novgorod the Great and in Pskov and the same method was used elsewhere.

State ochlocracy combined with despotism is a common feature in the history of the Orient. This system helps best and most effectively in the fixing of the principles of statehood within the Turanian civilization, namely that the governing state authority has the support of as large as possible portion of the population who are personally dependent upon the ruler. In other words this is the **building a state on the basis of the private law [of the ruler]**.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 210**

In the year of the "Lithuanian liquidation,"<sup>65</sup> in 1449, it was already evident that the state border was at the same time a cultural frontier. On the Western side there was the Latin civilization and on the Eastern some other not yet fully developed civilization. One generation passed and the direction of development of the civilization east of Lithuania was becoming clear. We see a trend towards the Turanian civilization. However in order to point at its location within the Turanian civilization, more data was needed. One had to wait till it developed more fully. It was not yet developed at the time, not fixed yet, not hardened. A change in some other direction could have occurred.

---

<sup>65</sup> [Peace treaty between Lithuania and Moscow.]

**HR, vol. 2, p. 221-222**

The year 1480 brought a sharp crisis in Moscow in the struggle between the Byzantine and Turanian directions. The former tried to organize the state on the model of the old Byzantine Empire, while the latter as before recognized only the Tatar "Tsardom" and aimed at having the whole of Zalesye under the dominance of Moscow leaving the issue of shedding the Tatar yoke for some distant future. The protagonists of these two camps were unaware that they were in the midst of two civilizational directions. At issue was the settlement whether Zalesye would submit to the Turanian or to the Byzantine civilization, which during the generation under discussion was growing in strength. Would it submit totally to one of these directions, or would a mixture be formed composed also of some native elements, producing thereby a distinct Turanian-Muscovite or Byzantine-Muscovite culture?

The followers of Byzantinism did not succeed in influencing the Grand Prince in spite of their great efforts. The opposition was to grow silently and in clandestinity so that its next explosion would be all the more potent.

**HR, vol. 2, p. 239**

Bogomilism was thriving in Wallachia. All the sources pertaining to the *жидоствующих* [heresy of the Judaizers] unanimously assert that the successor to the throne [Helen of Moldova, the wife of Ivan the Younger, the son of Ivan III, and mother of Dmitri] had much influence in this. The Novgorod lovers of astrology and the Kabbalah, when they were moved to Moscow where they

expanded their field of activity found ready sympathy in Helen, a follower of Bogomilism, in which there were some common features, because the learning from Thessaloniki had an impact on both these trends. What was more resolute, decided and radical had to come to the fore, namely Bogomilism. Its propaganda was facilitated because according to their beliefs, they could publically pretend to be Orthodox followers of the Eastern Church.

Thus Bogomilism, which was suppressed in the Balkans by Islam, found a refuge in Suzdal Ruthenia only to drown there in the northern "dual faith". Such was the final fate of the sect. Before this happened, Moscow Bogomilism went even further than the Balkan. They rejected the Resurrection and Ascension and finally denied the Divinity of Christ. They did not become Jews, but under the influence of the Jews they ceased to be Christians. Finally they started to celebrate Saturday as their holy day.

The sect thrived having the support of the court of Ivan the Younger.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 269**

Based on this security [from the Lithuanian side] Ivan III continued to organize matters in Zalesye in such a way that everywhere "everything would be as in Moscow". The time came for further blows against Novgorod the Great. In 1487 a further transfer of the population took place. On that occasion Ivan's army stayed in Novgorod for four months, and it left it after having introduced Muscovite order. In the next year more than 7 000 traders were deported and settled forcefully in Nizhny Novgorod, in Vladimir on the Klyazma, in Pereyaslav of Zalesye, in Murom, in Yuryev of Zalesye, in Rostov,

in Kostroma and in other "lowland" towns. In this way the Novgorod class of traders was disbanded completely and scattered in its fragments over "the whole Rostov land", throughout Zalesye. The traders sent in exchange from Moscow as well as from other Zalesye towns were less numerous and they did not make the city "Great" again. Their trade was limited and based exclusively on Moscow. Novgorod was becoming as if a suburb of Moscow, a second rank one, living of the remnants of Moscow trade which was imposing ever more clearly its exclusiveness over Zalesye.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 270-273**

The population was deported, with full consciousness the achievements of the past were destroyed, the tradition was deliberately abandoned severing all natural social bonds that had developed in an evolutionary manner by the work of generations and the circumstances of local life. But before this was achieved, while in Novgorod there were still remnants of the true Novgorod the Great, it caused Moscow pains bringing grave difficulties to both camps, the Byzantine and the camp of Ivan III with his *dyaks*. For a long time Novgorod had no physical strength and it never had any spiritual one. But with its last breath it managed to infect Moscow with Bogomilism which had been grafted onto Moscow by Ivan III himself who dabbled in theologising. He had invited three astrologers from the school of Skharyaia [the Judaizers] to Moscow, and this was even before the court of Helen of Moldavia became a centre of sectarianism.

Suddenly the horizon darkened and a danger hung above Ivan III. It seemed that the Orthodox Church would move against him. In 1487 the Archbishop of Nov-

gorod Gennady was handed a manuscript with prayers and hymns that were unknown to him. Following on the thread he found out that there was a group experimenting with astrology. Horrified that this was some kind of Black Magic he investigated further. Everything was uncovered and Gennady was sure that he was dealing with Jewish proselytes. He considered the sectarians as "Jews" and the younger Grand Princess, Helen of Moldavia as a "Jewess", even when the term "Bogomils" had come out of hiding.

Towards the end of 1487 there were investigations and judicial proceedings against the heretics in Novgorod the Great. Five of the accused escaped... to Moscow. There they were under the protection of the *dyak* Fedor Kuricyn, the first among the Grand Prince's *dyaks* and the first among the Muscovite students of Trakhanioties, the only one who could free Ivan III from dependence on a foreigner, namely from his diplomatic relations with the countries of the West. Besides, the heretics were patronised by Helen of Moldavia. Thus the investigation only showed that some drunken priests... had abused the icons. The result was only an insignificant flogging of the guilty, as was the custom in Moscow.

But Gennady did not give up. The issue was to come to the fore during the election of the new Metropolitan in 1489. There were to be many more complications with this spiritual heritage coming from Novgorod the Great.

Meanwhile Moscow was taking over the trading contacts of Novgorod the Great. Zalesye was sufficiently taken because both Pskov and Ryazan even though not incorporated were dependent on every whim of the ruler of Moscow. Of the whole of Zalesye only the northern trading centre of Novgorod the Great remained to be taken, namely the group of Vyatka. This was to be done

soon, in 1489. The two years delay in the simple consequence of conquering all the territories of Novgorod, which was not difficult to achieve, can be explained by the fact that Ivan III was planning at the time to grasp a much greater spoil.

There was hope in Moscow that perhaps the old dream of the princes of the "Big Nest" to take Kazan could be achieved. Should this happen, then the whole multi-tribe Yugra and all the further steppes would be a field for the trading exploitation by Moscow without any competition! Much was being done in this direction and through trading foresight it was achieved that the great eastern regions were becoming dependent on Moscow even though they were not subjected politically. They fell under the economic dependency of Moscow.

When the monopoly of Novgorod was destroyed in the east, there was the sharing of the heritage of Novgorod between all the more important towns of Zalesye; that was so, before the Novogrod monopoly was replaced by the Muscovite.

The old relationships with Perm were carefully maintained. They become closer as from 1472 when at the beginning of the year the first exploratory-military expedition was sent in that direction under the leadership of Fedor Pestryi. With oriental exaggeration this leader bragged about his successes. On the 26<sup>th</sup> of June 1472 a messenger came to Moscow from Pesrtyi informing that the whole land of Perm was taken. Probably this was supposed to mean that he managed to send some regiments throughout the region so as to establish relationships with the local tribal princes. The Permians remained independent and Moscow policy consisted in supporting them against the neighbouring peoples of the Yugra. When in 1481 the Voguls again endangered the Permians, rescuing even from captivity their prince Asyka, im-

mediately help was provided with assistance sent from Ustyug. There forces were always held in readiness, because being on the crossroads between Arkhangelsk and Siberia, Ustyug was an important point both for trade and strategically.

In 1483 a coalition of several Yugra peoples was formed under the leadership of Moscow. With the help of the Muscovites the Voguls [Mansi] were soundly defeated on the lower Pelym River. From there they moved further along the River Tavda up to Tyumen, into territories belonging to the earlier befriended Shiban Horde (a branch of the Nogai one), and then even further along the Irtysh River to the upper River Ob. This was the first Siberian excursion, a military exploratory expedition on a major scale. New relationships were established and what was achieved was that the local tribes agreed to maintain good contacts with Perm. The closer tribes, on the basis of the peace treaty negotiated in 1485 went under the dominance of Perm accepting that they are not to war against Perm. Thus indirectly they were coming under Moscow influences. In this way, thanks to the friendliness of the Shiban Horde, Kazan was encircled.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 286-287**

In order to perfect his armed forces Ivan III frantically tried to bring in "master technicians" from wherever he could. He was never short of cunning, stealth and pretending, only to achieve his aim. Moscow needed a frequent change in the source of this precious human import, because foreigners from the same country did not want to stay there for too long. They came enticed by excellent material offers only to be later disappointed by other conditions and so after some time nobody wanted

to travel to Moscow from a given place; it was necessary to seek them in some other country! As an example the following report in a chronicle may be given. In 1483 a physician called Onton (Anthony) came from Germany. He was ordered to take medical care of a Tatar Prince called Kara-Kuchya, a courtier "in service" to the Tsar's son Daniar. The patient however died. When this happened Ivan III handed over the physician to the son of the deceased, who tortured him, tormenting him for a long time and only after receiving a hefty ransom agreed to free him. But the Grand Prince objected to this with the result being that Ivan III ordered Onton to be soaked under the bridge in Moscow in winter and then had him "slaughtered there with a knife like a sheep". This case had such an impact on Fioravanti, who fearing a similar fate for any reason, asked to be released and allowed to return to Italy. For the making of this request, he was imprisoned, robbed and after release he was prevented from moving freely so that in fact he was interned. Not only then but also more frequently Fioravanti experienced such difficulties in spite of the fact that he was held in high esteem by Ivan III! One can imagine what happened to the others! Information about these incidents through emissaries and traders reached the relatives and friends of the victims, often after a long period, the result being that others were discouraged from migrating to the state of Muscovy.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 293-294**

Ivan III was not "available" for the King of Hungary nor for the German Emperor. Not in vain did politicking in Asia develop earlier and to a greater extent than in Europe, so much so that consuming fragments of the Tatar

territories Moscow exceeded in this field not only Vilnius and Kraków but also Buda and Vienna. Until today European diplomacy has never been able to win against the oriental, the European one being always led astray. What then can we said about the situation in the XV<sup>th</sup> and early XVI<sup>th</sup> centuries when European diplomacy was still in its infancy! It emerged in the XV<sup>th</sup> c. in Italy and Ivan III had in his service both Byzantine and Italian diplomats who when necessary added some European forms to the Tatar efficiency of intent, i.e. the ability to fool the partner. It remains an open issue to what extent the perfected Italian diplomacy owes something to the early contacts with Crimea, Istanbul and Moscow!

It is strange that neither in Buda nor in Vienna was it noticed that there was a discrepancy of interests between them and Moscow in respect to the Jagiellon dynasty. This was a total discrepancy, in fact a total contradiction. Since already Kazimir Jagiellon had to be an enemy of Ivan III (as both Matthias Korvin and Frederic III Habsburg claimed) it was all the better for Ivan III that this enemy [Kazimir] and his sons would settle in the West, as far away as possible from Moscow transferring their political interests in that direction! Had Ivan the intent or the possibility to meddle in the complex issues of central Europe his interest would be to help the Jagiellons take over Hungary and Bohemia<sup>66</sup> so that they would be as much as possible engaged in matters that were distant from the Yugra. Ivan understood this very well, while the others considered him as a simple object of exploitation which they would handle easily. They identified the lack of European culture as being equivalent

---

<sup>66</sup> [Vladislav, the son of the Polish King Kazimir Jagiellon, became in 1471 the King of Bohemia and later in 1490 that of Hungary and Croatia.]

to the lack of reason. They scorned the "barbarian", considering him in their understanding as being incapable of managing complex political issues, whereas in fact they themselves were in a state of political naïveté which saw the true or alleged community of enmity and so they did not ask about anything and deduced from this an absolute community of interests.

Ivan III had his interests in Hungary and Germany. Thus he gave the Hungarian and imperial emissaries wonderful departure gifts that generated hopes for the implementation of all their requests. These departure ceremonies were thought out in fine detail in such a way that they always served as a point of reference for the sending of a deputation by Ivan to the West and so the final settlement of any issue was always delayed until... the next deputation. And each of these deputations served as an agency for the recruitment of "master technicians". This was the secret of Ivan III and the reason why he organized mystifications for the rulers of Hungary and Germany profiting from their antagonism against the Jagiellons. The issue of an alliance with the Emperor against the Jagiellons lingered till the end of his reign, while in the meantime Ivan brought in from Germany as many "master technicians" as he wanted profiting from the support of the imperial offices. Metallurgical expertise was a German speciality and it was in those years that the Moscow artillery was exceptionally improved. Without abandoning the Italian source of these "imports" Ivan gained a new and more abundant source and a closer one at the same time.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 301-303**

The earliest trace of the idea that a claim could be made over Lithuanian Ruthenia, the *terminus a quo* [the date

from which]can be found in the rumours and speculations connected with the transit of Zoe Palaiologina through Germany, when the idea was proposed that Ivan III be given the honour of being called a King. These speculations had a more concrete form in the North, on the Baltic, in the territory of the great Hanseatic towns that maintained trade relations with Northern Ruthenia, beginning with Lübeck and then through the mediation of Livonia, along the route that Zoe took to reach Moscow. There in the North knowledge about what Ruthenia was, and what was Moscow was well grounded; in Livonia they knew about this very well. In Riga, in Cēsis and in Tartu every knight of the German Order, every trader knew about the instability of the borders in the north-east, as well as the fact that on both sides of the Lithuanian-Muscovy border there were Orthodox schismatics, i.e. the Ruthenians (the one term covered the people and the religious denomination). What was the difference at the time between Smolensk and Pskov or Novgorod the Great, what difference as regards language, notions, custom and the general state of culture? There were much larger differences between Novgorod the Great and Moscow. Since these regions were beginning to comprise a single statehood, this opened a wide field for deliberations about the issue: how far westwards do these countries extend which could be considered as being homogenous with the state of Muscovy? The incorporation of Novgorod the Great into this state had a crucial significance for the direction of political thought. It became a bridge towards new political possibilities.

It would be false to think that there was some historical necessity that could have been prevented, as it were sustaining Novgorod against Moscow. For centuries there were there two contradictory invasive di-

rections. *Tota Russia debet ad Litvaniam pertinere* [All of Ruthenia should belong to Lithuania] was claimed by Algirdas and later the same was claimed in the opposite direction. But Kazimir Jagiellon basically abandoned the projects of Algirdas, whereas Ivan III up to 1489 had no thoughts about Lithuanian Ruthenia even though his borders were continuously coming closer to the Lithuanian. Ivan wanted to expand his state, encompassing all of Ruthenia except the Lithuanian one. Also he wanted to subject to Moscow an increasing number of the border princedoms, of the uplands and northern ones. The governance of these princes was in fact restricted to "the right of free departure", thus they ceased to be reigning princes in the proper sense of the word. These princedoms were an anachronism that could not last for long. What was needed was their division between the states of Lithuania and Muscovy. It is obvious that Ivan wanted to take them all, because rapacity was at the very core of Moscow statehood. We do not find a similar trend on the Lithuanian side. King Kazimir wanted only to ensure that Muscovite acquisitions do not cross a certain border line towards the West.

The inevitability of some idea should not be considered as a historical necessity of the fact. Human thought is also subjected to the force of inertia and for this reason the idea of taking over all of Orthodox Ruthenia was something inevitable for minds. But the execution of this project, in one direction or the other was not a historical necessity. In fact, history has shown that an excessive expansion of the Lithuanian border eastwards or of the Muscovite westwards usually proved negative for the winning side. It was (and is) a historical necessity of finding a permanent border between Lithuania (Poland) and Moscow (Russia).

I repeat, there was no historical necessity for Moscow to attack Lithuania, but for human minds such an idea seemed inevitable. It was impossible not to come across such an idea.

## **HR, vol. 2, p. 320-322**

The conflict over Church property divided the two Church parties also politically. The Josephinians [followers of Joseph Sanin, of the Volokolamsk monastery] who came out in the defence of monastic property had to care for the favours of the Grand Prince who already once had shown in Novgorod the Great that he could and liked to secularize it. The Josephinians were a court party. This was an extension of the group of Byzantines whose activity we met in 1480. They were prepared to elevate the ruler as high as possible, ready always to consider themselves as his peasants provided the Grand Prince would serve the Church and shed the Tatar yoke. They were also ready to become the opposition should the ruler submit himself to the Khans or to the... heretics.

There was a strong intertwining of Church and state affairs here.

From Cyprian [former Metropolitan and saint] to Sanin in the history of the Muscovite mentality there was a Byzantine line gaining finally in the Josephinians a wider following, a greater number of adherents who were tied by a common idea that had not only Church importance. Earlier, Cyprian failed to convince Vasily Dimitriyevich that "there is no Church without a Tsar", but he obtained a lay arm within the Muscovy statehood that was favourable to the Church at least in fiscal matters. Pachomij [a monk from Athos who came to reside in Ruthenia] recognized the Tsar of Constantinople just as

much as Cyprian; Pafnutij [from the Borovsk monastery] would be happy to see a transfer of the Byzantine public law to Moscow. From that time an increasing part of the black clergy [the unmarried monks] wanted autocracy in Zalesye. It can be said about Pafnutij that he lived for the love of the Grand Princes of Moscow seeing in them the only rulers of the whole Zalesye. Sanin already saw a Tsar in the Grand Prince of the "whole of Ruthenia". It was only the Josephinians who were to tie the imperial-Byzantine origin of Zoe with the imagined heritage of Byzantium, and since the Volokolamsk monastery for a long time was as if the court monastery of Ivan III, something of this idea seeped into the mind of the ruler.

The Josephinians were less useful for Ivan III, because they were opposed to all secularizations of Church property, but they recognized the right of the state to interfere widely within Church matters, something that the "trans-Volga elders", the companions of Nil [Sorsky] opposed. The link between religion and statehood, to such an extent that the Church would support the state rule located in the hands of a single ruler with no restrictions, on the condition however that the state would mutually also support the Church — this was true Byzantinism. The moral heritage of Cyprian expanded and when Byzantium fell under Turkish domination, the Moscow Byzantines started to dream that the ruler of "all Ruthenia", the first lord in the Orthodox Church, would become the Tsar.

As regards this last postulate, the program of the Josephinians had the greatest political ally in the court of Helen of Moldova, who recognized autocratic rule in Wallachia. Thus from two sources, independently of one another, the similar tendency appeared. It needs to be assumed here that the influence of the Moldavian Princess

had the stronger effect. In 1483, the year of her marriage, the Volokolamsk monastery was only in its fourth year of existence, but around the year 1490 a much stronger influence of Joseph Sanin can be assumed, while the influence of Helen was then declining. Thus the idea of Tsardom for Moscow, propagated by the court of the Moldavian obtained support from the Josephinians — her most passionate opponents in every other respect.

## Excerpts from vol. 3 of “Dzieje Rosji” [“The History of Russia”]

Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 2003

### **HR, vol. 3, p. 184**

Shestakov’s letter was typical for Muscovite notions of the time, which remained forever Russian notions. Lithuania meant Catholicism; what was Catholic was Lithuanian and what was Orthodox was Ruthenian. The Latin perspective meant all who recognized the supremacy of the Pope and referred to Rome as to the centre of the religious focus, regardless of ritual. They knew perfectly well that the Church Union was of the Eastern Greek rite, and that Latin was excluded from it; but in spite of this for them it was the “cursed Latin faith”. So it was in the days of Isidore [the Kiev Metropolitan in 1436-1458], and so under Bolharynovich [the Kiev Metropolitan in 1499-1501]; and were things different ever? The Union of Florence was completely unnecessary for Ruthenia, because for them “Latinism” was the same whether it was in the Latin or the Greek rite. They saw no difference here. As we have stated in vol. I, in the mid XV<sup>th</sup> c., the time for the Union was already too late; the more so in 1500.

### **HR, vol. 3, p. 198-231**

The “masters” who appeared constantly in our discourse on the history of Ivan III are indeed worthy of a deeper

attention when viewed from the position of universal history. If it were possible to be civilized from the outside, with no personal effort and struggle, if a civilization could be taken and given, just as one takes objects, then the German and Italian “masters” of necessity would have made out of Russia a new part of Europe, some “young Europe”, something very progressive, capable of picking up a strong juvenile momentum from the position that was already attained in the 1500 years of efforts of the old Western Europe. We are accustomed to meet with this kind of problem while discussing the history of Russia at the end of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> century, when it was being “Europeanized” by the encyclopaedists, and further on in the XIX<sup>th</sup> c., when this “young Europe” was loudly announced by the pseudo-Slavophiles and by the pan-Asians to succeed the “rotten West”, and also from a third side by the various progeny of Marx... Well this problem is much older than is universally assumed. It appeared in the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c., when top scientists and top artists of Italy, the Italianized Byzantines and native Italians were establishing a young Europe in Zalesye, and after a short time, in the first quarter of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. the problem was resolved... when the Europeanized Muscovy fell with great speed into the precipitous gulfs of the Turanian civilization, becoming in fact a young Asia.

In May 1499 the family of the Grand Prince transferred to a new court, a beautiful palace built by Alevis on the model of the residence of the princes of Milan. In the line of Italian architects he may stand next to “Aristotle” and between them there were such masters as Marco Rufo and Pietro Antonio, the constructors of the “granite palace” (1491). How many builders, sub-masters, bricklayers, casters, founders, metalworkers of various crafts, from locksmiths to goldsmiths were

brought in from Venice, Milan and Rome as well as from Lübeck and other German cities! A numerous and diversified group was brought in in 1490, and from that time there were several new groups. Sometimes someone who was less useful managed to join, some brawler, an adventurer seeking luck in the wide world, escaping from duties among his own. Thus for example, an organist from the Augustinians in Lübeck, named Salvator arrived. Having nothing to do in a country that did not know organs, he married into some family in Moscow — and in the chronicles there appeared a noble report for the memory of descendants about an Augustinian, a Latin "monk", who discovered the superiority of the Orthodox faith!

Moscow culture continued to develop in the stylish Italian palaces. By no means did the princely family acquire any Italian manners; no one had any intention to copy the Italians in anything!

This extended family lived together. A new marriage did not result in the building of a new palace. It was mentioned many times in the sources that Ivan and Zoe together with Ivan the Younger and Helen of Moldavia (also as a widow) and all their children — with the daughters always — and with a grandchild lived under a single roof. The sons Vasily, George, Dmitri (nicknamed Gimp) also stayed with their parents, unless they were assigned some duty by their father outside Moscow.

Ivan III treated his brothers as an object of exploitation and it was easy to make out of this the political program of diminishing the size of those regions that it was not possible to abolish. The Moscow Byzantines wanted the main Grand Prince of Moscow to have the greatest possible power and so they supported Ivan's moves to enrich himself at the cost of his brothers; he

however was opposed to the regions only so as to acquire them for himself or his children. We have seen how he reintroduced the Novgorod-Pskov region! He never scorned even the smallest of acquisitions. When in 1494 his brother Boris of Volotsk died, leaving two sons, the elder one Feodor inherited Volotsk and the younger received a small region carved out of Ruza and the half of Rzhev. Ivan made a deal with these relatives in 1497, an agreement concerning the borders, exchanging with them some estates and villages obviously not in their favour. He found an even better method. When the younger Borisevich was ill, Ivan ordered that a will be made bequeathing his mini-regions to him, completely ignoring in this his brother; in fact, soon in 1503, he took over this small region.

The number of such small "governors" increased, and by the force of events their position gradually declined to the condition of princes "in service" (*служивы*), because only with the help of Ivan III were they able to maintain themselves more or less in princely fashion and should they not be obedient to him he would have found many ways against them that would eventually result in their losing everything. Thus it was better to serve the head of the clan in peace with him and to maintain some remnants of governance as a result. Sometimes such small princes would mint their own coins as a sign of their sovereignty. This had only symbolic significance because in practice the small amount of coins of such a prince as in Starica could not find recognition as source of payment in trade far away. Thus Ivan III forbade all the princes the minting of coins, and this applied even to his own brothers and sons, and no one ever dreamt even for a moment of not obeying him. The Byzantine program of single rule was approaching realization with the help of Ivan III, but at the same time also with his help it was

being distanced. Thus for example on the issue of the currency this same Ivan III permitted his son Vasily of Novgorod-Pskov to mint coins and to use for the purpose his two mints, the one in Moscow and the one in Tver that was not closed after the Tver princes.

The active opposition died out with the death of Andrew the Elder [the brother of Ivan III]! Traces of a passive opposition lingered here and there. Thus for example the princes of Ryazan would like to free themselves from Moscow hegemony, which obviously threatened the "Grand Principedom of Ryazan" in that it would gradually decline to the position of a principedom "in service". The Ryazan brothers, working together as brothers even found a way of salvation that could have been fool-proof were it not for the fact that it was too late. Ivan and Feodor Vasilyevich, the Ryazan princes, mentioned earlier, who by now were only symbolic figures in their principedoms that were not taken over by Ivan only because of his love for his sister, their mother, suddenly in August 1496 came up with long distance plans that were to turn against their former protector and in fact their continuous superior. They adopted the same means that Moscow had used thanks to which it was elevated in Zalesye. Their brotherly "accords" finalized on August 19<sup>th</sup>, 1496 were in fact mutual survival agreements. In the case of a childless death of one of them, the principedoms were to be joined under the leadership of the surviving brother. This was contrary to the custom introduced by Ivan III that after the death of a childless prince everything was to become the property of the Grand Prince. However this accord mentioned also something else. It was a slavish imitation of accords made in the Moscow line in recent times, in which the elder brother agreed with the younger ones. Only the elder of the Ryazan brothers, Ivan, had the right to deal with the Horde.

This was a point directly copied from the Moscow agreements. In this case it was the issue of dealing with the nomad Tsarevich who was operating for quite some time in the Ryazan region. At this stage it was Satyl-Khan who had emerged from the Cossacks. The matter concerned the obligatory tributes that had to be paid to him about which some time earlier the Grand Prince of Moscow as the ruler of the "whole of Ruthenia" had agreed that they would be paid to Satyl-Khan's predecessor, Daniazy. In the Moscow Ryazan agreement of 1483 it was clearly spelt out that only the Moscow Ivan had the right to deal with the "Tsar's sons", and the Ryazan princes were to pay their dues to the Khan through the hands of Ivan III. Thus the Ryazan princes decided to deal independently at least in respect to their own local Horde. They also promised one another not to make any treaties otherwise than together with a mutual agreement; but from the tone of the accord it follows that the exterior representative was to be always the elder brother. Obviously so! Had the Zalesye principdoms earlier on followed Moscow in this way, then probably the main centre of Zalesye would not have developed in Moscow, but at this stage it was too late. This was to become clear in four years time.

On May 29<sup>th</sup>, 1500, the older of the Ryazan princes, Ivan Vasilyevich died, leaving a six year old son, Ivan Ivanovich. According to the accord of 1496 primogeniture was to be followed and so the underage prince became the superior of his uncle Feodor. Custody over the six year old Grand Prince was in the hands of his mother, but then Ivan III appeared on the scene claiming to be the guardian of Ivan Ivanovich of Ryazan on the basis of the principle of his superiority over the whole of Zalesye. The Ryazan accord of 1496 was automatically shattered. Ivan III ordered all the Ryazan "in service" people to be

transferred immediately to Moscow, i.e. all the descendants of the former garrisons, all who were obliged to do military service, all *dyaks* and all kinds of officials in the Ryazan chancellery. The Regent-widow, Agripina, at a moment's notice had no one to rule and no means to do so, because she was deprived of the ruling apparatus. Having no military arm and no administration of her own, being unable to execute the collection of taxes, having no means to exercise the princely authority, she remained only... the owner of the Ryazan lands! All the public functionaries were in Moscow and they ruled the country from Moscow.

Not being satisfied with this, Ivan III tried to obtain an immediate direct benefit so as to carve out something for himself from the Ryazan region. Since Feodor was childless his province should in the case of his death fall to his underage nephew Ivan Ivanovich. Moscow lawyers, probably the Byzantines, thought out a loophole. Since the accord of 1496 mentioned childlessness in general, it was interpreted as meaning the childlessness of both agreeing brothers. But nothing was specified in the case when only one of them remained childless, and so it was said that the accord was not binding. So it was concluded that there was room to make a new testament at will! As a result, Feodor was forced to make a new testament handing over his small province to Ivan III. Feodor died soon after that and Ivan III incorporated Old Ryazan and Perevick directly into his realms.

What was the position of the "Grand Princedom" of Ryazan, which nominally remained independent, can be seen from such a detail: Ivan forbade the Ryazan people to make trade journeys onto the River Don, warning them that he would have them arrested on the Don, punished and even sold into slavery. Moscow was destroying

the Ryazan trade in the same way as it had destroyed the trade of Tver and Novgorod.

At this stage Ivan III did not formally incorporate Ryazan into his state and he allowed all those “in service” to the Ryazan princes to continue to consider themselves as servants of the child Ivan Ivanovich. Ivan III acted as the guardian of the underage boy and all he wanted was to ensure that Ryazan would not free itself from the hegemony of Moscow. He wanted to be sure that the Ryazan primogeniture would not be implemented. Feodor Vasilyevich, the uncle of Ivan Ivanovich had no force against the Muscovite violence in his own Perevick.

In actual fact the Ryazan region was directly subjected to Moscow, being ruled according to every desire of Ivan III coming from Moscow. This was a true extension of the country’s borders. And since the Ryazan region was governed from Moscow, this was not according to the Ryazan customary laws but according to the Muscovite. The Ryazan *dyaks*, who were moved to Moscow were supervised by the Moscow ones until they became similar to them and they themselves changed into Muscovite *dyaks*.

The organization of a state according to the principle “that everything has to be as in Moscow” was making great progress. A noticeable expression of this was the introduction of the Moscow “plough” everywhere for the measurement of the land for fiscal purposes. A classical year of the *писцовые книги* [scribe books] was 1491 and the following year. These books were compiled at the time in Tver, Starica, Zubtsov, Opoka, Klin and Zalesye Kholm reporting everything according to the Moscow ploughs. It needs to be recalled how in 1477 Novgorod the Great managed to obtain an exemption from the Moscow *dyaks* and for the time being it had the right to have the reports made by the local *писцы* [scribes]. But

in 1495 Muscovite scribes came and they reported year by year one *конец* [district] after the other. They called them *пятины* [fifths] since there were five of them.

The trend towards uniformity according to the Moscow model passed on also to matters of the Church!

At that time the role of Byzantines was on the increase and since this group was composed primarily of Church dignitaries, who led it, this helped the Church. At times Ivan III manifested an inclination for secularization and he did not abandon this project at this stage, but when around 1500 he tried to repeat the experiment of secularization that he had done in Novgorod, Metropolitan Simon objected, and so the plan came to nothing. The Church was also victorious on the tax issue, on the obligation to pay taxes. We have a characteristic example from Pskov. When in 1495 on the order of Ivan III a large tax was imposed for the needs of an expedition against the Swedes (one rider from ten ploughs), it was also specified that the priests and the *dyaks* of Pskov were to pay for the purpose. When they refused to pay they were flogged and then brought forcefully to a rally, where two of them had to face the gathering wearing only their shirts. There was no such thing as respect for the clerical state, but when the bishops took up the issue, they showed from the *номоканон* [Byzantine Church rules] and from the "Holy Fathers" that Church property was to be exempt from taxation. This was conceded, meaning that signal of this nature came from chancellery of the Grand Prince.

But there was no retreat when at issue was the introduction everywhere of the Moscow ecclesial custom; also in the realm of the Church "everything had to be as in Moscow". In Novgorod the Great, in 1492, when the construction of a new stone fort was completed (and the

clergy had to contribute to its building) a ceremonial procession was organized there on December 8<sup>th</sup>, so as to bless the fort. Many igumens however refused to attend, and so Archbishop Gennady was forced to make a procession around the wooden old fort a week later. The Grand Prince ordered the archbishop to invoke the Moscow Metropolitan Peter “the miracle maker” as a saint during the procession around the *детинец* [inner fortification] of the new fort. Also there had to be prayers for Metropolitan Alexius, thus for the two Metropolitans that had contributed most to the introduction of Muscovite hegemony in Zalesye. This was a novelty in Novgorod which had plenty of its own saints and did not need “foreign” ones from “The Low Country” or from “Suzdal”. In the procession around the old fort only local saints were mentioned. The Orthodox Church generally knows only local canonizations; the universal recognition of some saint was exceptional at the time. According to Ivan III and probably also the Moscow Metropolitan, the Moscow saints were such an exception, and so their sainthood had to be obligatorily recognized as far as away as the rule of the Moscow Grand Prince extended. The hegemony of Moscow covered also the saints from the capital. But according to the Novgorod people and the Novgorod monasteries such saints would have to be honoured with Novgorod citizenship, because without it they could not be venerated in the city of Novgorod. Finally the conflict was resolved according to the well tested method of “dual faith”, with the positioning of one next to the other without rejecting any of the mutually exclusive views. In 1493 it was decided that during ceremonial processions, there would be alternate invocations, once to the Moscow saints and once to the Novgorod saints, but always separately, singly. We lack any further information on this issue. Obviously there were no more conflicts or

difficulties about this. In any case Ivan III imposed his will and introduced his Moscow saints into Novgorod.

At the same time the supremacy of Moscow expanded in the easterly direction. Its trade moved increasingly towards the Urals and this was followed by Moscow hegemony. This easterly drive was in connection with the encircling of Kazan. On one side of Kazan, the River Oka was taken and on the other side of Kazan the River Kama, and in the north, the River Vyatka. Only the route down the Volga remained open for the Kazan people.

Already in 1462 the local prince in Perm was baptized. Ten years later the relationships deteriorated. Ivan's army took Perm at the time, but the indigenous princes were left until the next generation. It was only in 1505 that the local prince was dismissed and in his place a deputy of the Moscow Grand Prince was introduced. The baptism of the indigenous princes was only pretence, because locally offerings were still made to the idols. The "dual faith" was only enriched with new elements. The reception of baptism had no impact at all on social and legal notions or on customs. The Metropolitan complained and reproached the Permians that they followed "the Tatar custom" allowing their women to move about with loose hair. There was much scandal from the fact that even baptized Permians "married within the family", with the brother marrying the widow after his brother's death. The Metropolitan did not know that according to Turanian notions this was the obligation of the surviving brother. But it was not only that the Turanians did not submit to any cultural influences that could have emerged from Moscow. In fact here and there something opposite was taking place. With surprise we see that under Ivan III the *волхвы* [shamans] returned to lands that were settled by decidedly Slav people. Christianity did not prove enticing to the Yugra. In 1455, Asyka, a prince

of the Mansi people was not afraid to murder Pitirim, a Permian bishop, but the Yugra divinations found followers even among the upper classes of the Slav population! Prince Ivan of Mozhaïsk burned *boyar* Andrei Dimitrovich with his wife on the stake for following pagan divinations. On another occasion the mother of *boyar* Jury Mamanov was led to the stake.

From Perm the river valley of a Kama tributary led into a region, where the the Ural Mountains are lowest. The Ural Mountain range in its 300-mile length has groups of peaks at more than a thousand or a thousand and a half meters in height, and only in this one region (north of Yekaterinburg which was established there later) over an area covering less than 3% of the length of the range there is a substantial lowering of the heights making as it were a link between Europe and Asia. This is the "cultural gate of the Urals". It was through this region that the population of Sarmatic lowlands [between the Vistula and the Volga] flowed and continue to flow onto the Siberian lowlands.

Around the year 1490 the supremacy over the region along the Pechora River was established, because in 1491 Ivan III was able to send two Germans there. They were mining experts searching for silver and other ores. These two returned after a year with promising information and so soon settlement began there composed of free seekers of silver and luck. Then the brothers Stroganov organised the immigration and exploitation. During the year 1499 governance over the northern Yugra was greatly secured. In the summer the Grand Prince sent a military corps from Ustyug in the Dvina region, from Vychegda and from Vyatka onto the Mansi people. Some native princes submitted and promised fidelity, while others fought to the end but without hope for success. They were captured and sent to Moscow.

The conflict was ferocious and seemingly long lasting, because the Moscow regiments returned home as late as in March 1500.

All of this was in connection with the encircling of Kazan. There Latif [the Kazan Khan] was becoming increasingly dependent on the good will of Ivan III. One of the Kazan princes, i.e. the Murza of the Kazan Horde, Urak, rebelled against Latif, gaining the support of Agalak, the brother of Mamuk [the former Khan]. That was in the spring of 1499. Ivan III stood in defence of the Tsar appointed by him in Kazan and sent three regional princes against Agalak. These had no opportunity to enter into any military operations against Agalak because hearing of the coming Moscow divisions, he retreated without battle and the whole enterprise of Urak proved only ludicrous; he counted on the inactivity of Moscow. But Ivan III had reasons why it was not indifferent to him who ruled in Kazan. He preferred that the Kazan Tsardom remained in some association with the Crimean Horde, because through the Kazan issue it was possible to exert some pressure on Mengli [the Khan of Crimea].

Information about the power of Moscow spread further East. Starting from the Urals themselves, delegations were coming to Moscow and these contacts could be used so as to interfere in the quarrels between the Hordes. This turned out to be very useful for the conquest of Siberia. It was around the year 1500 that the Urals were crossed.

In 1492 there appeared the first scientific traveller who wanted to visit Siberia. [Michael] Snups, a German from Austria came to Moscow, as he offered to be a messenger carrying letters to Delator [the envoy of Emperor Maximilian I] in Moscow and so in this way he had more liberty in going so far, even though he had nothing to

do with diplomacy. He came to find out about the country and he wanted to learn the language of the "eastern Slavs". This Snups wanted to travel to the River Ob, but he was not allowed to go there. Hoping to profit from his travels in some other direction, he wanted to return through Turkey, and finally through Poland. But he was not allowed to travel in any of these directions and he was sent back promptly the way he had come, that is, through Livonia. For a very very long time, Moscow did not tolerate the presence of travellers wandering "without purpose", suspecting them to be spies. Even in the second part of the XIX<sup>th</sup> c. travel "without a purpose" was treated with suspicion in Russia.

In 1499 it was decided to enter militarily into the "Pechora region". It was on this occasion that the last Vogul [Mansi] expedition was made. Three regional leaders of Ivan III led a 5000 strong army from Ustyug, Viatka and the Dvina land. Having reached the Pechora River, they established a fort on the river and then they moved further on beyond the Ural Mountains referring to these first discovered Siberian regions as "the land of the Yurga".

The state of Muscovy was acquiring an increasing Turanian component... It is not to be imagined that the Turanian element held an inferior position in social life and relationships. They were incapable of establishing state institutions, they submitted to the military might of Moscow, but they were an affluent element and socially developed, and so their leading individuals entered the higher classes of Muscovy. Thus the political incorporation of Turanian regions into the state of Muscovy was accompanied, already from the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. with a social integration and absorption into Muscovy. There was no such thing as a civilizational assimilation. Obviously

there must have been few civilizational inequalities between the Turanian and the Slav elements, since the Yugra not only maintained its custom, but the Slavs were adopting the Turanian custom and this particularly in the court of the Grand Prince. The only assimilation among the higher classes was that of the language. A Turanian from the Muscovite state who wanted to attain positions and acclaim had to receive baptism and so through the mediation of the Orthodox Church the Slav language was becoming common throughout the multi-tribal Yugra spreading even beyond the Urals. Besides, this language, the precursor of the Russian language, was the language of the state *dyaks*, the official papers, and thus it had to be adopted by anyone who wanted to play any administrative role, which as a rule was the ambition of the more affluent Turanian subjects of Ivan III. In mid-XVI<sup>th</sup> c. the majority of those "in service" of Moscow and the majority of the *boyar* families were not of Slav origin. They were Turanians. Did this happen suddenly, in one stroke? The incorporation of the Kazan "Tsardom" only crowned this trend, but it lingered on for quite some time and towards the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. it already had given a distinguishing mark to the state. The language assimilation was not followed up by a civilizational integration. The Turanians remained themselves even though they changed the language. This very fact smacks of Turanism, of Asia. In Asia a change of language has never any significance. Asiatic societies frequently change the language not ceasing to be what they were before. This is a stark difference in comparison with Europe. A European, when he adopts a foreign language, he enters a new society that before was alien to him and by this he becomes alien to the society from which he derived.

As a result of this in Zalesye there came about a true civilizational "dual faith". Elements of varying civiliza-

tions find a place side by side. They are intermingled mechanically, externally, generating often the chaos of internal contradictions. Thus, the basic illness of Russia began: the trend towards a synthesis of mixed civilizational influences. This was to bring about a whirlpool, and Russia drowned in it.

The strong pressure of Turanian elements on Muscovite custom indicates how weak the civilizational foundation of Muscovy was.

The Tatars also belonged to the Turanian world and they had been exerting an influence over Zalesye for many generations. The overall Turanian influences coming from the Yugra and the Tatars have to be individuated, and among the latter the Volga ones have to be distinguished from those of Kazan. The Crimean influences were never strong because of the distance involved. The old Mongolian impact operated by force of inertia, but through the mediation of the Tatars, through the Hordes of the Tsarlets "in service". This impact by now was in fact already a part of the Muscovite identity.

In 1500 there were already "Cossacks of the Grand Prince" present in Crimea, where they had their own *кочу* [temporary camp]. Thus there were transfers from Tatar settlements in Muscovy to the steppe Horde and back again with voluntary, unlimited transfers. A Moscow delegate found 53 *государственные Казаки* [state Cossacks] in Crimea; others had just left for Moscow and in the "camp there remained 70" of them. At the same time Tatar settlement expanded increasingly in Zalesye. There were already Tatars in Rostunovo and in Peremyshl.

Many Tatar or generally Turanian influences could have reached Moscow through the mediation of Wallachia, which was also submitting much to Tatar influence. Leaving a closer study of the issue to future ethnog-

raphy the manifestations of the Muscovite-Turanian mixture need to be studied.

The whip, a Mongolian instrument of discipline and... administration was under Ivan III a part of the technique of governance. Not only Pskov clerics were whipped for wanting to avoid paying taxes, but also very distinguished persons. For example, when in 1488 the will of Andrew the Younger which bequeathed something to a monastery "on the Rock" appeared, and this was declared to have been falsified, the archimandrite of the Chudov monastery was accused of the forgery together with two princes of Ukhta and Khomontov. They were all publicly flogged on the market place. What is more significant, a penalty of this kind was not followed up by any further consequences.

Turanian influence was also evident in the general alcoholism. Earlier the Genghis Khans were known to get drunk and permanent intoxication became a feature of the Mongols. This passed onto Kipchak. I am unable to tell whether and to what extent Islam curtailed this practice in the Golden, Kazan and Crimean Hordes. The Islam of Kipchak was in many ways a barbarian caricature of the Quran. There were often symptoms of degeneration in the history of the Kipchak Tsardoms. The sources do not provide any basis for the assumption that Mongolian drunkenness reached Moscow through Tatar mediation. It is possible that grafted by the Genghis Khan Mongols drunkenness fell on such fertile ground that it developed further without association with the source of the evil. It seems that this was passed on through the Yugra, through the Ugro-Altai peoples of the Volga region, but also this topic has to be left to other investigators.

As the second part of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. began, drunkenness was common from Moscow all the way to Kiev. Whether

it reached Kiev from Zalesye or from some Horde Cossacks remains to be established!

In the Zalesye of Ivan III there is information about inns with vodka which however was allowed to be served only on certain days. People also got drunk on mead [fermented honey]. The example came from above. Ivan III himself was known to sleep being drunk during banquets. Europeans had the impression that the majority of the inhabitants of Moscow were a drunken society.

Intoxication spread and turned into a custom, because drinking itself acquired the dignity of some kind of rite. It belonged to the ceremonial of hospitality. At the court of the Grand Prince this rite entered the court ceremonial and diplomatic meetings. The highest social classes practiced ceremonial drinking as something that was indicative of a higher social status. No wonder that this was copied all the more faithfully and it passed on to the common people.

Lithuania learned the rite of drinking from Moscow. The ceremonial which was considered obligatory during the reception of foreign delegations in Moscow arrived after some time in Vilnius whenever Moscow ambassadors were received — and the further spread of the custom went automatically. It was of course a great honour to be invited to the table of the Grand Prince and it was a higher degree of recognition to be allowed to drink at his table. Sometimes the guests were asked to eat but they were not given drinks, as for example in 1495, when a delegation from Lithuania arrived. Always however, after an official dinner at the Grand Prince's, even if there was drinking at the table, after the guests were delivered to their quarters, a special deputation was sent to them entitled to intoxicate the guests in the name of the ruler. This act was accompanied by a special ceremonial. This was referred to as *пoити oпoслe cтoлa* [drinking after

the table]. This required a large room because the delegation normally consisted of several, often more than a dozen members who were accompanied by servants. In the delegation documents it was always mentioned who was sent to drink with the deputies. In February 1494 there were two Lithuanian delegates in Moscow, the Janowiches, and each one of them had a separate drinking company assigned, composed of one prince, one *boyar* and five *boyar* children each. To what extent the enforced drinking was ceremonial can be judged from the fact that detailed instructions were given as to who was to stand next to whom and who was allowed to sit. No excuse from the ceremonial was permitted. And the drinks were not small. When in 1476 a Venetian traveller, Contarini had the honour to drink at the Grand Prince's table, he managed to drink only a quarter of what was assigned to him. It was the highest honour when not asking to wait for the invited dinner the guest was served a drink immediately after the official audience, and what an honour when the cup was served by the Grand Prince himself! Such an honour was awarded to an ambassador of Vladislav of Bohemia and Hungary, named Czeżelicki in January 1500. Ivan himself served him a goblet of honey and ordered his sons to also serve the guest.

Contarini recorded this for posterity: "They are great drunkards and are greatly proud of this. They despise those who do not drink. The Grand Prince does not allow everyone to brew beverages, because if they had this freedom they would be drunken everyday and would kill each other as animals". In fact they seemed animal-like to him.

Little work was being done. On the bazaars there was trade only till noon and after some hour absolutely no-one worked, and all were sitting in the inns. As we can see for centuries Moscow suffered from the unfortunate

facility of easy life, since only half a day's work sufficed for everything including drunkenness. Trade gave high returns without much effort.

State authority placed its hand on trade. It is a custom of the Turanian civilization that the head of state deals with trade. We have already mentioned that Steven of Moldavia and Ivan III took part in the fish trade. The example for this came from the Tatars, from the courts of the "Tsars". Mengli-Giray [the Khan of the Crimean Horde] engaged in some trade speculations in Lithuania and the ambassadors or traders accompanying them were receiving commissions. When during the Wallachian expedition in 1497 the hostile position of Giray became increasingly visible, when the units of the Crimean Horde reached far into Lithuanian and the Polish lands, Jan Olbracht [King of Poland] imprisoned such a spying deputation. He had the ambassador (sent during wartime, not during peace) executed on a picket and his companions were beheaded, while the rest were imprisoned and whatever they had with them was confiscated. Mengli-Giray recalled with regret (in the delegation of Kazimir and Khozyasha) to Ivan III that *а те люди торговали моими деньгами* [these people traded with my money]. The Moscow ambassador in Istanbul, Pleshchayev was also engaged in some trade there. When he was caught and forced to pay a ransom, he was disclaimed by his ruler. It does not seem that he was conducting the trade operations on his own account, and there is no information about him being punished on his return to Moscow. He must have been a commission agent of the Grand Prince. A similar fate was met by the next ambassador in Istanbul, Golokhvastov. In Kaffa his retinue was searched but no trading goods were found. There were complaints later that the Turkish authorities ordered them to pay for the transfer by ship

from Kaffa to Istanbul. Mengli had trade dealings with Moscow. Among the 39 traders accompanying a delegation of Mereka to Moscow in 1494 (among them there were 33 Crimean Tatars) there were some who were privileged because these were his people<sup>67</sup>.

Were it only that the rulers of this part of Europe which was infected by the Turanian civilization traded in fishes and silks! Steven of Moldavia, Steven the Great, traded in prisoners of war.

To characterize the trade in people, some examples only from the last few years of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. can be given. In the autumn of 1496, Ivan III complained to Mengli-Giray that he had interfered in the trade of prisoners that he had bought from the Golden Horde. The Trans-Volga Tatars captured Muscovites travelling over the steppes and they were selling them "beyond the sea". It happened that they caught Ivan's falconer. He was caught on the territory of the Crimean Horde and a Crimean Tatar had no doubts about purchasing him so as to sell him back to some Moscow boyar who had pity over a countryman and a servant of the Grand Prince. Mengli claimed that he himself had given 500 *altanes* for this ransom or repurchase and he asked Ivan to reimburse him. But Ivan was annoyed by something else! It happened at the time that Muscovites caught several Trans-Volga Tatars and brought them to Crimea obviously for sale. Mengli received them but without paying... and is said to have set them free, while he himself dealt in human trafficking! The main market was in Azov, where Turkish traders came for the slaves. In that year 1496, it happened

---

<sup>67</sup> It is mentioned that Armenians and "Frayezers" [?] in the caravan had to pay well for participation in the delegation and security during travel. The very smuggling of traders in ambassadorial delegations was a good business.

that several such Muscovites who were for sale escaped to the delta of Dnieper and moving up the river they reached Cherkasy, but there they were caught again by members of the Crimean Horde who brought them back to Mengli-Giray (thus he was buying slaves!). Mengli took a half of this "transport" for himself and sold it to the Turks "beyond the sea", while he allowed his people to sell the other half. When one of them escaped, he sent a pursuit after him and he was caught by the Khan's servant and again sold to the Turks! When in 1500 steppe bandits attacked a delegation of ambassador Kubensky, they took four men and sold them to Azov, from where some Turk brought them to Kaffa knowing that he would make a good deal because Kubensky would reimburse him generously. We learn about this from a letter of Kubensky sent to Ivan III in October 1500 from Crimea, whom the Tatars of Astrakhan brought there for sale and also how many Muscovites they sold locally in Astrakhan.

Not everything that came from the Turanian civilization was evil. With relation to the Tatars, it needs to be pointed out that in Muscovy much of the inheritance of the "blue" Mongols as well as from the original Chinese bureaucracy was preserved, things that did not pick up in Kipchak. Thus the Tatar Turanian civilization in many respects stood lower than the Turanian-Slav mixture further north. Nowhere in sources do we find anything about Tatar mail, while in Zalesye the *yamsk* arrangement was maintained as it was introduced by the *дарогу* [administrators of roads]. Messengers of the Grand Prince travelled from *yamsk* to *yamsk* with instructions for the *ямщики* [wagoners]. Many of the travel instructions survived, and so it is possible to draw a road map of Ivan's realm. There were Jews in the Grand Prince's postal service. We meet them at least in 1500 on the line from Moscow to the Livonian border.

Since the days of the *Русская Правда* [*Ruthenian Truth*] the equipment of a travelling official was graded with a specification of the number of horses of course with appropriate servants and oats fodder. The regulation was probably of Mongolian origin (as much of what is in the *Ruthenian Truth*) and this entered Moscow law adopted for the administration of the roads<sup>68</sup>. The dignitaries travelled with substantial entourages at the cost of the Grand Prince; a simple messenger travelled as trio.

During the days of Ivan III a more definite hierarchy among those "in service" started to develop. Determining the ranks became ever more necessary as the number of people "in service" increased. From that time every "boyar child" had to be "in service" in the army and these youths earnestly competed for the prestigious functions in the administration, as ambassadors etc. Soon, all who were of *boyar* descent had to serve in the military or the administration. Each one of them was somebody in the court whenever he arrived there. They could not be equals, because the functions they held were not of equal importance... The hierarchy was organized in an aristocratic manner. It was not the offices but the origin of the officials that was classified; the higher was the origin of the official the more important was the office that he had the right to hold. The career of the officials "in service" was determined by their birth. On top were the princes, the pauperized dynasts, then related families or foreigners related by marriage to the dynasts who accepted "service" in Moscow

---

<sup>68</sup> This regulation was still in force in 1917. Of course an administrator travelled by train, but the cost of his delegation was calculated in the number of horses with fodder, with the cost of the wagoner, servants and stop-overs — as in the good old days of the *Ruthenian Truth*.

on the condition that they were equal with the princes (generally these were Tatar noblemen). In this class genealogical proximity to the branch ruling in Moscow was decisive. Those of foreign origin came next, unless by marriage they were related to the dynasty (this was the case of the Patrikyevyches). Among the non-princes “in service”, among the boyars, as they were still referred to, the years “in service” determined their position, but it was not the individual service that counted but that of their clan, according to the generations. It was immaterial how long a given individual was “in service”. What was important was how long his family had served, when the first ancestor came “into service”. The years of service calculated in this way applied to all the members of the clan. Thus for example someone entering the service today could have ten times as many years “in service” as somebody else who has already served for ten years! This was an aristocracy of service, a reward for families which had served from the beginning, and did not search for luck outside of Moscow.

The Grand Prince ascertained the value of people on this basis and this was decisive in allowing them to sit at his table at higher or lower places. From this highest favour came the name of the customary-legal institution, the *местничество* [placing]. The place one had at the table was according to legal rules and the whole hierarchy of “service” derived from this. This was kept all the way till the days of Peter the Great [1689–1725]. This system was finally set during the reign of Ivan the Terrible, who himself was a specialist in this oriental “heraldry”, but the system was already in existence under Ivan III<sup>69</sup>.

---

<sup>69</sup> In the intermediary period there were sometimes doubts as to whether a prince had always priority before the *boyar* family that was oldest in service.

The heraldic pride of Western Europe was nothing in comparison with the sensitivity of "place" in Moscow. But even the highest dignitary was only a *холоп* [servant] in respect to the ruler and he designated himself so. No one ever claimed any greater rights than those provided by the favourable eye of the ruler. Truly Mongolian notions ruled reducing all both together and singly to the position of the ruler's footrest. These notions passed on unaffected to Kipchak, to Crimea or the Golden Horde and from there they passed on to the court of the descendants of the "Big Nest" [Vsevolod III, 1177-1212]. The ambassadors of Mengli-Giray to Moscow, the dignitaries of the Crimean court were referred to in instructions and official documents as the *наробку* [servitors] which term was understood to mean purchased labour slaves.

Besides the Tatar origin there was a second source of foreign customary influences, namely that of Wallachia. The court of Helen of Moldavia had significant influence as we have seen on the issue of Bogomilism and the question of autocracy. In the field of custom a trace has survived in every Russian village: the *баня* [bathhouse]. This is the steam bath with massage by flogging which became something inseparable from the life of the Russian people. Its name is taken directly from the Wallachian language, thereby indicating the origin of the idea. The very resistance to hot water indicates that the idea is of oriental origin and the Moldavian princess only contributed to the introduction of this custom in Zalesye; people of the West are known for their resistance to cold water.

There is another Wallachian word that was directly transferred into the Ruthenian sources, namely the *сулиця* [spear]. This term passed onto the Polish language [*sulica*] and we received it undoubtedly from Wallachia, together with the thing itself. The item however

is not of Moldavian or Romanian origin but comes from further on in the east. The warriors of the multi-tribal Yugra, as well as the Finnish ones were often armed with spears. It was known among the Chudes tribes in the north and in Livonia from where it passed on to the soldiers of Teutonic Knights probably of Chude origin.

From the east also came the custom of closing off the women, even though it came into force only later.

It is the general opinion that already in the XV<sup>th</sup> c. Muscovite women lived closed off in the *теремы* [tower part of a house]. The historical sources tell something else. It is true that the harem mode of life was adopted in Moscow as a Tatar custom together with an archlong list of customs copied from the Kazan Tatars. This was adopted fully only after Kazan was occupied in the mid-XVI<sup>th</sup> c., but it was gradually being introduced from the beginning of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c., namely after the reception of the Tatar (Kazan) fashion in the Moscow court as a result of the marriage of Vasily Ivanovich with the Tatar daughter of Saburov in 1504. This will be discussed later. There were many Kazan, Crimean and earlier Trans-Volga Tatars in Muscovy, and in Moscow itself. It is obvious that their households were run according to the Islamic custom. Even a baptized Tatar could have maintained the Tatar custom in his home. In the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the institution of the harem as a way of isolating the women was adopted from the Turks, the barbarians of Islam and from them it passed on to the Tatars, but only to the more affluent class. And from the Tatars the custom moved on to the most affluent Muscovites towards the end of the reign of Ivan III. Among the common people the harem was never practiced!

It is erroneous to tie the introduction of the "tower part of the house" with Zoe Palaiologina. In Byzantium there was a certain restriction on the movement of

women, but there was never the closing off and complete isolation of the weaker sex. Zoe received various delegations on par with her husband. In fact she was not fully a Byzantine. After all, her mother was an Italian, the princess of Ferrara, and she herself was brought up in Rome! When Contarini arrived in Moscow in 1476 he visited the  $\Delta\Delta\pi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\alpha$  [matron] and Ivan himself encouraged him to do so. Also Delator personally offered her respects and gave her presents. Delegates from Lithuania visited her many times: members of the Janovicz, Chreptowicz, Jakóbowicz and Pietraszowicz families. There is also information in the sources about delegations from Zoe; they frequently accompanied the delegations of her husband repeating the same instruction.

An error was made from the other side. Once the erroneous view that the closing off of women was a native Muscovite custom was adopted, that is, that Zoe did not organize the "towers", a radically contrary conclusion was drawn that Zoe had opened up the "doors of the towers". A female author (E. Certelja), the biographer of Helen Ivanovna when faced with this issue, came rightly to the conclusion that "Moscow life in the XV<sup>th</sup> c., still far removed from the closing off of women gave Zoe the possibility to live an open life", and the princesses of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. "were much more free in life and custom" than those of the XVII<sup>th</sup> c.

The argument cannot be based upon the fact that Ivan III did not want to show his daughter to Popielov or to Delator. That he did not want to does not mean that custom did not allow this. Delator was told that the custom was not to show the daughter before the agreement, but from this it follows that they were shown before the marriage, but after the terms of the marriage had been agreed to. Thus the determination of the conditions for

a marriage constituted a preliminary step and only after that there could be the personal acquaintance of the couple; if there was no agreement concerning the conditions, marriage was excluded and in such a case what would have been the purpose of the acquaintance? Simply the girl was "shown", meaning that only a serious suitor whom the parents approved and who certainly could marry her could meet her should she prove to be to his liking. Such a suitor would meet with the girl, but he had the right to withdraw, if he did not like her. This right was confirmed by Ivan III himself in a naive way in the preliminary agreements about the not finalized marriage of his daughter with Maximilian. It needs to be remembered that there were some necessary conditions, without which the project would not have been taken seriously into consideration (the Orthodox Church and the clergy), thus why would the daughter be shown before the Habsburg accepted these conditions? First of all, it was necessary to establish whether in principle the marriage was possible? Should Maximilian accept the conditions, then, readily the girl would be shown, leaving the final decision about marriage to the suitor. Since the King of Rome would not personally come to see the bride-to-be, he conducted the courtship through an envoy, and so he left it to the envoy to ascertain whether there were any obstacles. The same took place later with the courtship of Alexander. If we assume that Ivan III followed the general custom, this would imply that there were no marriages or even engagements without having seen the girl. Nonetheless the meeting of youth of different sexes was in fact very limited, though basically it was not considered improper. There was no social life, and there was no notion of "love"! And since marriages were organized very early, generally the son married following the will of his father, his orders. The suitor had

the right to make a decision, but he was so young that seldom he made use of it. It is doubtful whether the female youth had the right to make a decision; marriage was probably decided only according to the will of the father.

A wife when she was next to her husband lost all her personal rights and in favour of him; it can be said that she was a slave that should be treated as well as possible. But she regained her personal rights as a widow and as a custodian of children.

We know from sources about two incidents showing the great difference in notions about the relationship of wife to husband in Lithuania and in Muscovy.

In September 1496 a Moscow envoy to Alexander [the Grand-Prince of Lithuania], Boris Kutuzov presented in Vilnius the following request: "A Greek, Peter, the son of Dmitry travelled on our request from Venice and on the way he served in your (Alexander's) land for prince Vasily Michajlovich Wierejski (an outcast living in Lithuania). He married there a daughter of Jakob, one of his men. Currently Peter submitted into our service. So please brother, tell him to give him back his wife together with her dowry and give him a word from you — Do this for us — so that he will be allowed to pass through your land onto ours".

Thus according to Ivan III Lithuanian officials could "return" or "not return" a wife originating from the Lithuanian state when her husband migrated to Moscow. Should they allow Peter's wife to travel with Peter, this would be a favour and not the fulfilment of a duty, a favour for which he pleads ("Do this for us").

A second incident is more characteristic. When Prince Feodor Bielsky was "departing" to Ivan he did this suddenly (after an unexpected discovery of a plot) and so he failed to take with him his recently betrothed wife.

Alexander was asked to send her over to her husband. She was not held up in any way. Alexander gave a "letter" providing her with free passage without difficulties, but he had no intention of forcing her to follow her husband. There was communication with her from the Moscow side without any hindrance from Alexander and in August 1494 Ivan III sent Vasily Naumov to bring her over, but in vain. Then her husband sent for her, but she did not want to go. The husband again asked his ruler for an intervention. And so in January 1495 Ivan III requested Alexander that he order her to be handed over to the people he was sending for her from Moscow. Alexander refused to use force. In May 1495 Ivan ordered that through the envoy Pietrashkovich Alexander be told:

"After all, in our Christian law even if a wife does not want to go to her husband she should be delivered to him by force".

Ivan III repeated the same through Boris Kutuzov in September, to which Alexander replied:

"In our law there is nothing about this and it is not permitted to send free people into slavery; and now, whenever she will want to travel to her husband, we shall not prevent her from doing so".

According to Lithuanian notions a wife was a "free person" just as a husband could be free and regardless of her husband she had her own personal rights. This individual distinctiveness was not attributed to wives in Muscovy.

Thus a movement began granting women some direct rights irrespective of the care of the father, brother or husband, and this commenced with property issues. An "agreement" from 1491 (known also as the *судиебник* [Code] of Ivan III) gave daughters the right to inherit property.

This *Code* was produced by the work of *dyak* Vladymyr Gusiev. This was a collection, or rather a haphazard agglomeration of fragments of laws derived from various sources, from various periods, all arranged mechanically and rather thoughtlessly. Among the civil issues mentioned there, what draws the attention is the right of daughters to inherit property, as well as the ruling about the prescription of rights in conflicts about land. The expiration time was strangely short, only three years, and it was only the rights to land property of the Grand Prince that were defended for six years. On criminal issues, the significant progress consisted in the fact that for theft, brigandage, murder, arson etc. fines were replaced by corporal punishment, including the death penalty. There was still nothing about systematic incarceration. The accused in the case of being submitted to God's judgment was tried by a "duel" rather than by iron or water [scorched or drowned]. We can see in this the impact of the higher clergy because these were Byzantine influences.

The compilation of Gusiev was made for practical purposes in the judiciary and in fact it was recorded only for the Grand Principedom of Muscovy. But the very existence of a written law in Moscow had as a consequence that the *dyaks* of the Grand Prince tried to extend its role as the binding law in the entire state. To begin with this was only a tendency. The whole reign of Ivan III still had only local legislations and this is proven by the appearance of the separate *уставная белозерская грамота* [Belozersky Charter of 1488]. In Novgorod the Great the *судная* [judicature] of 1471 was still binding.

Novgorod the Great stood at the forefront of legal development for a long time. There over 60 *виорст* [64 km] from the main fort, all the land was already measured. In Muscovy we find proof of a conscious delineation of land

only on monastic property; the borders anyway were based on tradition. The violation of borders was punished in various ways, depending on the class of the owner. The ploughing into or harvesting within the borders of a prince, *boyar* or monastery was punished by flogging and furthermore it was necessary to pay the claimant a rouble. The same issue between two *крестьяне* [peasants] invoked a penalty of only two *altines* [copper coins].

In the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the legal notions of Novgorod the Great, the population of which changed, ceased to develop. The rulings of the *Русская Правда* [*Ruthenian Truth*] became obsolete. They were kept as a formality. Since for a long time the Tver princes and later the Moscow princes were Grand Princes of Novgorod the Great, it would be strange if nothing of the Novgorod law would not trickle into Tver and Moscow which had no written laws. This issue has never been a subject of scientific enquiry among Russian scholars. The *Truth* was never the law of “the whole of Ruthenia” because before it managed to pass on to the “lowlands”, Muscovite hegemony was aiming at the establishment of a single law throughout the state in such a way that everywhere Muscovy customary law were to be binding regardless of any circumstances. In many instances it is possible to find in the sources a great diversity of laws in the lands of the Rurikids that were gradually conquered by Moscow, because this Ruthenia still, with some insignificant exceptions, followed the local customary law. Moscow itself at this time was at the far end of legal development, but it was imposing its backwardness upon the others. Many of the legal achievements for example of Tver were lost due to the loss of independence. In 1483 Tver agreed with Lithuania to exchange a certain category of refugees and criminals, but later nothing is heard of this.

Generally, Lithuanian influences were diminishing. Initially Moscow public law was formulated following the influence of Lithuania. The Muscovite statehood developed to a certain extent as an imitation of the Lithuanian, but this was so only while ethnic Lithuania was pagan. Moscow never imitated the Christian, Catholic, Latin Lithuania, in anything! Lithuanian influences in general, also of Lithuanian Ruthenia were declining until they vanished.

One could study the history of customs noting how the wave of influences from the Lithuanian state moved eastwards in some issues, but this did not bring about at any stage any permanent consequences, until finally the Tatar customs won entirely in Muscovy. Only those who know Russian history uniquely from "tell tales" can speak of Byzantine influences!!

The court ceremonial in Moscow held onto the simple oriental principle: aim for the highest position, take up a pose of the first person in the world. The court of Ivan III was so full of this that it used this principle even in its relationships with eastern courts with which it had to admit his inferiority. When in 1500 Andrey Kutuzov was given letters for Bayezid, Ivan's name was written in it prior to that of the Sultan. Should the envoy be asked at the court of the Bayezid's son in Kaffa that had to be passed *en route*, why this was so, the explanation was to be given that in previous letters Bayezid's "name" (i.e. the titulature) was given first place, but since the Sultan did not reciprocate, Ivan decided to offer himself this satisfaction. This resulted in an amusing misunderstanding in Istanbul. Pleshchayev, the first Moscow envoy to Istanbul became a *persona ingrata*, not only because of the trade misdeeds that he conducted on the Bosphorus, but also due to his improper behaviour. Ivan had to wait long before this could be corrected. He waited in vain

throughout the year 1498 for a reciprocal Sultan's Turkish envoy in Moscow.

Pleshchayev, just as Andrey Kutuzov in 1500 was ordered not to sit down in the Turkish mode in Kaffa or Istanbul, but to stand. Should an envoy of Mengli-Giray accompany him to Kaffa he was to avoid common audiences, because he was not allowed... to sit lower than the latter. Also should Pleshchayev visit the Sultan in Istanbul and should there be other envoys there at the time, he was not to sit lower than any other. The envoy's speeches were not to be given in the presence of the pashas [Turkish dignitaries]. If the Sultan did not want to hear the speech himself, Pleshchayev was to hand over the speech in writing<sup>70</sup> to the pashas. The envoy moved too far in his eagerness. Being invited by the pashas to a meal, he refused, claiming that he wants to have nothing to do with the pashas, nor does he want to receive any gifts from them (that were normally presented at the banquets), but only from the Sultan himself! All this was the subject matter of a letter sent from Istanbul to Kaffa and further on to Kyrkora [Crimea]. Mengli showered Ivan with reproaches saying that the Moscow delegation brought so much shame to his envoy Murtoza, who had brought Pleshchayev to Istanbul and presented him there. After all, there were Hungarian envoys visiting the Sultan, Polish envoys and *от фрязских князей* [from Frisian princes], and only the Muscovite proved to be such a boor. Bayezid himself was surprised how Ivan could send to him such a "youth". In oriental language this meant: such a simpleton<sup>71</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> A written version of the speeches was always given to the envoys and they had to learn it by heart.

<sup>71</sup> According to a custom of Chinese origin, it was a compliment to consider someone older than he in fact was. This

It has to be noted that at that time Moscow custom still stood high. This was far removed from the later decline, when in the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. no one wanted to offer quarters to Moscow envoys, because afterwards the house used by them became unfit for further habitation by Europeans! But already at the time, towards the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c. the Turk considered them as unacceptable in civilized company!

On contact with society, Moscow custom had to be dropped, because it was simply unworkable. We have evidence that even the principle of "placing at table" had to be dropped and this Moscow etiquette was set aside. In the etiquette instructions given in Moscow to Helen Ivanovna and to her entourage as she was going to take the throne of Lithuania [being married to prince Alexander Jagiellon], we read that should Alexander walk together with Helen holding hands, then *детьем боярским идти к рутце без мест* [*boyar children go to the their place without placing*] and in another fragment we read that the *boyar* children are to *сидеть без мест в лавке и в камнем* [sit without placing on the bench or stone]. Both old and young couples walked holding by the arm, or perhaps by the hand (such was also the custom). This was a Renaissance custom that passed on from Kraków to Vilnius! There was still no Renaissance architecture in Poland, but the Italian custom was familiarized. In contrast, in Moscow the architecture was there, but not the custom, and it was not to be there, because the Tatar one was to be adopted. In order to comprehend the differences between Lithuania with

---

was also followed in the court of Moscow. Ivan III asked his plenipotentiary in Novgorod in 1493 about the person of the Danish envoy: *какой человек, доброй-ли или молодой?* [What kind of person, good or young?]. In this place "good" means "serious.

Lithuanian Ruthenia and Zalesye it is enough to read a description of a court banquet in Troki [in Lithuania] presented in the travel memoirs of Contarini! Latin elegance beams from the description.

Beneath the customs there were deeper issues and considerations. It is worth noting how Zabrzeziński in a 1493 letter to Zakhariynych, the Novgorod plenipotentiary spoke about his colleagues, the Lithuanian nobility. He writes about them: *панове братья моя* [Lords, my brothers]. Do we not feel our blood pressure rising hearing this? And this was already towards the end of the XV<sup>th</sup> c.! Already in Lithuania! This did not pass on further east.

The brotherhood of Renaissance custom stopped at the Lithuanian-Muscovite border. Two distinct worlds of notions and feelings were developing, and these two worlds were about to clash with one another. The war between Lithuania and Moscow was to begin, which soon expanded into a Polish-Muscovite war.

## **HR, vol. 3, p. 302-304**

By bypassing his grandson Dmitri [when he and his mother Helen of Moldavia were imprisoned by an anti-Ivan faction in the court], “Ivan III” abolished the principle of primogeniture, the fundamental rule that had been in existence since the days of Metropolitan Alexius. He changed the Moscow public law, because it became unworthy of “his” views. He changed his own previous decisions, because he had second thoughts. The explanations that were given did not contain anything else beyond the fact that the ruler had a change of mind, that he preferred something else. No new law of succession to the throne was introduced and it was announced that

such a new law was unnecessary because uniquely the will of the ruler was to decide. The manifestation of his "will" could derive from constraint, as in this case!, but externally it had to have the form of the ruler's arbitrary will. Once such a notion of public life would be adopted and developed, then the mystery of policy making would be reduced to the art of exerting influence upon the ruler. In this, always, the art of governance and the art of policy making consisted in Turanian despotisms.

We learn from the sources about the views of "Ivan III" on statehood. It was during his lifetime and with his guidance that his youngest son, Yuri, made an agreement with his elder brother Vasili who already had been appointed successor to the throne. The younger one was to *держат господином* [keep as master] the elder one and this commitment was extended to the next generation, but in such a form that Yuri recognized as *господин* [master] such son of Vasili whom the latter would award the titles of *велкими княжествами* [Grand Princes] (in the plural), that is of Moscow, Novgorod the Great, Tver and Ryazan (this was after the incorporation of Ryazan in 1503 or 1504). This "agreement" is significant for several reasons. The use of the term *господин* [master] implies that the younger brothers were *государьы* [princes] in their own provinces in respect to their populations, but they had above them their dynastic *господин* [master]. We have here a specifically dynastic exclusiveness of issues of the state. The population had no say, as to which Rurikid was master over other Rurikids; it was sufficient that everywhere there was someone who was a *государь* prince over them. The stage was not yet reached when the Grand Prince was to be a *государь* prince over his brothers ruling in their regions as if over his own subjects; this had to be left for future developments.

The master over the brothers was to be not necessarily the eldest one. Having abolished primogeniture Ivan III did not return to generational seniority, that is, to the so called tribal seniority, nor did he establish any new general law as regards succession to the throne. The successor was to be the one whom the previous ruler had appointed.

The predecessor who appointed a successor had the right to give priority even to the youngest descendant.

Thus the state was the property of the ruler, who could donate it to whomever he wished. It was probable that he would choose some son of his, but this was up to him, a human decision, his paternal sentiment and not some state principle. The freedom of choice encompassed the entire dynasty, and at the same time it was limited by the dynastic rights. It was impossible to nominate someone from outside the Rurikids.

Once Vasili became the successor the need to establish a secundogeniture for him disappeared. Mentions of the Novgorod the Great province vanished and it was not given to anybody else. In the agreement it was specified that the prince designated as the *господин* [master] was to receive all the Grand Princedoms, thus a secundogeniture was in principle excluded.

In which civilizational direction the change in succession to the throne was made? This has to be determined. When 30 years earlier the term *государь* [prince] on the throne appeared, we pointed out that the evolution of state notions was turning towards a Turanian statehood. It can be observed at times that there was hesitation whether the state of Muscovy was aiming in the Byzantine or Turanian direction, but there was no hesitation as to the fact that it was to be based upon the arbitrary will of the ruler. It was easy to adapt from Byzantium that

which at the same time was Turanian; both these civilizations recognize the will of the ruler as the prime source of law and this amounts to attributing him the right of self-will.

Thus the change in the succession to the throne that was introduced in 1502 is insufficient as a criterion for the determination whether Moscow was moving towards Byzantinism or towards Turanianism.

This change was introduced by the proponents of the Byzantine civilization who would be happy to see in Moscow a resuscitation of Byzantine public law. They presumed that through the person of Vasili Ivanovich they will ensure a victory for their ideas. They were wrong!

Having abandoned the idea of an Orthodox, post-Byzantine Tsardom, in the hope of gaining the Kiev-lands and further on the whole of Lithuanian Ruthenia, and counting in this on help not only from Crimea but also on the favour of the Khan, they submitted thus the state apparatus to Tatar, in fact Turanian influences. The compromise of the Byzantines with the political projects of Mengli-Giray was to prove the ruin of Moscow Byzantinism. They struggled against one Tatar state, the Golden Horde, so as to be politically independent, but at the same time they fell into dependence on the notions of a second Tatar state, since they were forced to deal with Crimea in the name of political gains.

## **HR, vol. 3, p. 385-388**

All of this were minor accessories to the basic historical moment, to the official declaration made to Lithuania that wanting to have peace it has to succumb to the

whole of Ruthenia. Let us consider what this declaration meant to contemporaries.

Pierling described the expression *русская земля вся... наша отчина... а их отчина лятская земля да литовская* [the Ruthenian land is all... our fatherland... and their fatherland is Latgalian land and Lithuania] as the “ethnography of Ivan III”. I have never found anything like this in the sources. The advisors of Ivan had dynastic arguments on their mind and not ethnographic-national ones. They meant three states and not three nations. Wherefrom would the Muscovites of the early XVI<sup>th</sup> c. have any notions of ethnographic considerations, let alone national ones! Their language even did not have a term for this.

In Moscow they did not know any different sense of the word “Lithuania” than that of the state. Ivan III said that Alexander *за собою держит к литовской земле* [was drawing with him (Ruthenian lands) to the Lithuanian land] and so he insisted that those forts *кои держит к литовской земле* [that he brought to the land of Lithuanian] be released. This was not a region that was ethnographically Lithuanian, but it was the Lithuanian state, the frontiers of which could change as that of any state. Recognizing that Smolensk and Kiev belonged to the “Lithuanian land” Ivan could not have had ethnographic considerations on his mind! What he wanted was that certain lands which according to his words were undoubtedly Lithuanian should cease to be Lithuanian. Thus the term “Lithuania” was used in the Moscow chancellery in its state-geographical sense.

Contemporaries knew nothing at all about an ethnographic element that was not Ruthenian, not Slav in Lithuania. At the time no one knew anything about this neither in Kraków, nor in Moscow! The term “Lithuanian language” was understood to mean only and uniquely the

Ruthenian language. Even when Mengli-Giray sent Ivan a Ruthenian letter that he received from Alexander he adds: *и та грамота в литовском языке* [and this text is in the Lithuanian language].

Ivan distinguished the Lithuanians from the Ruthenians in the Lithuanian state on the basis of the same criterion as all his contemporaries did, namely according to the religious rite. What was Latin was Lithuanian, and what was Orthodox was Lithuanian Ruthenia, which should cease to be "Lithuanian land".

Except for the Catholic clergy of the Vilnius and Samogitia dioceses no one knew about the existence of ethnic Lithuanians, a distinct non-Slav people. Did they mark their identity with anything else than their confession and rite? Externally they expressed themselves only in the Ruthenian language.

The "Lachy" [Poles] were something different. Externally they used their own language and thus they could perhaps have introduced some ethnographic thinking had anyone in Moscow be prone to follow such a course of thinking.

All the Orthodox inhabitants of Ivan's state were "Ruthenia" and the "Ruthenians"; apart from them there appeared a new term: "Russak". When an envoy was dispatched from Mahmed-Shikhzoda of Kaffa in 1501 these two terms were used in contrast to *бесермены* [bergermen], that is, the Muslims. The matter concerned trade-judicial issues. In the documents the term "Ruthenian" was used nine times and the term "Russak" four times, when referring to the same people. We meet the term "Russak" for the first time in 1491 in a letter of Menli-Giray (who complained that his brothers, Izdemir and Devlet are now in Kiev "eating and drinking with the Russaks"). This expression was still rare, while the term "Ruthenian" was in universal usage.

The meaning of the terms "Russia" and *Ruthenus* in foreign lands was mentioned in the first volume of this book. Until the end of the reign of Ivan III nothing new was introduced in this respect in the sources.

The Orthodox inhabitants of Lithuania and of the state of Muscovy were equally "Ruthenians". The primary origin and meaning of this term [coming from the Scandinavian Rus] was long forgotten. It became popular with passing generations as a term applying to increasing segments of the population. There was no term to distinguish the Orthodox population of the two countries. The word "Muscovite" used in the sources of the time meant an inhabitant of the city of Moscow. It was only during the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. that the term began to refer to the state. Around 1500 it was used in the wider sense only on the Lithuanian side, where there were many Ruthenians who hated Muscovy.

Thus in 1504 the issue was: peace or armistice? Peace or several truces? To put the matter clearly: peace with Lithuania or a permanent war interrupted at times and of necessity by temporary truces?

And was it only with Lithuania that there was to be a permanent war? Since the Polish Sejm (parliament) crowning of Alexander, Poland took part in Lithuanian-Muscovy issues officially. From December 1502 it was known in Moscow that Poland was making agreements with Lithuania and Lithuania with Poland, and so in respect to Moscow both states were one. Should this Polish-Lithuanian relationship turn out to be permanent, Moscow would find itself in a permanent war with Poland whenever it attacked Lithuania.

Thus the Patriarchate of Constantinople led to a result that was most favourable for it opening the spectre of a permanent war between Poland and Lithuania on one

side and Moscow on the other, in the name of Orthodoxy, just as Garmanovich had predicted in 1499.

This Garmanovich was the first to see through the alliance of the schism and Islam. The Caliph, an ally of Phanar, was safe thanks to this alliance, because he would not have against him the vast majority of the Balkan Christians; the Catholics were only a small minority there. The Caliph-Sultan concluded the alliance and he was to maintain it and during that time he would not help any Khan to conquer Kiev. The Phanar itself started to make efforts leading to the eruption of a major Turkish war and then all projects aiming to curtail Lithuania would be in order. At the same time the Patriarchate had the great privilege that it was not an official part in the diplomatic or warring field, and so in no time was it restricted and it could freely operate against Lithuania and Poland during all the armistices.

At that time Phanar, the highest representative of the Byzantine civilization, took upon itself the task of supporting the growth of Moscow's potency. It considered the growth of Moscow as an expansion of Byzantinism and Orthodoxy. In this period the state of Muscovy grew constantly and rapidly; but was it developing in a Byzantine manner? Had it any intention to rely on the "imperial" law in any other than Church issues? We shall look closely how this progressed.

In that time, in 1503, there came a new stage of the constant growth of the state due to the incorporation of the rest of the lands of Ryazan. We have already mentioned the incorporation of Perevick. Now came the time to incorporate the main part of Ryazan land. This issue is interesting because of the circumstance that the Ryazan branch of the Rurikids had not died out.

**HR, vol. 3, p. 395-396**

The persecution of sects was a common occurrence also in the history of the West, where the dominating Church proved able to wash its hands and transfer the heretic to the secular authorities for punishment. But at the bottom of such similar occurrences there were deep differences. The Western Church as it combated the heretics did not discontinue its struggle against the secular power (which it needed to counter the heresy), demanding the recognition of its canon law, while the Orthodox Church submitted to the secular power completely.

This is of great civilizational significance. The legal processes against the “Judaizers” were a victory of the Orthodox Church in its struggle for the “imperial law” that had been waged since the days of Cyprian.

In a very characteristic manner, this page of Orthodox Church history is referred to as a struggle for the “imperial” law. This term was used by contemporaries and we shall hold on to this terminology. The Moscow Church was to be organized in the way in which the Byzantine Emperors dealt with their Church. The bishops wanted only that the Church affairs would be resolved according to the “imperial laws”, i.e. by the canon law that had been enacted by the Emperors. It was of course purged of any thorn that could contain some embryo of the influence of society over the state. This was a canon law that was outright autocratic.

In the days of Ivan III “imperial” court proceedings were introduced into clerical courts, and this was all. This could have been something, were it not... everything! This could have been the beginnings of a far reaching current, but like everything in the history of Eastern Slav lands, it was spent there and ended earlier before it

managed to ripen. The beginnings of a struggle for law were at the same time its end. It ended with the result that heretics were tried in an "imperial" way, i.e. following the old Byzantine norms; this was the culminating point of the Muscovite Church history!

Both wings of the victorious political camp were satisfied, the Byzantines and the Josephinians. The latter got rid of a heresy and the former introduced something from Byzantium to Muscovy and they could imagine that in this way, step by step they will ensure that Moscow will become a new Byzantium.

## **HR, vol. 3, p. 399-421**

Ivan III, always cautious in his relationships with the Tatars, did not neglect Kazan in spite of the disdainful tone in which he wrote about Kazan issues to Mengli-Giray. He was playing a game because this served his purpose but his thoughts on the issue were different. Even before Amin undertook hostilities, an entire year earlier, he accepted the possibility that it may perhaps be necessary to pay the Kazan Tsars a tribute.

Till the end of his life Ivan III was not sure whether Moscow was free from Tatar supremacy. Neither did his successor, Vasili Ivanovich III have this certitude for a long time. Vasili III never had an absolute certainty. This came only during the days of Ivan the Terrible and only... after Kazan was conquered.

Despite popular opinion the shedding of the Tatar yoke was not tied with any outstanding event, with any battle or any military expedition against the Tatars. No such thing happened. The matter ceased to exist as a consequence of exhaustion. The Tatar domination was neither shed nor broken. Just like an African river that sinks in

the sands disappearing somewhere within or under them and terminates even though it has no delta, so the relationship of dependency towards the Khans ended. This happened by the force of circumstances and contemporaries are rarely conscious of such events.

In this study we have seen how the tribute was paid in two directions, and sometimes even in three. According to the sources that we have access to today, it is most difficult to establish when it was being paid to Kazan. But the fact itself of making such payments is doubtless and a new and definitive proof of the fact is the circumstance that when Ivan III was settling issues in view of his expected death, he mentioned the tribute to Kazan. He would not have mentioned it if it did not exist earlier; at least one can assume that Amin reminded about it. Maybe in the final days it was due to Mengli-Giray who was the superior of Kazan?

We have proof from 1500 that Mengli received the payments. Having asked for it through his envoy Kutush, he received it, both the capital and interests paid in Moscow currency and in the "atamans". Since the interest was mentioned, it follows that there must have been delays, and they must have been substantial, since Ivan was only able to pay half of the interest. We do not have such definite evidence from later years. There are only indirect signs.

On June 16<sup>th</sup>, 1504 an agreement was made *по приказу Великаго Князя* [by the order of the Grand Prince] between his sons Vasili and Yuri. It was composed of two *договорные грамоты* [contractual documents] that were exchanged mutually. This accord has already been discussed here in connection with the determination of the position of the Grand Duke and issues concerning the succession to the throne. Now we return to these documents in connection with the decisions concerning the

tribute. Yuri promised to pay what was due from his tributes (in the plural) to the Hordes (also plural), namely *и в Крым, и в Асторохонь, и в Казань, и во Царевичев городок и в ыные цари и во царевичи, которые будут у меня в земле, или у моего сына, у великого князя, и во все татарские проторы давати ти мне... А коли мы в выходы в ординские и в татарские проторы не дадим, и нам и у тобя не взяти\** [and to Crimea, and to Astrakhan, and to Kazan, and to the Tsar's sons in your land and to other Tsars and Tsar's sons that would be in my (Vasili's) land, or in that of my son the Grand Prince, and all the Tatar dues you will pay through me... And if we do not pay out the tributes to the Hordes and to the Tatars, then we shall also not take them from you.].

Under tributes here are understood all the Tatar dues resulting from the position of subservience. They were of two kinds: a direct tribute and indirect ones consisting in the imposed obligation to sustain among themselves the relatives of the Khan, various former "Tsars" and multiple "Tsar's sons". Both these kinds of imposed duties could arise from the dependency towards three Hordes, the Crimean, the Golden and the one from Kazan. Ivan III paid up in all three directions and had reasons to believe that in the days of his successor this will continue in the same way. It does not necessarily follow that these dues would be binding to all the three Hordes. Not always did the Grand Prince pay them. The reservation that the tribute will not be claimed from the provincial princes when it was not being paid to the Khan's treasury is known to us from earlier documents and this was only repeated here. This could refer both to cases of not paying the

---

\* <https://secrethistory.su/1630-russkie-knyazhestva-i-nasledniki-zolotoy-ordy-v-xv-v-nachalnaya-istoriya-kasimovskogo-hanstva.html> - \_ftn39

exaction, even if it were due, as well as to a basic not paying of the main tribute. Both situations were possible. There were times when the taxes were not paid to all the Hordes. It happened also that there were delays in the payment to this or that Horde. We do not know from the document what the case was at the time of its editing, in 1504. It specified regulations not for some political moment but as a basic generality for the future. The document speaks a lot about the past. About the current situation the document proved that Ivan did not consider the financial subservience to the Hordes as closed and he considered that everything that had happened in the past could be repeated in the nearest future. Thus we can read for sure that in 1504 the state of Muscovy was basically subject to Tatar domination. We also have clear evidence in the text of the document that none of the Hordes was considered as being more legitimately entitled to collect the tribute and to send relatives for upkeep than the other Hordes. In this respect no Tatar legitimacy was recognized. It is interesting that Astrakhan was not left out. The Golden Horde could be resuscitated either by Sheikh-Ahmat, should Lithuania want to help him, or by the Nogais, and so the far sighting Ivan III preferred to anticipate everything.

It is probable that also the other younger sons of Ivan III exchanged such documents with their elder brother and their Grand Prince.

We find these same anticipatory stipulations in Ivan's III will which was probably written up in the same year 1504, and certainly not later than in the next year 1505. We read there the following decision.

The younger brothers were to pay the eldest one, the Grand Prince *в выходы в ординские, и в Крым, и в Азтархань, и в Казань, и во Царевичев городок, и в иные цари и во царевичи, которые будут у сына*

моего у Василья в земле, и в послы в татарские, которые придут к Москве, и ко Твери, и к Новугороду к Нижнему, и к Ярославлю, и к Торусе, и к Рязани к Старой, и к Перевитску ко княж Федоровскому жеребью рязанского, и во все татарские проторы [tributes to the Hordes, and to the Crimea, and to Astrakhan, and to Kazan, and to the Tsar's son in town, and to other Tsars and Tsar's sons whom my son Vasili will have in the land, and to ambassadors from the Tatars who will come to Moscow, and to Tver, and to Nizhny Novgorod, and to Yaroslavl, and to Torus, and to Ryazan, to Staroy, and to Perevick, to Prince Feodorovsky of the Ryazan field, and to all the Tatar protectorates].

Here also we have mentioned the possibility that it may be necessary to pay tribute or possibly several tributes to this or that Khan. Thus what can be thought of the alleged supremacy of Moscow over Kazan, since Ivan III himself in principle recognized the right of the Kazan Horde to collect a tribute?

This document is more specific than the other one, since it mentions Tatar envoys who might arrive not only in Moscow but to also in towns in which where for a long time there were no princes, in Tver, in Nizhny Novgorod, in Yaroslavl, in Torus, Ryazan and Perevick. Who might have been these envoys who were to arrive where there was no court to which they could be ambassadors? To whom were they to travel to... in Nizhny Novgorod?! The only possible explanation is that here the term "envoy" refers shamefully to all the tax collectors of the Khan, and the places mentioned were where the collections and payments were made. This is one of the rare evidences for the *darogas*, signs of the administration of the Tatar supremacy. The *darogas* did not stay in Ruthenia permanently, but they only came as envoys to collect the

tribute. The provincial princedoms which in the administration of the Khan's revenues represented separate administrative units were mentioned. Since this administration derived from the Golden Horde this mentioning probably referred to the possible tax-collectors of this Horde who could come and who obviously arrived from time to time during the reign of Ivan III. Mengli-Giray [of Crimea]<sup>72</sup> considered himself the rightful head of the Golden Horde. The "ambassadors" from him were more likely. There is no doubt that Mengli collected the tribute and here we see evidence of how he made such collections.

Were it so that since 1480 no tribute was paid (as it is commonly held) then the instructions about payments made some 24 years later would be incomprehensible! The last proof of the payment of the tribute is from the year 1498. Here we have further evidence that it was paid to Giray in 1500 and to Sheik Ahmat in 1501 and 1502, and besides there are indications that refer to the time after 1502.

Ivan III's will contradicts also some other completely erroneous views claiming that this ruler was basically opposed to the regional system.

This will recognized the regional system, but only held to the principle, adopted already by his predecessors, that the regions are to be as small as possible and that the inequality has to be as far as possible in favour of the Grand Prince. He himself therefore carried the bulk of the responsibility for the Tatar tribute. Thus the small prince Feodor Borysevich, the grandson of Ivan III had to pay towards the Tatar contributions only 37.5 roubles for every thousand roubles that were paid by them all.

---

<sup>72</sup> After his victory in 1502 Mengli claimed everywhere that he had regained his "paternal" horde.

His son Andrew had to pay 40.5 roubles and 3.5 denegs. Dmitri had to pay 58.5 roubles and 7 denegs. Semen had to pay 65 roubles less 10 denegs. Yuri had to pay 82 roubles with no fine. Vasili had to pay 717.5 roubles and 2.5 denegs for every 1000 roubles of the tribute.

Thus Ivan III judged the ratio of his eldest heir and Grand Prince in respect to all his other heirs as 717:283. The fact that the sums were given not in round figures indicates the accuracy of the calculations. The ratio was calculated on the basis of the profitability of the regions. After all Vasili held 66 forts and the four younger sons together had only 30 and second rate at that. The more important forts of the brothers' regions were as follows:

Yuri obtained Dmitrov, Zvenigorod, Ruza and Bryansk.

Dmitri (Zhylka) was given Uglich, Ustyug, Khlepen, Zubtsov, Opoka and half of Rzhev.

Semen was given Kozelsk.

Andrei was given Viereya.

Everything else, thus everything that was more important, yielding more revenue was the province of the "ruler". Furthermore Vasili was given the vast majority of the villages, that is, the princely farms of his father. There was also a novelty. It was specified that in Moscow, the common capital city, only the Grand Prince could collect the municipal revenues, paying directly each of his brothers annually 100 roubles from this. Only the Grand Prince was to run the judiciary in Moscow and in the suburban region (in more important matters). Also the paternal will allowed only him to mint money.

The grandson Dmitri was deprived completely of any heritage.

When Ivan III was 66 years old he systematically prepared his will preceding it with various detailed provisions. A document survived concerning his son Yuri, who was given a village and some estates in the suburbs (e

*nocaðe* [in the land — the inhabited areas outside the city walls]) of Moscow; in a separate document he gave him Kashina and in another there were the surveyed measurements of Kashina and Dmitrov; a separate one was given for Zvenigorod; still another one pertained to Zvenigorod, Dmitrov and Ruza. Probably similar documents were issued for the other sons. A more general document has survived, donating buildings in Moscow to the sons Yuri, Dmitri, Semen and Andrei.

Apart from the provinces of his own sons (and besides the Sevier region and the *верховые* [upstream] princedoms) there remained only one region belonging to his brother's grandson, Feodor Borysevich that was also mentioned in the list of Tatar tributes. This was a remnant of the Volotsk region. Ivan III already held the major part of it, because the princedom was much in debt to him and not only to him. Ivan Borysevich had died shortly before, and he divided his realm into three parts: for his brother (Feodor Borysevich), a niece, and for the Grand Prince in exchange for the remaining debts paid by him.

During the reign of Ivan III there occurred several sudden abolitions of regions with no regard for justice and this had led and continues to lead many historians to the erroneous view that this was a process of "collecting" regions. But Ivan III was not an opponent of regions, in fact, he even established them himself! In his will he designated minor regions and during his life he set up a major region of Novgorod the Great for his son Vasili! Ivan III was only interested in ensuring that other branches of the Rurikid family would not have regions, but he was not opposed to the idea of there being regions. As Klyuchevsky has rightly pointed out, Shemiachich of Sevier was the last regional prince not descended from Vasily the Blind. But there were still regional princes of

this blood and one can argue whether the complete unification of the state was achieved through some general political principle that excluded the notion of provinces or whether the dying out of this privileged progeny of the "Big Nest" was the cause. A closer acquaintance with the sources and monographic studies definitively leads to the rejection of Klyuchevsky's view that the "finalization of the territorial unification of north-eastern Ruthenia by Moscow changed the Muscovite principedom into a Russian national state". The question of nationality has been mentioned earlier; the issue was still at the same point as in the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. The abolition of the regions therefore has to be studied.

This is frequently compared with the joining of provinces by Western monarchs. Ivan III has even been compared in this respect with the French Louis XI. But all searches for analogies between Moscow and the Western feudal world are a futile exercise. Where was the supposed "Crown" which by the rule of law had a right to extinct fiefdoms? Moscow was not a Crown. It was not the nucleus or root of some ideal state, but only a region, just as all the others. The only difference was that originally, in fact, it was smaller than the others, a third order region. Moscow never had any legal title over the other regions, because at no time were they part of the Crown! It is not only the question that there were no feudal laws here. Poland also did not have a feudal system. But the abolition of regions during the reign of Władysław Łokietek [1320-1333] was the result of the will of the population, which called Władysław to rule over several regions at the same time. This did not entail the hegemony of one region over the others. Meanwhile Moscow had a decisive hegemony, an increasing one, and by no means was this based on the will of the people.

There is no analogy not only with Poland, but also with the history of Lithuanian Ruthenia. When the Grand Duke of Lithuania abolished the Kiev principedom, he did not expand his borders or even a sphere of his influences. The Kiev principedom belonged to the Lithuanian state from 1362 regardless of whether it had a prince or not, because the Kiev princes were nominated by the Grand Duke of Lithuania. Both before and after the abolition of the dignity of a prince of Kiev, the Kiev lands were one of the provinces of Lithuania. But were Novgorod, Tver etc. ever a part of the Moscow state before the abolition of the principedoms?

Was Ivan III abolishing the provinces of his state, i.e. **within** the state or... was he annexing lands that were lying **outside** his state? Ivan was not changing the relationships in parts of his state, but he was attaching new regions to it, which previously had no relationship to his state. Ivan III was simply not absorbing his regions but conquering new ones. In Lithuania, in Poland, in the West there was **consolidation**... while in Zalesye there was **annexation**. The diminution of the number of principedoms in Poland and later in Lithuanian Ruthenia was an internal policy of these states, whereas in Zalesye this was the foreign policy of Moscow.

For example, after the abolition of the Kiev principedom, there was no abolition of the local government in the Kiev lands; in fact it was extended under Polish influence, whereas the lands of the former Zalesye principedoms (and later others beyond Zalesye) were losing totally their self rule. The abolition of internal principedoms in Poland and in Lithuanian Ruthenia did not impede the decentralization of the state, while in Zalesye centralization was on the increase. (This clearly shows the difference between a state, ruled by its citizens and one ruled by a bureaucracy.) In Poland even the earlier court

dignitaries of a given region remained in place; an official had to be a landowner of the region in question. In Zalesye, the officials of the former princedoms had to transfer to Moscow. There, in Moscow, bureaucratic institutions were organized to administer the former regions, and only those whom the ruler appointed could be employed in such an institution. Polish regions had self-rule, whereas the Zalesye ones were ruled from Moscow. Even the very hegemony of Moscow was imposed from without, because Moscow was the creation of the Khans. It grew up because it was the Khan's tax collector.

The passing on to the direct sovereignty of the Crown in the West was only the elimination of one element in the state's constitutional order, an intermediary element. In Zalesye, incorporation into the state of Muscovy entailed the destruction of the whole system that had been in operation to date, because the principle was that "everything had to be like in Moscow", even the land measuring system.

But at the same time, the creative originality of Moscow was strangely cramped. In this period it went even further in accepting the Tatar custom, even the Tatar institutions.

It was under Ivan III that the so called "placing" at table was introduced, taken over from Kazan. During his reign we find the first undoubted source evidence of this social institution. This involved a pedantic accuracy in the hierarchy of princes, *boyars* and courtiers, that is, of dignitaries having functions in the court, people of the upper class. The strict rules, as to who was to sit higher up at the table and who was to sit lower down, were a manifestation of this precision. Everybody's place was specified. The order of sitting at court banquets evolved in consequence into a hierarchic order of court positions

and also those beyond the court, thus an official and social hierarchy. This system was introduced under Vasily Ivanovich, but under Ivan the Terrible it attained a peak of its development. Ivan the Terrible himself was the greatest connoisseur of the complicated rules and a true Grand Master of this ceremonial. At the bottom of the rule, there was the conviction that there cannot be two people of equal dignity.

The first places were occupied by the princes, dynasts as well as in-laws of the Grand Prince. Further on, the places were assigned according to a complicated combination of birth, origin and chronology of the clan being "in service" to the Grand Prince. Whoever became an in-law of the dynasty occupied by right a higher position, that is, he superseded others in the hierarchy. In this way Yuri Patrykyevich jumped a place. He was to become the head of the Golicyn and Kurakin families. Meanwhile, his older brother, prince Feodor Khovansky, even though he also was of the Gedymin family sat at the wedding of his younger brother lower than Feodor Saburov, because the ancestors of Saburov, converted Tatars, were "in service" since the days of Ivan Kalita. Soon the Saburovs were to be placed even higher!

The Tatar mentality was soaking into the body of Zalesye through all possible pores.

To an increasing extent the open areas of the eastern regions were settled by Tatar populations mixing with the Slavs and the "in service" Tatars were increasingly integrated into Moscow society. Gradually the Tatars were being accustomed to agriculture, even though no Tatar tribe on the Don or Volga ever abandoned completely the nomadic life. Thus they learnt temporary agriculture that would last for a year, as a supplement to the main pastoral life. They settled and gathered crops on some minor part of the region where they lived as

nomads. The space for nomadic life was becoming increasingly limited, reducing the parts of land that served a tribe, because overpopulation was being felt more and more. In some tribes the change of location could be not more than a few miles, and so as a result Tatar agriculture expanded as something increasingly necessary for the survival of the population. There was no other solution for the Tatars but to take up the despised agriculture, or find new areas for their plundering expeditions.

This economic question lay also at the base of all the policies among the Tatars themselves and their relationships with their neighbours. This was not resolved and as a result there was a total downfall of Tatarism with the exception of the Crimean. They found for themselves a region for plunder in Southern Ruthenia. When this was lost to them, they lost their independence. They did not change into full scale farmers in Crimea until the XIX<sup>th</sup> c. and in any case they preferred to deal in trade. In the days of Ivan III they were still first-class traders, and their suppression was the dream of the Moscow traders.

Since it was increasingly difficult for the Tatars to manage without agriculture, the Kazan Tatars found a simple solution. They placed prisoners of war and bought slaves on the land and fixed them permanently to the soil. In this way a distinct class of people developed, the enslaved farmers, working under compulsion for the benefit of somebody else and making use of their own work only to the extent that it was necessary to maintain their usefulness as labourers. Thus slavery became hereditary among them and such a farmer could never acquire land property of his own even though he integrated with the dominant elements, adopted Islam and the Tatar customs. In the Kazan Tsardom a Tatar agricultural proletariat developed that had alien origin. They worked for the sustenance of their masters who dealt

with warring and trade only. In this way a permanent, systematic agriculture was introduced into Kazan society<sup>73</sup>.

The nomads from the Volga and Don regions found themselves in much poorer conditions and they had to descend to tending the land with their own hands. It was a sensation when they moved onto the middle Boh River during the winter of 1488/89, spent the winter there and in the spring started to plough the land! The result was a mobile agriculture, each year in a different place, always on fresh virgin land that did not require much preparation. We need to recall that this state of agriculture existed among the Slav peoples searching for new territories to settle, as if experimental agriculture. The farms of the most easterly Slavs differed however from those of the most westerly Tatars. The Slav farmer was trying through this temporary method to find the best land to settle, while the Tatars of these regions remained and even today are semi-farmers, just as they were ages ago, nomadic farmers changing place every year.

The Cossacks became an intermediary element between Tatardom and Muscovy. The Cossacks to a certain extent were beyond the Tatar society. Even though they did not cease to be Tatars, they increasingly moved away from strict Tatardom. It is unknown, what were the causes for the development of the Cossacks in some Hordes? Soon they became the majority and finally the Horde changed into the Cossacks. It is impossible to judge whether this turning into Cossacks was an advancement, a victory of some new currents over the conservative ones (cultural currents or only economic

---

<sup>73</sup> Forced agricultural slavery was introduced in Muscovy during the reign of Godunov [1598-1605], a Tsar of Tatar blood.

ones?), or whether it was the opposite<sup>74</sup>? We only observe that extensive Tatar lands were becoming Cossack ones. Thus for example, the Tsar of Tiumen, Ivak, known from the final battles of the Golden Horde appeared as the head of a Cossack Horde. In a similar way "Turkish" Cossacks appeared on the Sea of Azov. They were an entire Horde, being a nuisance to travelling Moscow traders. Also Cossackdom spread in the vicinity of Moscow. At the beginning of the reign of Ivan III they were known only in the Ryazan region and in 1498 there were also the Meshchera Cossacks. Thus Cossackdom was a phenomenon known on both sides of the Urals and from the most northern Tatar regions to their southern steppe limits, from the Siberian east to the Ryazan west.

Cossackdom preserved a certain basic Turanian characteristic, namely an Asiatic democracy, a **camp democracy** that knew no classes but only military ranks. The exclusively military organization of such a society resulted in the fact that on meeting neighbouring peoples, they distinguished only two kinds among them: enemies and allies, and anyone who did not enter into an alliance with them, who did not pay a tribute was an enemy. As a rule every foreigner in such societies was considered an enemy, and this resulted in a worldview that all aliens have to be eradicated. One of the consequences of such notions was great cruelty towards prisoners of war. This universally is considered an Asiatic characteristic. This was impressed onto Moscow. Novgorod prisoners had

---

<sup>74</sup> If I may be permitted to judge from impressions, as the state of sources does not allow here for anything else, I am inclined to accept the latter explanation. It seems to me that Cossackdom was a return to a more strictly military social organization.

their noses and lips amputated and so maimed they were sent back to Novgorod the Great. Ivan himself ordered that more important prisoners be beheaded.

Moscow found itself on a dangerous cultural path, the Turanian, which viewed the Turkish custom as a norm, as a perfect ideal. What were the ideals of this norm can be seen from the *kanuns* [traditional customs] of Sultan Mahomet II (†1481) about "fratricide". The killing of brothers was in fact recommended in view of the peace of the state. It was to eliminate possible counter-candidates to the supreme power.

The Tatar custom passed onto Zalesye also in the realm of peaceful Tatar activities. This can be seen in trade. The oriental custom of collective shops and bazaars was already adopted and trading went on in them only before noon. The old Mongolian habit transferred to Moscow can also be seen in the fact that the head of state was engaged in private trade. Ivan III practiced this earnestly, and this was copied by his envoys sent abroad. For example, such behaviour of Rhalev in 1500 was deemed scandalous in Italy. The practice continued in Moscow Ruthenia and among the Cossacks until the XVIII<sup>th</sup> c. The Tsars and the Cossack headmen were traders on a grand scale. Amongst the first order objects of Moscow trade prime place was held by slaves. The prisoners of war were sold into slavery. Since the mid-XIII<sup>th</sup> c. the Tatars managed to expel the Jews from this trade, and now Zalesye traders were starting to eliminate Tatar competition in this, increasingly abundantly providing living merchandize.

Not only the Tatars with their Cossackdom were transferring Turanian notions into Zalesye. The incorporation of ever further Yugra into the borders of the state had to lead eventually to a predominance of Turanian notions, unless these Turanians would adopt some higher culture

radiating from Moscow. This problem will be discussed in coming volumes of *The History of Russia*<sup>75</sup>. At present there is not enough material to deal with this topic.

One thing is certain, the more Turanian notions penetrated into Moscow-Russia, the greater became the difference between the two Ruthenias, the greater the divide between Zalesye Ruthenia and Lithuanian Ruthenia. Zalesye was acquiring a distinctiveness of its own, all the more extreme, due to Turanian influences, and as a consequence Western Ruthenia increasingly differed from the Eastern.

There was a clear consciousness of a frontier between Lithuanian Ruthenia with the Sever region and Muscovy. This was a boundary that was independent of the political moves. It resulted from the awareness that a part of Northern Ruthenia formed a distinct unit, regardless of who happened to rule over it or over a given part. The settlement tradition of the former "all Rostov land" did not disappear, even though the name itself was no longer in use. We rarely meet the term "Suzdal land", with the term itself having acquired a pejorative significance some time earlier. A third term survived, also an old one, namely "Zalesye". It covered as before the former "all Rostov land" and "Suzdal land", as well as the territories of Novgorod and Pskov but not the Sevier land.

We find several times in the chronicles a list of Zalesye forts. *А се грады залесские* [These are the Zalesye

---

<sup>75</sup> [There were no further volumes of *The History of Russia* by Feliks Koneczny. There is only Koneczny's earlier (1921), less detailed book, entitled "Russian History, from most ancient to most recent times" which appeared in English as *From Ruthenia to Russia. The History from a pre-Soviet perspective* (Antyk. Komorów, 2019).]

forts]. There were 88 of them. Here is an alphabetical list of them. [There follows a list of these historical forts, a transliteration of them into English would be pointless]<sup>76</sup>.

On the territories of these forts and their lands there was a consciousness of being different in respect to Lithuanian Ruthenia, which as a consequence of the Polish-Lithuanian union was to some extent beginning to be influenced by Polish and Western European civilization. This Ruthenia differed therefore in some respects from the other. The Lithuanian *boyars* were not *холопы* [servants] of the ruler, but citizens and those of them who had the luck to advance became "lords". On the Moscow side, a most fortunated individual be he even a prince, could be deprived of everything, including his life, at any moment, because in respect to his ruler he was basically nothing. He existed at the grace of his ruler, dependent on his every whim. On the Lithuanian side, a wealthy *boyar* was "a lord of the council" that was **based upon law**, not on personal favour. And when we look lower, below the *boyars*, in Muscovy a *dyak* remained always a scribe, while in Lithuania he could become a writer, a notary, a secretary, a citizen, a land owner. On the one side there was citizenship and on the other servitude. In Lithuania there was the trend to acquire rights and liberties, in Muscovy the holding onto gracious favours.

Before we delve into the very essence of these differences, and to the basic cause of causes, it has to be noted that it was not in these phenomena themselves (about which we spoke in greater detail above) that the differentiation between the two Ruthenias consisted in. It were not the symptoms that caused the civilizational

---

<sup>76</sup> Noteworthy is the absence of Ryazan and Perevick, while Pskov is mentioned.

differences, but the circumstance that Muscovy Ruthenia considered the relationships in Lithuania as inferior, poorer, as something which one had to deplore. In was in this view, in this difference of mentality and feeling that the civilizational differentiation laid. If a Muscovite *boyar* **wanted legal rights**, sooner or later he paid for this with his head or he had to flee to Lithuania. In Muscovy he was what was known as a "foreign body" and he had to be eliminated in the interest, health and further development of the civilization to which Moscow belonged.

The leaven of a statehood based upon citizens' consciousness lies always in the struggle for rights in the face of the ruler. This is so in order that the public issues will not be a plaything of his private arbitrary will. The aim is to locate these public affairs in some system, some purposeful pursuit from which a political program would be developed. The struggle for legally sanctioned rights is the forming backbone of the history of states, regardless of the time period or part of the world. In Western European civilization the struggle over law as a consequence led to the assigning of society some influence over the state, until the state is based upon the society. Throughout the history of the Western world, always the struggle for legal rights began with the clergy, demanding the recognition of canon law.

Sometimes analogies are detected between the history of the Eastern Slav lands and Europe, but one should not be misled by this. The analogies are everywhere of a purely formal nature. Also in this case the Orthodox clergy did wage a struggle for canon law, beginning with the forgeries of the *Statutes of Vladimir and Yaroslav* all the way up to the *столглав* [100-chapters, a Statute of 1551], but the long duration of this conflict is inversely proportional to its historical value! It was always about the introduction of Byzantine canon law into the state

of Muscovy. This canon law from the very beginning accepted the total dependence of the Church on the secular power. It was always only a question of the material interests of the Church and of the introduction of Byzantine forms in place of the anarchy that had prevailed in the Church of "Kiev and the whole of Ruthenia", both on the Muscovite side and on the Lithuanian. Such a conflict about such canon law could not generate social improvement and a progressive state system.

The determination of the type of civilization has to be left for the moment, before the completion of the review of the main factors that strike the historian analysing the facts. For the time being we need to consider only the achievements of these Byzantines, who starting from the slight beginnings in the days of Metropolitan Cyprian led to the moment when tying with the Josephinians they acquired total control over Ivan III.

Cyprian and his spiritual following wanted to see Moscow as subservient not to the Kipchak Khans but to the Byzantine Emperors, and when these ceased to be, that she would shed the Tatar subservience and herself become an Orthodox Empire. The Moscow Tsar was to be the ruler over all of the Orthodox apart from those who were under Turkish rule. Phanar made an alliance with the Sultan, and thus the Sultan was also the rightful ruler over the Orthodox, but not the Grand Prince of Lithuania who was Latin, a Catholic! Thus it was the duty of the ruler of Moscow to take over Lithuanian Ruthenia.

From among these three aims postulated for him and his family by the Moscow Byzantines, Ivan III never accepted the call to shed the Tatar dependency. When circumstances allowed him to become a "brother" of some Khan, indeed he would do this, but never ever would he progress through military force! When he was dying, he still considered himself to be a tributary of the Hordes.

After some time, thanks to the hopes of encroaching upon Lithuanian Ruthenia through Tatar help, the Byzantines themselves abandoned this aim; they too accepted the Khan's supremacy, so as to execute it, in the name of the Khan, over the whole of Ruthenia, so long as they could expand the state of Muscovy. The shedding of Tatar domination was therefore postponed for some unlimited time. Similarly they also abandoned the using of the imperial title. Of the three aims only one became actual; the conquest of Lithuanian Ruthenia.

Such was the history of the ideology of the historical leaders of Muscovy in the second half of the XV<sup>th</sup> c., during the reign of Ivan III. There was no historical evolution in this, in the proper sense of the word, only a clever adaptation to the circumstances. What initially was in the first plan was abandoned, or at least postponed in such a way that it ceased to be a political programme. And what originally was in the background, on the very end emerged in the first place. The striving for the shedding of the Tatar yoke was born in Moscow on native ground. The idea of the Tsardom also was accepted more freely, since Ivan III has decided even to crown his grandson and allowed himself to be proclaimed Tsar. This was also a native idea. But the idea of uniting all the Orthodox Eastern Slav lands was a foreign idea, taken over from the Germans and from the Tatars. The Byzantines adopted this idea after a relatively long time. And it was this idea that was to become the backbone of the history of Russia!<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Throughout the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. (and very likely longer) this idea was decidedly restricted only to Lithuanian Ruthenia. There is no doubt that no one in Moscow knew about the existence of Orthodox lands within the kingdom of Poland.

We shall see that Tatar supremacy was never “shed”, and the Tsardom that was adopted later, at the beginning of the second half of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. was not the kind of Tsardom that the Byzantines had in mind. This was not an Orthodox Tsardom, but a Tatar one, as a follow up not of the Byzantine Emperors but of the Tsars of the Golden and Kazan Hordes. It was only later that it was transformed into an Orthodox Tsardom, and yet even later still the idea was attached, pinned on as it were, that it was to follow up and replace the Byzantine Empire, eventually even against Turkey on the favour of which initially everything was based.

The Byzantines gained power, but it was not Byzantinism that came to the fore! The post-Byzantine Tsardom dissipated in thin air until finally it disappeared completely.

Did the Byzantine civilization courageously enter Moscow? Were the gates wide open for it? We saw on the example of how Dmitri was eliminated and Vasily was elevated that this did not happen according to Byzantine notions, but according to the Turanian.

Ivan III had everything well prepared for the circumstance of his death. Fate was favourable to him in this respect in that he managed to complete all the matters properly. One problem, a rather important one, lingered on for some time, but just before his death, a few weeks before, he managed to settle it, namely the marriage of his successor Vasili.

In May 1503 Ivan III inquired with his daughter [Helen] in Vilnius on which monarchic courts there were princesses that would be suitable for Vasili. He did not restrict his choices to Orthodox candidates! He asked equally for Catholic and Orthodox ones, because the latter were nowhere to be found... An Orthodox girl of princely blood was found when it was discovered that

the despot of Serbia, Steven fled from the Turks, having found asylum in Hungary. When therefore in November 1503 *dyak* Nikita Guba Moklakov came to Vilnius for news from Helen, he was primarily interested in information about the family of this despot. Strangely enough, Helen proved unable to find out anything, even though the King of Hungary was her brother-in-law and getting information from Buda would have been of no problem for her! Obviously she did not want to be involved in the matter. But she did provide information about the daughters of the margrave of Brandenburg, the prince of Bavaria, the prince of Szczecin, the King of Denmark, even about the sister of the King of France. Moklakov requested that she would send someone to Hungary to find out something about the family of despot Steven and he wanted to wait in Vilnius until the messenger would return. Then Helen admitted openly that she has no intention of sending anyone to Hungary, nor to any monarchical court at all in search for marriageable princesses, because she would consider this improper since her father was at war with her husband (not a very good in-law relationship), and at the same time she warned that no Latin Lord will give his daughter to marry into the "Greek law" without the permission of the Pope.

In February 1504 a bride for Vasili was still being searched for in the wide world, and six months later he married his own subject who was of Tatar origin. When the hopes for a foreign daughter-in-law turned out to be nil, and the successor to the throne, who in fact for the last two years was already ruling, could not remain unmarried, it was necessary to find a wife for him in Ruthenia. But candidates from the Rurikid family were excluded. Just as Ivan III excluded this possibility after the death of his first wife, so he did not depart from this

principle in the difficult circumstances, when it was impossible to find a daughter-in-law from anywhere. A subject was preferable to a Rurikid. It was imperative not to give the relatives an occasion to consider themselves equal!

Once it was decided that Vasili will marry a subject, the search went on among the highest ranking clans. In Muscovy the highest noble families were those which derived from the Tatars, particularly the ones from Kazan. These represented the leading cultural sphere. The Kazan Tatars stood much higher by way of civilization than Muscovy. The family of the Saburovs was exceptional. Their ancestor Murza Cheta was an émigré from the Horde, probably the Golden Horde and already in the mid-XV<sup>th</sup> c. his family was considered to be one of the most eminent. It was of princely rank due to its being derived from Murzas. Of course in the meantime they received baptism. Probably Cheta himself promptly adopted Christianity. In the days of Vasily the Blind they were very close to the court. Under Ivan III Andrei Vasilevich Saburov was responsible for the prince's table, and later he was a voivod nominated by Vasili. Another member of the family, Dmitri Semenovich Saburov-Pieschkov for a long time was at the court of Helen in Vilnius. We do not know what was their relationship to Yuri Konstantinovich whose daughter Salmonida (Solomoniya) was chosen bride. The wedding was assisted by Metropolitan Simon on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 1505.

Noble Tatar families probably held on to their Tatar customs, because baptism had no effect on this. This explains the report that the choice of the bride for the young ruler of Moscow was made according to the Tatar custom, that is, the Khan's system of finding a bride. It was said that 1500 virgins were brought to Moscow from

the entire state, selections were made, deliberations conducted, until finally the choice fell on the one... that was chosen anyway from the very beginning.

This was the Khan's method practiced also today among the semi-civilized Sultans of the Far East. Moscow rulers were inspired by the Khan's court, considering it a model in many ways, and the courtly custom derived primarily from Kazan which was the highest example of courtly elegance. The court of Ivan III was adopting an increasing number of Tatar features and the court of his successor became entirely Tatar. In this sphere of life, there was no Byzantinism in Moscow! The Saburov wife of the Grand Prince assured the predominance of Tatar customs.

Once the Ottomans stood at the head of the Muslim world, the fashion and custom came from the Turks. A free Tatar woman was finally dressed in a hijab and closed off in a harem. But we do not know since when this was introduced. It is probable that Salmonida Saburov did not know this custom; this was to come later.



# Excerpts from “From Ruthenia to Russia, The History from a pre-Soviet perspective”

Publ. Antyk. Komorów, 2019

## **fRtR, p. 115-117**

Against this background there was a quiet conflict of the higher clergy with the new class of courtiers, the *dyaks* [deacons, clerks], who supported Sophia and Vasili. The *dyaks* had appeared already in the days of Vasily the Blind. These were literate laymen. They were not rich, and they earned their living through writing, being the officials of the Grand Prince, without having aspirations for a higher social status. They were the beginnings of the Moscow bureaucracy which soon was to become a class of political importance.

Ivan the Stern greatly increased the number of the *dyaks* and supported them so as to be as least as possible dependent on the clergy. The spheres of state power had grown immensely and this required more officials. The annexations needed more armed forces and since Muscovite order was imposed everywhere by force this required a **permanent army**. This was the case in all the Asiatic despotisms, even in their miserable caricatures, such as the Volga Khanates which served as models for Moscow. Around the year 1490 Ivan conscripted in military service the “children of the *boyars*” throughout the country. Thus all the youth of the *boyars* had to be maintained at the expense of the state, not to mention the non-*boyar* army which was also on the increase.

The introduction of firearms also entailed considerable expenses, and Ivan had no intention of saving on this because he knew that the cannons gave him superiority over Lithuania.

The taxes in Muscovy were always higher than anywhere else in Zalesye. Since the principle was held that **everywhere things should be "like in Moscow"**, the annexations always brought an increase in taxes. In order to facilitate military communication and the constant movement of officials a general postal tax was introduced which was a primitive form of road tax. The taxation system was based on land property and thus the land had to be measured. The measurements known to the previous authorities of the former princedoms of Zalesie were considered insufficient. The pinnacle of Moscow political statesmanship consisted in imposing uniformity everywhere, in great and small issues. This principle is inseparable from all bureaucracy. It was judged therefore that the local measurements are irrelevant and the requirement was made that everywhere the Moscow *sokha* [primitive plough] was to be used for taxation purposes [i. e., the land that could be ploughed one day with a *sokha* was considered a unit of the area]. This required whole regiments of Moscow officials.

Ivan the Stern needed higher taxes all the more so, because having resisted Sarai legitimism, since 1480, he had to pay the Tatar tribute in two directions, to Sarai and to Crimea. Evidence that he was subject to Mengli-Giray extends as far as 1491. On that occasion on direct orders he supplied military assistance for an expedition against Lithuania as well as against the eastern Hordes with which he had been allied earlier. When his brother Andrew did not prepare his regiment on time as was required by the Crimean Tsar, Ivan imprisoned him. But in the following year the subordination to the Tatars ended.

The Crimean Khan wished to occupy Ukraine. Should he incorporate Ukraine to Crimea, the lower Volga region and Kazan, which were his, who would be able to oppose his might? Ivan however made an agreement with the Golden Horde, promising to abandon the cause of the Crimean Horde, provided that he be recognized as independent, making an alliance as an equal. He therefore did not appear with his regiments near Putyvl at the position required by Mengli-Giray and when the Golden Horde blocked the way of the Crimeans, they had to retreat with nothing. The circumstances worked out so well that the Crimean Khans left Moscow in peace until 1521.

## fRtR, p. 124

It was true that Ruthenia was the patrimony of the Rurikids, but also for a long time it was the undoubted patrimony of the progeny of Gediminas! Ivan held the position that **the rights of the original owners cannot expire, so long as there are some inheritors**, even of the furthest possible degree of relationship. It may be worth mentioning here that such notions about property rights continue till this day in Moldavia. The law of repurchase and pre-emption known everywhere at some stage of social development occur there in the most primitive form, and Ivan applied this in respect to Lithuania. The repurchase of course was to be made by armed force. It has also to be noted that Ruthenian law had no such pre-emption law.

At issue was a private-legal notion, the right of ownership. The notion of Ruthenia on the Moscow side was the same as in the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. Ruthenia was where there are Rurikids or where they have been. It would be vain

to seek any national substratum to this, even an elementary one. In the beginning of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. throughout Ruthenia, both that belonging to Moscow and that belonging to Lithuania, no one ever thought of... nationality. This is not an oriental concept and the territories of the Moscow state, directly after the times of Zoe- Sophia!, were rapidly adopting Asiatic features.

### **fRtR, p. 130-133**

In Moscow the time of Tsarist terror began. The Tsar could do whatever he wanted because the state religion would bless anything that he demanded. Vasili beheaded the *boyars*, treated them as his slaves and referred to them as his *смерды* [peasants]. Even his brother-princes had to call themselves his *холопы* [slaves, servants]... This was the beginning of an oriental despotism that copied the Tatar Tsardom. It could spread so profusely, because the Orthodox Church helped it along.

Vasili returned to strict religious fidelity. Under his rule the Josiphlanes (Josephites) gave direction to the Church. They were called so after *igumen* [head of a monastery] Joseph, i.e. Joseph Sanin. They insisted upon a fierce persecution of Bogomilism and so they supported autocracy. They finally determined the strict bond between the Church and the state so that they would support one another. Thus they approved the extensive right of the state to intervene in matters of the Church. The struggle with the Judaizers was not easy, because the Jews, who practiced astrology and were involved in the Bogomil groups, were... the only scholars present in Moscow Ruthenia. Due to their intellectual superiority they had an influence also in spheres that were unquestionably Orthodox.

The Jews and converted Jews played an eminent role in the writings of the Orthodox Church, and since they came from Lithuania the Belarus language appeared in the translations of the Bible and commentaries to it. This did not however reach Zalesye and the Belarus language never passed beyond the border of Lithuania. The victory of Josiphlanism and the suppression of both Bogomilism and the Judaizers were linked through a complicated set of historical circumstances with the separation of Moscow from the cultural developments of other parts of Ruthenia. Thus a cultural distinctiveness of Zalesye resulted.

The Orthodox Church wanted to have correct theological teaching, correct translations of texts and correct commentaries to the texts. It was urgent that the true Bible be distinguished from the Apocrypha that were very numerous and hardly anyone was able to differentiate between them and the true Holy Scriptures. Thus a scholar from Athos was brought in, Maxim the Greek, who had spent much time in Italy and interacted with many eminent humanists of his generation. He arrived. He translated the *Psalter*, and... was persecuted by envious ignoramuses and money-makers of the Orthodox Church. Finally he was convicted for heresy and for an improper translation of the Bible. He was equalled with the princes and he too died in prison. From that time onwards and for many years Moscow Church scholarship, limited to only a few luminaries, consisted in the memorization of some texts, which naively were always to be taken literally and all commentaries were suspect. The basic principle of Josiphlanism was victorious for several generations insisting that "thinking is the source of evil; thinking is the second fall of humanity".

On the basis of Josiphlanism were derived social and state consequences. At first this was only in a loose and

practical sense, as if accidentally, but soon a theory was articulated.

The creator of the Moscow state and culture theory was the monk Philotheus. In his letters to Vasili he reflected upon the history of the Church and of the Christian world in general. The true faith that for centuries was held by Constantinople did not crash together with the fall of the city. "Holy Byzantium did not vanish but was transferred to Moscow" as to "the third Rome, and there will be no fourth". On this basis Philotheus welcomed Vasili as the new "head of all Christendom and the lord of the future of the world".

For a long time there were signs that the religious slogans of Zalesye would be more exclusive than anywhere else and that these peoples would be able to define their identity only on a confessional basis. With this foundation a strict exclusiveness was worked out, with an ever more outspoken and clear notion of their own religion and the consideration of themselves as being a chosen people in contrast to the neighbouring peoples and the heathens. Philotheus finally defined **the basic canon of Moscow culture: the conviction about their own superiority over the rest of the world, founded on a state religion and temporal despotism controlling the Orthodox Church.** The canon of Philotheus became the leaven of a new culture.

## fRtR, p.134-135

As the occupation of provinces progressed, thousands of families of the military troops, courtiers and *boyars* of all the former principdoms transferred themselves "in service" to the one *государь* [Governor, Tsar]. Whoever failed to report to this service would be suspected of

being malcontent and would lose not only his position but could also expect as a certainty a confiscation of his property. Without any precept being decreed, in fact the obligation of "service" was introduced. Since then each son of the *boyars* had to go through military service. Who had not performed his military duty when young could not claim to belong to the *boyar* class. The result was that it was impossible to hold any public office or have any larger land property without being "in service" to the Tsar. Who did not "serve" belonged to the plebs, even if he was very rich; but after some time he would lose the right to own land property.

Thus there were three classes of those who were "in service": the princes, the *boyars* and the *dyaks*. Anyone could become a *dyak*; this was a democracy of the alphabet [only literates could be *dyaks*]. The princes were the aristocracy by birth. In the middle there was the *boyar* class, which was indeterminate. The Tsar's favour could make a *dyak* or practically anyone into a *boyar*, just by giving him use of the prince's villages. These were the so called *помещику* [landowners in service]. At the same time disfavour with the Tsar could result in expulsion from this indeterminate class necessarily connected with affluence. But the Tsar could not deprive the princes of their title, even should fate reduce the progeny of some provincial prince to a very lowly condition. Thus there were many truly impoverished princes who by their lifestyle and social influence stood much below the *boyars*. It has to be noted that numerous princely families resisted the subjection as long as it was possible and they were penalized by the Tsar's disfavour.

In this manner a new social system was developing, which in the next generation was to adopt Tatar elements directly and... to petrify. At the beginning Tatar

influences were only in the state notions and court custom. Vasili liked the Tatar fashion and arranged his court completely in a Tatar mode, embellishing it with shining oriental luxuries. He introduced a fully slavish Tatar etiquette and Tatar attire.

## **fRtR, p. 139-145**

The mindlessness of those who rule is not the monopoly of any culture or any part of the world. But here something else was noticeable. None of these regents ever thought of occupying the throne himself in spite of the fact that the characteristics of Ivan were simply calling for his dethronement. His bad instincts were very clearly differentiated from the noble "sternness" of his grandfather and so he was given the ignoble name of "Terrible", i.e. somebody who was cruel, and yet nobody ever thought of the possibility of depriving him of the throne.

At the age of thirteen Ivan was already "war-worthy" and so fictitiously it was said that he held the reigns of government. In 1543 he had a fit of madness during a court banquet and he ordered that the regent, Andrei Shuysky be thrown out into the courtyard among wild dogs. The order was obeyed and the dogs devoured the regent, while the guests continued with the meal. It is clear that mid-XVI<sup>th</sup> c. Moscow was already totally a part of Asia. It was to go down on this road long and far.

Ivan the Terrible allowed himself to be tamed by the Glinski clan, the relatives of his mother, while he completely ignored his father's relatives. Such a tendency for scheming on the mother's side was a constant feature of the Orient. Thus a second period of the influence of the Glinskis ensued, but also not for long. Their only

political act was the further extension of the armistice with Lithuania in 1544 for a period of ten years.

In January 1547 Ivan was crowned and married, because he was already... 17 years old. He chose a spouse according to the method practiced by the Khans when they wanted to complete a bevy of concubines. Throughout the country the prettiest girls were found and sent to Moscow for the Tsar to choose among them. This Christian Tsar however was not selecting a concubine but a righteous spouse that would be a monarch for the state. Ivan was to repeat this procedure six times because in all he had seven wives. This became the dynastic custom in Moscow.

The relatives of the first wife, the Romanovs removed the Glinskis from the Tsar's favour and government already in the same year 1547. It is difficult to tell in whose hand the Romanovs were to function as tools, but once they realised that they could live and operate on their own account they did not refrain from doing so. When in that year a fire devoured Moscow, which until the mid-XIX<sup>th</sup> c. was wooden, the rumour was spread that the Glinskis had set fire to the city. A mob destroyed their home and the head of the family, Yuri Glinsky was strangled to death. Since then for a long time there were no aristocratic clans in the Tsar's court.

The customs and behaviour of Ivan did not encourage people to commune with him, especially those who could manage without this. The positions in the court were filled by such individuals for whom proximity with the Tsar was such a step in their career that it was worth the experience. People hardened in this "courtship". There were for example those who would not even sigh when the Tsar played in his favourite manner piercing their foot to the ground with the point of his famous walking cane. This was one of his more innocent entertainments!

With time he reached such ease in the Asiatic games of a despotic degenerate that for him it was a trifle to murder people by the dozens, even from his close retinue. He always found the greatest pleasure in the immediate torturing of anyone who happened to draw his attention because he enjoyed seeing the pain of his victim, even if it was his wife.

No matter whom the Tsar was his person was an object of religious veneration. After all Philothus had declared that the Tsar was the representative of the "third Rome" and not the Metropolitan! Thus in the name of the supernatural order, in the name of God's peace on earth, God's kingdom on earth, one should consider oneself an unquestioned slave of the Tsar. This slavery supposedly did not debase, in fact it elevated, ennobled, because it gave man a higher religious sanction. The kingdom of God consisted in the fact that there was a Tsar. Thus a righteous Muscovite could not have any doubts about the form of governance and how could one want to limit the power of God's chosen one? **Whether the Tsar was good or evil, this was something between him and God, and the people had nothing to say about this.**

This is why no one ever thought of dethroning Ivan the Terrible. As long as the state religion was not affected, belief in the mystic world mission of the Tsar protected Muscovite despotism from any danger. It seems that Ivan himself fervently believed in this aspect of his imperial dignity and considered himself to be a religious figure.

The religious substratum of monarchism became the primary feature of Moscow culture and thus a chasm developed between it and the Lithuanian-Ruthenian culture which was moving towards the adoption of liberal Polish notions about his Majesty the King as the first citizen in the state. In fact **the very notion of citizenship was and continues to be alien in Moscow**, because

it is impossible to fit into its canon of principles and views notions about rights and human dignity based on personal values that would be parallel to duties. This is the reason why feudalism in any form could not develop in the Muscovite humus. There were many who were "in service" in Moscow, but the "service law" of Lithuanian Ruthenia failed to cross the borders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The social structures of Lithuanian and Muscovy Ruthenia were very different.

Under Ivan the Terrible there developed a social structure that was perfected to the smallest details having a decisive bureaucratic component. The hierarchical position of each clan was defined with precision following the principle that there are no equals and that everybody was either above or below somebody else. The *Родословные книги* [genealogical books] were written up containing a list of families of princes and more important *boyars*, who held positions in Moscow even before the whole Zalesye was forcibly united. These families would be harmed should they be located below some prince of ancient pedigree whose ancestors were maybe enemies of the fortunate line that delivered Tsardom. Thus these loyal *boyar* families were treated on an equal par with the princes and placed alongside them in the genealogical book.

The starting point for the hierarchical position of a given family was their place within the court ceremonial: where should they sit when invited to the Tsar's table. This had consequences for all realms of life. This is the origin of the so called *местничество* [placing] i.e., the determination of the place at table. A true placement mathematics was worked out, by no means easy, following complicated rules that contemporary European minds would find incomprehensible. Ivan the Terrible delighted in these calculations and he gave a legal status to

these genealogical books, attributing to himself the right to interpret them. He became a master in this field. Appeals against a too low location were sent to him and he personally resolved these complaints. Finally, being obviously exhausted by these issues, he ordered that only the head of a clan had the right to appeal its location in the genealogical book.

Hierarchical justice meted out so accurately only to “the best” met with approval and was desired by all “the good”. Thus the *родословы* [genealogies] were extended so as to cover all the families that Ivan the Terrible considered to be the *boyars*. It was only then, when they were written into the genealogies that the *boyars* became a specific social class, a caste to which one belonged simply on the basis of birth, when this was officially certified. Thus from this moment, one could be very rich, even influential, but if one’s father was not written into the genealogical books, one was not a *boyar*. And from this moment onwards **the ruler could nominate somebody as a boyar**, whereas before, the notion was unclear and had no legal meaning. Thus the *boyars* became a closed caste the access to which was possible uniquely through the Tsar’s nomination. This was so because only a Tsar’s decree would allow for new entries in the genealogical books.

In this way a second formation of Muscovy gentry appeared: the “written in” *boyars*. This was a gentry that had no crests, symbols or clan calls, and was only conditional, because each generation had to be renewed in nobility by being “in service”. Thus the class did not have any dignity of its own; in respect to the throne they were all slaves dependent on the Tsar’s whim. The *boyars* therefore lacked the basic elements of European gentry. In the eyes of the gentry of Lithuanian Ruthenia the Moscow *boyars* were not true noblemen. The

greater the importance of the Polish gentry, transferred then to Lithuania and Lithuanian Ruthenia, the greater was the cultural chasm between the two Ruthenias. All the privileges of the Moscow *boyars* were based on... the forced duty to be "in service". Thus the social placing soon became a service hierarchy, a kind of bureaucracy by birth, because the service position was determined by the placing in the genealogical books. It became therefore a principle that being a *boyar* depended on service, and the position in service depended on birth.

The will of the Tsar could of course make all sorts of alterations, but this was the only sphere of life in which the Tsars, even Ivan the Terrible, considered their power to be limited. Only later did they attempt to free themselves from these restrictions of placing, because the situation was reached that even military rank during war depended upon it. The decision about who was to lead an army was determined by the position in the genealogical books.

A certain kind of correction was supplied by the *dyaks*, who increased in number. They were not listed anywhere and did not hold any superior official positions, but they could be and often were very influential. The Tsar determined the extent of the *dyak's* responsibility according to his whim. These were extraordinary officials who could have any position. And the Tsars preferred people of low social standing because they enjoyed the exercise of their power through the humiliation of the higher and the elevation of the lower.

During the time of Ivan the Terrible a major conflict erupted between the *dyaks* and those of "higher birth". There was a time when the *dyaks* were winning. The smart managed to reach high even under Ivan the Terrible; but no one ever knew for how long. *Dyak Alexey*

Adashev advanced so high that he became as if the premier of the state, something like the viziers of the Khans or the high vizier of the Sultan. He was given as an assistant a clerical companion, no bishop or learned monk but a simple priest, a *dyak* in clerical garb by the name of Sylvester. So as to forestall any opposition from the *boyars* Adashev ordered his subordinate bureaucracy to select people he could rely on in the forts and settlements and to tell them to come to Moscow on a fixed date in 1550. A comedy was organized pretending that they were representatives of the entire country. Their gathering, which took place in the open air in Moscow, was simply an ostentatious installation of Adashev. The *dyaks* showed their power. Village and town people were organized against any possible opposition of those of "higher birth".

The *non-boyar* classes fared well under the rule of Adashev. Local administration was established allowing for some self-government with elected *starosts* and with an autonomous judiciary. This improved life and property security. After all this is the foundation of all communal life. The government of Adashev was beneficial in many ways because he introduced order in the administration. The negative side was the introduction of the chancellery spirit even in the local governments.

## **fRtR, p. 150-153**

Now, in the second half of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. the Tatarization of Muscovy took place on a grand scale.

Strong Tatar social influences contributed greatly to the rapid mechanization of society according to hierarchical ranks. In Kazan there was a strict social hierarchy with three kinds of gentry but access to pub-

lic life and importance derived only from service in the Khan's offices. What so far had only an indirect influence on Moscow arrangements through the imitation of the Khans, now was directly introduced in the state and social organism with full force, because what was from Kazan was considered fashionable. The higher Tatar classes differentiated automatically into bureaucratic-hierarchical ranks, according to the *чиньы* [Chinese ranks] which had persisted among the Tatars dating back to the old tradition of Tamerlane. Muscovite ranks continued to follow the genealogical books, respecting the nobleness of birth. Thus two hierarchical systems faced one another in rivalry until the Tatar proved victorious. Just as earlier conquered Greece imposed its culture on ancient Rome, so Moscow was drawing from the conquered Tatars by the handful. At rapid pace not only the state but also society were becoming Asiatic.

The mixing of the Slav element with the eastern Yurga and the Tatars was not restricted to the *boyar* class. Much of the Slav population moved into the spacious conquered Volga regions. A renewed dispersion of the people began. The extensive character of the Russian form of life began with a very easy struggle for existence. Riches were ready to take, once the people traded along the newly conquered routes in three directions: to Siberia, the Caucasus and the White Sea. Many generations had waited for the occasion to boycott and push out the Bulgar and Tatar trade and to take their place. Once the possibility opened no encouragement was needed. The Slav people began to trade in the Volga region and beyond to such an extent that soon there was a shortage of hands for agriculture. Even the Finns, who had always been farmers, started abandoning agriculture and entered the wide horizons that lay open. As Christian

subjects of the Tsar they profited from privileged conditions enriching themselves quickly through trade. Enormous fortunes were made while wider areas of cultivated land turned fallow because there was nobody to work on it. Trade enticed not only those who had some capital at their disposal, but also quite poor people, who acted as second class intermediaries. These agents, engaged in minor trading tasks as *закупы* [purchasers], took high advance payments and then tried to do something on their own. Quickly some capital was gathered as well as useful information and so they could continue on their own accord, finding others to do the subservient works. These were brought in from Zalesye and offered remunerative positions. Thus they abandoned the *boyar* villages without much thinking and willingly. Even land that was owned was abandoned in search for the Golden Fleece. Trade in the Volga region was exceptionally remunerative and it did not require much intelligence and input. It was so profitable that it was difficult to resist the temptation to abandon everything and take part in it. Kazan Tatars knew these temptations well, and so among them the agricultural population had always been ascribed to the soil because otherwise there would have been... no agriculture.

Thus shortly in the newly occupied territories there were many Slavs, primarily townspeople engaged in trade. Usually individuals would go alone into the wide world marrying some locally encountered woman, most readily a Tatar, because a Tatar of even the lowest rank was considered to be of aristocratic species. It was not surprising that in the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. there was the saying that each Tatar was a prince!

Initially the difference in religion was of no concern, and when the Orthodox Church structures were brought into the new territories once again there was... the dual

faith! Thanks to this particular facility the Church maintained its "purity", in the sense that there were no changes in the liturgy. That was sufficient and since the oriental religious systems were of a lower kind, the Church did not absorb anything of their essence from them. It stood among the population, irrelevant to it, but not deteriorated by it. It stood above the population engulfed in the dual faith, but it did not adapt to this population. Throughout the Muscovy state the Orthodox Church was uniform and everywhere the same.

The maintenance of Church purity in that period was all the more important because this was what differentiated Muscovy culture from that of Lithuanian Ruthenia. During the Reformation the Grand Duchy of Lithuania became very Calvinist and Protestant pastors influenced the Lithuanian Kiev Metropolitan see. The Orthodox Church readily assimilated the novelties. The *boyar* class of Lithuanian Ruthenia, particularly in Belarus, in its vast majority adopted Calvinism. Also other sects were successful but Calvinism was dominant. There was resistance against a Church union, but there was great readiness to accept Protestantism. These influences stopped however at the Lithuanian-Muscovy border. In the realm of the Tsar there are no signs of Calvinism. The purity of the Orthodox Church was maintained. Soon there was a return wave towards Catholicism in Poland and in Lithuania [the Counterreformation]. In their struggle against Calvinism fervent and fortunate Catholic missionaries converted also the Ruthenian Protestants. In this way, and only in this way!, Catholicism of the Roman rite reached the Ruthenian *boyars*, who thus became completely equal with the Polish gentry. The adoption of "Latinism" facilitated further the adoption of Polish culture. Thus the *boyars* of the two Ruthenias simultaneously went in different and opposing cultural directions.

The Muscovites hastened in the Asiatic direction and the Lithuanians were becoming European.

## **fRtR, p. 175-186**

The negative consequences of abandoning agriculture for trade were soon to manifest themselves, even before the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. Periods of unrest came which spelled instability for the state and famine for society. Political influences follow wealth. Since the core of national wealth started to pass from immovable property to movables, the landowning classes felt endangered: the aristocracy, *boyars* and monasteries as well as the class of people endowed by the ruler with the right to use the Tsar's villages, the so called *помещику* [lesser landowners] were increasing in number and obliged to do military service. The fleeing from agricultural work endangered the availability of soldiers, undermining the existence of the *помещику* thus questioning the tradition of the "boyar children". At the same time this disturbed the social and state structure depriving the princes and *boyars* of affluence. Should the role of the trading *boyars* increase everything would have to have a different shape, because in trade it was impossible to form a social hierarchy that would be "in service" for the government, because a trader had no time for this.

There was only one class that had access to public life and was not against the spreading of the population well beyond the centre. These were the *dyaks*. They increased in number as a caste of scribes who occupied the administrative machine. They were supported by the Tsars, who imagined that by freeing themselves from the decisive influence of the clergy and the *boyars* they could rule independently according to their own will through those

who only had an executive function. This illusion pleased the Tsars in their governance. Thus in time their main occupation was the organizing of the *dyaks* in chancellery sections, the so called *розряды* [sets], designated for various special purposes. Towards the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. there were as many as 30 of them and in the mid XVII<sup>th</sup> c. there were 50. The larger the size of the country, or the more dispersed was the population the more field there was for these administrative sections. The greater the need for new ones the more there was the need for *кормлене* [feeding]. It is easier to make money taxing a trader than a farmer.

The mutual dislike between the clergy and *dyaks* grew as a result of different positions on this issue. The Orthodox Church was the owner of half of all the arable land and the escape from the land could ruin it. Thus the clergy was in solidarity with the *boyars*.

Thus all those who had official importance moved against the sudden growth of the trading class. The Tsar himself had to oppose the changes that were undermining militarism and the personal dependence on him of those who were "in service." The problem was further increased by the disintegration of all rural economy, not only the agricultural one throughout the country. People were fleeing the land, ignoring their agricultural duties, not waiting for the time of harvest, not fulfilling any agreed times. The number of prosecutions of those guilty of fleeing the land grew at a terrifying rate. First, there were attempts to prevent the evil by prolonging the time lapse for prescription in such cases, from two to three and later five years. This began in 1590. When this failed, Godunov began limiting the right of termination of contracts in agricultural relationships, thereby tying people to the soil by force. The terrible three year famine (1601-1604) sanctioned this practice. In the times of unrest that

were about to come, whoever held state power reduced the freedom of the rural population to move until in 1607 this liberty was completely abolished.

As a result, only the trading occupation of the Tatars survived, from which they were almost totally excluded. The social system of Muscovy followed the Kazan Tatar model with compulsory tilling of the land. This began with the farm hands, with the *закун* [purchaser] and *смерд* [peasant], but soon this forced employment passed also onto the small landholders and the population of the *деревни* [hamlets].

The *boyar* or *помещик*, the landowner or leaseholder, first of all had to be "in service". Thus he did not live in the village, and did not manage the farm. He was responsible towards the government for the village that he rarely saw, and which he did not farm personally. His responsibility consisted primarily in the paying of taxes. The destruction of village social relationships did not come about suddenly, but it moved in this direction almost from the beginning of the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. extending more and more during the century. It was impossible to deal with every peasant individually being in fact absent all the time and not knowing him. Thus a joint taxation responsibility of the entire settlement in respect to the owner and the government was introduced and the distribution of the taxes from individual families and heads was left to the peasants themselves.

In this way the Russian *мир* [peasant commune] was formed. It was a forced association of the entire population of a district with collective communal land ownership and periodic distributions of the land for use by individual families. Justice required the division of the land according to the size of the family, because the taxation system was based on the number of heads.

It has to be noted that collectivisation was the only method of bypassing the prohibition of leaving the soil. As long as the lord, the local governor and the treasury of the state, *казна* [treasury] suffered no loss, what interest was there in having this or that person in some given place? Since the remaining paid for all, it was immaterial how they collected the money. Thus permissions were granted for seeking fortune in the world, in urban or itinerant jobs, provided the appropriate sum was sent on time. For those that remained the duty was easier, and finally the situation was reached when at least half of the population of a village that was ascribed to the soil in fact lived elsewhere.

This social arrangement led in time to two consequences. Whoever belonged to a given village on a clan basis was always a co-owner of its lands and he had to remain such an owner. This was not only his right but also his burden, which he could not shed, even if he wanted to, because he was not allowed to do so. In class sense he had to remain a peasant, once he was born as such. Even when with the knowledge and permission of his lord and having paid well, he lived in town, being in fact a craftsman or trader, often quite affluent, he could never cease to belong by law to his village commune, where he had to pay his taxes as a collective co-owner. As a result he could never cease to be a *холоп* [slave], neither he nor his descendants.

Thus migration from the land was later taking place quite openly and legally so long as the principle of the peasant commune was not affected. Initially, there was no other exit for the dissatisfied and opponents but to become... Cossacks. One Tatar social system brought in another. The Ryazan Cossacks continued to be in the pay of the rulers of Moscow and they grew in number supplementing their ranks not only with Tatars but also by the

multitude of ethnic groups of the watersheds of Oka and Don. There was never a shortage of individuals who delighted in irregular warring. Their settlements extended along the river Don. Trade and brigandage was their income and the Tsar provided grain. Under Ivan the Terrible these Cossacks were reorganized. They were to be the border force on the Don against the Tatars, whose plundering raids were to continue for several generations. The Orthodox Church imposed unity upon these Cossacks of various origins and turned them all into Slavs.

The Cossacks spread from the Don far westwards, because the steppes were enticing and they offered the possibility of enrichment through the robbing of the Crimean Tatars. Along the river Dnieper a second centre of fugitives from neighbouring countries, Wallachians, Hungarians, Ruthenians and Poles developed. As a rule, amongst this mixture, fugitive Polish noblemen took over command. Already in the beginning of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. these Dnieper Cossacks organized themselves in military fashion. Following the example of Moscow also the Polish Kings took them on in their pay. First in 1531, under Sigismund the Old 2000 Cossacks were registered and later Stephen Bathory gradually accepted them all under his pay, making out of them a permanent armed force on these marginal (Ukrainian)<sup>78</sup> lands. Earning a living through military activity was always attractive for people of the East. The number of Cossacks increased at such a rate that the royal registry could not handle this being limited by the royal treasury and the need of having agriculture in the neighbouring lands. Just as in Zalesye there was flight to trade, so in Lithuanian Ruthenia there

---

<sup>78</sup> [The original meaning of the word Ukraine is "land on the margin".]

were fugitives joining the Dnieper Cossacks. Soon Ruthenia was dominant among the Cossacks, in fact attaining a decisive majority, while others [Tatars, Poles etc.] became Ruthenian through the influence of the Orthodox Church. Also here Orthodoxy tied all the Cossacks together.

The main difference between the Don Cossacks and those from Zaporozhye on the river Dnieper was of economic nature. The Moscow Cossacks avoided agriculture while the "Polish" ones divided life between tilling the land and a war camp known as the "Sich".

Ukraine, the former Kiev land, from the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. began again to be economically functional. The Kings made great donations of open spaces, sometimes of several or even a dozen or so square miles, and as a result the Ruthenian magnates became the greatest entrepreneurs of settlements known to European history. They brought in settlers by the thousands and they needed tens of thousands. Thus they were not happy with the Cossacks who were depriving them of hands for the plough. The Cossacks did not bring women into the Sich. A married Cossack picked up any patch of still no one's land in the steppes, wherever he wanted and established there a settlement, a small farm. They would change places. Some of them were with the Sich, in military readiness, and others were with their families on their small farms.

In these extensive steppes of uncultivated and uninhabited land, the dozen or so thousands of small farms were lost as if nothing. It was a common situation that a farm laid within the territory of somebody's estate. As a rule, the owner of the small farm had no way of knowing that his land had already been donated to somebody, because no magnate used the whole of his land immediately. He would establish settlements and larger farms

gradually as conditions allowed for this. After a number of years it turned out that a Cossack had settled on the land of an aristocrat! The Ruthenian magnate was not interested in the piece of land but in the few pairs of hands from the small farms. The private law there followed the Lithuanian statute to which an extra ruling was added in 1588, providing that whoever had settled on land that was not his for a period of ten years, he became a subject of the owner. Many therefore would abandon their small farms in the tenth year and then move on searching for fortune elsewhere. But there were many others who were affected by this ruling, when they had held a farm for more than ten years, which turned out later to be within somebody else's estate. This ruling was often painful to the Cossacks and it was the first reason why the Southern Ruthenian lords and the Cossacks were at odds with one another, even though they were of the same origin and faith. Today we would say that they were of the same Ruthenian nationality.

At the turn of the XVI<sup>th</sup> and XVII<sup>th</sup> c. there was a moment when in the South of the former Lithuanian Ruthenia, in the provinces that had passed under Poland following the Union of Lublin, a Ruthenian nationality would be formed. The peasant element was a sufficient substratum in every respect so that a nationality could be based upon it. It was numerous and had distinctive features. Finally, a national consciousness started to appear in these Ukrainian regions, for the first time among the eastern Slavs, and this was so because an intellectual class developed and it was influenced by the example of Polish culture.

In Muscovite Ruthenia it was impossible to stop the ordination of illiterates to the clergy. Otherwise, as the synod of 1551 declared, there would be an insufficient number of priests. Meanwhile, in the part of

Ruthenia that until recently had been Lithuanian and now belonged to the Polish Crown the educational level was rising high, not only among the clergy. Ecclesiastic literature was produced, and there were works that could readily be compared with the average theological-polemic treatises of the West. The Orthodox Church on this side of the river Dnieper boldly encountered the ideas of the Reformation, copying the Poles and the Lithuanians in this respect. There were many influences of Calvinism and Arianism among the Ukrainian Orthodox clergy. Just as Radziwiłł in Lithuania, so Prince Konstanty Ostrogski in Southern Ruthenia stood at the head of the "novelties". He was the lord of over 35 towns and a thousand villages. In his native Ostróg, he established a printing house and a higher school of education that aspired, not without justification, to the rank of an Academy. He gathered professors for it from all over the world, profiting also from the mediation of Possevino. This was the first such example in the eastern Slav lands. Meanwhile in Muscovy only "craftsmen" were imported for military purposes. Some faint echoes of this activity did reach Moscow, but they were as if crumbs falling from the Ostróg table. In Ostróg there was the first printing house which published liturgical books for the Orthodox Church. There in 1581 the first complete Bible in the Old Church Slavonic language, the famous "Ostróg Bible" was published. There were attempts to set up a printing house in Moscow, but, fearing that compulsory literacy would be imposed upon them, the lower clergy organized "popular" rebellions, and the printing house was branded as "the work of Satan" and destroyed. The Ostróg Academy however was far from being truly Orthodox. On the contrary, it seeped the Protestant trend into the Orthodox Church. Prince Ostrogski himself was deeply influenced by Arianism.

This Prince Ostrogski, who drew others by his example, was symbolic of the budding national life. Based on the Polish citizen's culture, he considered himself to belong to Western Europe and it was only with this Europe that he sought spiritual and cultural links. At the same time he was an Orthodox, and he favoured the "novelties", because he sought ways for the rebirth of his Orthodox Church. He never thought of abandoning it and was fanatically attached to it. But this had nothing to do with his political views. He hated Moscow that imposed itself as the defender of Orthodox Christianity. He despised the Muscovite ways and held nothing in common with Moscow. On the contrary he saw himself to be completely different and opposed. He saw the two totally different cultures, one of which he wanted to combat. He readily stood at the head of Lithuanian armies so as to fight against Moscow. His whole life was devoted to this combat. At the same time he did not become a Pole and nobody among the Poles considered him to be Polish. He was something different. He considered himself as belonging to Ruthenia, and so we also have to treat him as such. The inevitable conclusion of this is that **Ukrainian Ruthenia (from the Podolie, Bratslav and Kiev regions) began to distinguish itself from Muscovy by way of nationality.** The entire Ruthenian intelligentsia of Ukraine, both lay and clerical supported Ostrogski. From this Ruthenian language the specific [derogatory] term "Muscovite" passed onto the Polish language.

All of this did not last long and the genesis of a Ruthenian nationality was soon to be violently interrupted having scarcely reached the mid XVII<sup>th</sup> c.

At that time religious issues were inevitably tied with the political. Protestantism was in opposition against Sigismund III Vasa, and so Protestant influences drew Southern Ruthenia also into opposition together with

this newly arising Ruthenian nationality that held onto the Orthodox Church. Completely contrary dogmatic reasoning was besides the point here. The vast majority of the intelligentsia in the whole of Europe was equally mistaken.

The Protestants, who were disappointed with the King, came to an agreement with the Orthodox and they were ready to dethrone Sigismund. Then the King came up with the idea of putting a wedge into this alliance. He proposed to revive the Union of Florence. The issue was in the air in the sense that the highly expansive missionary activity of the Latin Catholic Church sought a harvest for itself among all types of Protestants, including those in Ruthenia. In this way, through the mediation of Protestantism, the Latin spirit spread among the leading classes of Ruthenia.

Dogmatically, Orthodoxy is closer to Catholicism than even the mildest form of Protestantism. In fact in the eyes of Catholicism it is not a heresy. This circumstance must have become increasingly obvious to those who participated in the religious debates of the time. It would have been strange that in the period of reconversion of the former Orthodox from Protestantism to Catholicism, the idea would not come up that since it is possible to convert successfully from Calvinism or even Arianism to Catholicism, it should be even easier to convert from the schism... This was the logical conclusion. Thus there were attempts to achieve unity of the "Church of God" in Ruthenia, supported by distinguished members of the Orthodox Church. The King did not invent the Uniate movement, but he grabbed it with an awkward hand, namely a political one. He held onto it wholeheartedly, supported it, hastened it and directed it in his own way. **The Union of Brest of 1596 was half a religious and half a lay achievement, announced too hastily.**

Only White Ruthenia [Belarus] and Podlasie wanted it and were prepared for it, but Sigismund ordered that the Union be proclaimed for the whole of Ruthenia thinking that he could eliminate the schism from his country by... political means.

The whole of Southern Ruthenia sharply opposed the Union at an Orthodox synod called in that same year also in Brest. From that moment the King had fierce enemies in Southern Ruthenia. Konstanty Ostrogski stood at the head of this opposition. In Ostróg violent pamphlets were printed inciting the population against Poland accused of organizing the so-called Union. The Union was understood as being a direct persecution of the Orthodox faith.

The reactivation of the Union moved both Moscow and Constantinople. From Constantinople agitators were sent whose task was making the Union impossible. Cyril Lucaris, the former rector of the Ostróg Academy was the principal agent and his mission consisted in the spreading of hatred against Poland. He had his main headquarters in Ostróg where he was protected by Konstanty Ostrogski who had previously beaten Moscow. But Lucaris and those like him were not enemies of Moscow. In fact, they saw the development of the power of Moscow as being in the prime interest of Orthodoxy. Every agent sent by the Patriarch was at the same time an agent of Moscow. Thus the Union of Brest unfortunately forced into one political camp both the devotees and the opponents of Moscow, who were unified in their opposition against the Polish King, and as a consequence also against Poland.

## **fRtR, p. 199-201**

The Union of Brest resulted in the pastoral concern of the Orthodox hierarchy for the people of Southern Ruthenia,

and in particular for the Cossacks of the Dnieper region, the Zaporozhye Cossacks. Even Phanar noted them. The Zaporozhye Cossacks were a permanent army on the steppes between Poland, the Crimean Tatars and the Black Sea. Thus they were of political and military significance for the Porte. Poland could make out of them an important borderland military force, because their numbers could increase indefinitely. They were sufficiently numerous and through their small farms the steppes could be colonized. Thus an excellent vanguard that was always ready could be made out of them.

They were excellent soldiers and this was known in Istanbul because the Cossacks often made freelance expeditions against the Tatars and the Turks without asking the King or voivode for permission. The Don Cossacks did the same because the spoils from such daring and unexpected expeditions against some region gave them prosperity for many years. Both the Moscow and Polish governments had to punish severely these acts of brigandage, because they could provoke a war with Turkey at a least favourable time. The average Cossack did not understand this; he had too little education and in any case what did he care? He earned his living by wars. If the King or Tsar did not want them to organize plundering expeditions on their own, then they should ensure for them a comfortable existence! As a result Moscow which was militarily organized found it easier to deal with its Cossacks and tolerate them than Poland which avoided militarism.

For a time it seemed that Poland would maintain a very large Cossack registry bringing them thereby under control because it looked that great wars against the Turks were approaching. The spirit of King Stephen was being revived in Prince Władysław and already during the reign of King Sigismund III the Turkish wars began. For

this reason the Porte was interested in generating discord between the Cossacks and Poland. The religious question turned out to be useful for this. Thus the interests of the Caliph coincided with those of the schismatic Patriarch. It was not for the first time that the Patriarchs of Constantinople acted as agents of the Sultan, and the Sultan was the protector of Orthodoxy not only in the Balkans.

Within such circumstances Władysław IV succeeded his father on the Polish and Lithuanian throne in 1632. He was a King who was acceptable to the Cossacks, because he devoted his whole reign to the Turkish issue and had plans for immense wars in which he greatly counted on the Zaporozhye Cossacks.

## **fRtR, p. 209-212**

Again the prime principle of policies was that everywhere everything had to be as in Moscow, but for the first time this was introduced through legislation. The differences of local laws and the traditions of customary law were abolished imposing uniformity in all the provinces. For this purpose a codification commission was set up composed of three princes and two *dyaks*. In this way and for this purpose the *уложение царя Алексея* [*The Code of Tsar Alexei*] was decreed. It was a code of laws that were binding everywhere to the limits of the Tsar's rule, with all things being forcibly set according to the Moscow straightjacket.

Khmelnysky called upon Tsar Alexei in 1649 to undertake a joint operation against Lithuania and Poland. In response the Tsar demanded from Warsaw that the Smolensk voivodship be returned to Moscow. This was a declaration of war, but disturbances in his own coun-

try prevented the Tsar from attacking Lithuania, so he delayed the expedition to some more favourable time.

The Tsardom of Muscovy was going through a crisis that basically was more serious than what was happening in Poland, because it derived not from external entanglements but had its origins in the very essence of Muscovy. After the agricultural overturns which by no means were over, urban unrest exploded which had an economic and a religious source. This generated a deep split within society with a religious war, and besides Moscow also had a problem with its Cossacks just as Poland did and of no lesser magnitude. Thankfully for the Tsardom each of these opposition groups operated independently and their actions were never simultaneous. There was never any agreement among them and the riots were spontaneous, vehement, with no calculation or plan, and void of any order.

The military organization of the state was such that inevitably the taxes had to increase at a faster rate than the economic possibility of the people. Morozov therefore opted for Asiatic fiscalism, a method that was well known to oriental despots, namely to... the fiscal control of trade. Whole branches of trade were declared to be the Tsar's monopoly. This provoked enormous confusion in the economic relationships of the towns, particularly those of the northern provinces and led to a civil war with the towns rebelling against the state. Even the capital rebelled and Novgorod the Great and Pskov had to be conquered anew.

The third Cossack war took place without the interference of Moscow. A 100 000 strong Tatar horde moved into Ukraine and Khmelnytsky mobilized about 200 000 of Ukrainian people who were afraid of Tatar captivity and were agitated by Orthodox priests who in a systematic way were spreading the rumour that the Pol-

ish lords were about to forcefully impose the Union of Brest in Ukraine. (In fact they were the least concerned about this!) Soon a three day battle took place on June 28<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup>, 1651 near Berestechko. This was the greatest battle of the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. Theophanes was in the camp of Khmelnytsky. He was sure of victory because there were three times as many Tatars and Cossacks than the army of Poland and Lithuania. King John Casimir would often stand ground personally and he proved successful here. It was a major victory under his banner. The triumph was commemorated solemnly in Rome, Vienna and Paris because it was rightly understood that the vanguard of the Islamic onslaught was beaten, held back by the *antemurale Christianitas* [bulwark of Christendom — a term often applied to Poland].

Considering the fact that they were defeated the Cossacks were given very good conditions: the Crown land from the Kiev voivodeship would be distributed among them and there would be 20 000 registered Cossacks under Hetman Khmelnytsky. But he wanted to be the reigning prince! With this in mind he tried to occupy Moldavia for himself in 1652, but since the Hospodar there was at the time on friendly terms with Poland, he could not be abandoned. Thus, the fourth Cossack war broke out. This time the Tatars did not support Khmelnytsky and as a result there was no fear of Tatar captivity, so he could mobilize no more than 50 000 armed men. This was a very noticeable fact! With such reduced forces Khmelnytsky feared to give battle alone and he had to search for help elsewhere, wherever it was possible. He applied again to Moscow and it was in this war that the Tsar entered the arena.

In Moscow from the very beginning the matter was understood in no other way than as a simple submission to the ruler of Moscow, in such a way “as things are in

Moscow", that is, as an unlimited subordination to the Tsar's autocratic will with unconditional acceptance of his despotic power. Moscow demanded that the entire Cossack army swear allegiance of fidelity to the Tsar before he would enter the war. This oath had to be sworn, because without it Khmelnytsky would be doomed. The Cossack elders, who received the rights of noblemen from Poland, were told that the same would be given them by the government of Muscovy. They understood that Ukraine would have self-rule, that no taxes would be imposed upon them without their accord, that there would be no officials of the Tsar in the towns but only local autonomous officials dependent on the Hetman, the direct ruler of the country, who would obtain his office by election. In other words, everything would be as under the King but better, because the Tsar's registry would be higher, raised up to 60 000 and the Orthodox faith would not be endangered.

In February 1654 the entire Cossack camp moved, as ordered, to Pereyaslav where they pledged their fidelity to the Tsar in front of representatives of Moscow. Then they asked the Tsar's delegates to reciprocate and pledge the conditions of the agreement in the name of the Tsar. Here the Cossacks met with the same reaction as years back the inhabitants of Novgorod the Great had heard from Ivan the Terrible. They were scorned and sternly reprimanded. How dare they demand an oath from the Tsar! Thus, the very beginning of the matter proved that the Tsar was totally different from the Polish King!

Khmelnytsky's army did not return to Ukraine from Pereyaslav. It was sent immediately against Lithuania where aside the Moscow army it besieged Smolensk, Vilnius and Polotsk. In the southward direction, against

Chernigov and Kiev, the Tsar at first sent only his Muscovite army, because he did not trust the Cossacks.

## **fRtR, p. 214-216**

**A distinct Ruthenian state was established from the voivodeships of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernigov, having its own army, treasury, ministers and offices under the leadership of an elected Hetman.** This state was to be in union with Poland and Lithuania. The gentry of all the three states would jointly elect their common King and would send delegates to a common grand parliament. The Cossacks were to be the gentry of the new state.

For a second time during the Cossack wars the emerging Ruthenian nationality was given complete self-government, this time in the form of their own state. Orthodoxy was to be the basic feature of this nationality. The Ruthenian banner was raised high, as was indicated by the explicit specification that only an Orthodox could hold any public office there. The Ruthenian state had all the means necessary for governance, an army, a treasury and offices. Ruthenian society of the time had all the classes that were needed for the genesis of full nationality: great magnates, the owners of the most extensive estates in Europe, small owners of farms and very numerous folk people tilling the soil. They had more soldiers than any other nation because even the masses learned some military organization during these wars. There was no shortage of traders because everyone there had many possibilities to trade; every Cossack traded. Finally, a class of gentry was to be formed out of the Cossacks, the middle class of the Ruthenian nation.

But this new gentry was illiterate and by "Cossack freedoms" they understood... the unlimited right to brew

vodka. Individuals endowed with some cultural formation were exceptions. The majority was a dark mass and this terrible ignorance meant that all the structures worked out for them by the Poles in the name of peace proved in vain. Left to themselves, moved by their ignorance, they attacked one another.

Now civil wars among the Cossacks broke out over the issue who was to be their Hetman. These wars lasted 22 years until 1680. Throughout this time one Hetman submitted to Poland another to Moscow and the third to Turkey. At times there were simultaneously two or more Hetmans. The Cossacks ceased to be the decisive factor in the budding Ruthenian nationality, and never afterwards did they attain such national consciousness. Amidst the universal anarchy only the mob felt well and whoever had some personal cultural consciousness turned away with disgust from the dominant state of affairs.

The short era of Ruthenian nationality was ending and the episode of the Ruthenian state terminated with the result that whoever did not have to be a Cossack, whoever could manage without this way of earning a living, left the Cossack ranks and being ashamed of the atrocities committed during the Cossack wars dominated by the most appalling mob, tried to conceal any trace of participation in this. Those who were to form the Ruthenian gentry were abandoning Orthodoxy *en masse* and converting not to the Uniate Church but directly to the Roman Catholic faith of the Latin rite. Towards the end of the Cossack wars and as a consequence of them the entire Ruthenian intelligentsia and the whole gentry class of Podolia, Volhynia and Ukraine became Polish. They did not want to have anything in common with the heinous murders, brigandage and licentiousness and so they defended their moral sense under the wings of Polish cul-

ture. From then onwards and as a consequence of the war Orthodoxy remained the faith of the peasants of Ukraine. Only those who could not abandon the Ruthenian identity, namely the simple people remained with it.

Such was the end of the first national consciousness in the eastern Slav lands. Ruthenian nationality evaporated in the horrors of the Cossack wars and ultimately these wars strengthened Polish nationality in Southern Ruthenia.

## **fRtR, p. 218-224**

In 1667 a compromise was agreed upon with Moscow, which divided Ukraine. The armistice signed for 13 years in Andrusovo gave Smolensk to Moscow, while in exchange Polotsk and Vitebsk as well as all the acquisitions Moscow made on Polish Livonia were returned to Lithuania. Ukraine was divided along the river Dnieper. The eastern side was to belong to the Tsar and the western to the King. Since the Tsar was unable to deal with his Cossacks, he asked that he be permitted to introduce his garrison into Kiev for a period of two years. This was accepted, but once the "Muscovite" entered Kiev, he never left it.

Kiev, "the mother of Ruthenian forts" after whole centuries of varied circumstances found itself in the hands of the disdained "Suzdal region" from where "the Tsardom of the whole of Ruthenia" emerged. The Cossack wars have a significant place in the history of culture and this was also so because they tightened the bond between Kiev and Moscow. The former "whole Rostov land" to a large extent had been a settlement region of Southern Ruthenia and the Kiev Pechersk Lavra was the mother house for all monasteries in the eastern Slav

lands. The Orthodox Church had always revived and improved its standards when it had Metropolitans from Southern Ruthenia. It was always the case that revival came from the South. Even the Muscovite state initially [before the domination of Tatar influence] had been organized by men from the South. Later the relationships weakened only to be revived again at the turn of the XVI<sup>th</sup> and XVII<sup>th</sup> c., when the Ostróg Academy was flourishing. The subsequent Academy established in Kiev by Mogila had a direct impact on Moscow. This derived from Church studies of the Biblical texts.

Once the books used by the Church were printed, the settling of the textual version became an issue. The books that were used in Ruthenia had many errors made by copyists and resulting from an inadequate knowledge of languages among the translators. These errors were being discovered as the liturgical books were prepared for printing. Already in the days of Tsar Nicholas [Romanov] there was hesitation as to whether the errors should be maintained uncorrected because they have already been... confirmed by tradition. An interesting and remarkable conflict broke out, with the question being raised where the faith had "greater purity", in Greece or in Ruthenia, that is, where the manuscripts of the Scriptures are better?

Patriarch Nikon was in favour of Greek theology. He cared much for the raising of the standards of theological studies. In this matter it was possible to refer to what had been worked out in Ostróg and Kiev in the field of exegesis and this should have been done. The Kiev school of theology was exerting an increasing influence but at the same time it provoked suspicion and resistance because the Kievans... knew Latin and in general they relied on Polish culture. When a learned brotherhood, led by the Greek Arsenius and the Ruthenian Jepifanij Slavynckij

(†1676) moved from Kiev to Moscow, Nikon entrusted them the work of editing a correct version of the Church books. During the “Council” of 1654 the Patriarch had a resolution passed requiring a scientific revision of the texts. This resulted in great opposition extending well beyond the Council.

There were two sources of the opposition. The introduction of corrected texts was to take place through the imposition of the printed versions. This implied the obligation of learning how to read and write. This was tedious, whereas it was simpler for the priests to remain illiterate! Furthermore, the court preacher, Symeon of Polotsk (†1680), who was also educated in Kiev and was the author of theatrical mysteries based on the Bible modelled on similar Polish versions, called for the establishment of schools for candidates to the priesthood! There were also deeper reasons for the reaction. Entire generations had become accustomed to certain forms and expressions which for the followers of the *двоеверие* [dual faith] functioned like incantations. A minute change in them was interpreted as a deprivation of these formulas of their magical power. And why should they be changed when they proved good and effective for so many generations?! With horror it was discovered that novelties were to be introduced, that the innovators write the name of the Saviour *Isus* rather than *Jisus* and that they make the sign of the cross with three fingers instead of with two etc. Gradually Patriarch Nikon was acquiring the opinion of being the Anti-Christ...

Again a violent conflict broke out as to the superiority of “Greek theology over the Ruthenian” and it affected the court of the Tsar. In 1658 the Patriarch left Moscow settling in a neighbouring monastery which he had established. He lived there foreight years, and then in 1666

he was exiled to the White Sea. Through a strange type of compromise his person was sacrificed, whereas the crux of the issue was preserved. In that year the Tsar ordered that copies of the corrected books be sent to the eparchies and major monasteries. The result was that simultaneously in various parts of the country an open and violent opposition broke out protesting against the "corruption of the Orthodox faith". Fanatical priests and many people touched by religious frenzy wandered from fort to fort encouraging a direct active opposition.

The revision of the texts proved to be the drop that caused the container to overflow. Terrible post-war poverty, famine and pestilence prepared the ground for revolution. The inflation was such that bronze coins were introduced having a nominal value in place of the silver currency. This fact alone gives an idea about the depth of the economic crisis and the increase of the costs of living! Under such conditions the taxes were raised and various restrictions to trade were made through the introduction of state monopolies! And yet the people would have accepted all of this in silence as coming from the holy person of the Tsar, but the problem was that the Tsar had perverted the religion... Thus there occurred the one and only case when an upright Muscovite could stand up against the Tsar. He had corrupted the faith and so just as Nikon he was becoming the Anti-Christ. The fact that he had exiled the Patriarch and deprived him of his Patriarchal office was irrelevant, since he ordered that prayers were to be celebrated according to his heretical books.

The social and state formulas of Moscow had to be rooted in religious humus; only then did they have value, power and life. Both the state organization and revolution had to have this basis, because without them they would be meaningless. Opposition over such issues as famine, exploitation, ruin, the tying of peasants to the

soil and the blocking of the earnings of traders would organize and change into a revolution only when a religious moment was attached to it.

Since 1668 the opposition had its main headquarters in the famous pilgrimage shrine, the Solovetsky monastery in the far north. From there slogans about the defence of the endangered purity of faith came and there the *раскол* [split, schism of the **Old Believers**], the religious civil war began. The entire society, all the people divided into two camps because the quandary of consciences affected all the classes.

It can be said that the *раскол* (split) was a gift of Ukraine to Moscow as a consequence of the introduction of the printing press... Since the schism was based on clear errors in the religious texts, it could not have survived had there been a systematic furthering of education. Those who unawares were the cause of the conflict, the Kievans, the graduates of Mogila's Academy, had every right on their side. Had the social reasons for rebellion subsided and were ignorance to be replaced by education, the problem limited to a purely theological matter with no social colouring would not have persisted. The Kievan influences would then have been the foundation stone of what is often referred to as the "Europeanization of Russia".

The cultural revival of Muscovy could effectively come from the same source from which it sprung in the past, namely from Southern Ruthenia. This Ruthenia was subject to Polish influences and was already exercised in "Latin scholarship", adopting even though slowly some elements of Western culture. Through the mediation of this Southern Ruthenia some kinds of secular writings adapted from the Polish language were reaching Moscow.

A similar phenomenon occurred here as was the case with Byzantine influences. Just as Byzantinism came to be known after it was subjected to transformation in Wallachia, so Europeanism could be grafted onto the Moscow soil only after an appropriate Orthodox transformation and this could be supplied only by the Kiev Academy and by Southern Ruthenia in general. Direct Polish influences were excluded for religious reasons and in any case the cultural rift was too great.

Unfortunately for Muscovite Ruthenia, the Kievan culture did not survive. Kiev lost a great deal by being transferred to the Tsar. Cut off from Polish culture meant that very soon Kiev had nothing to offer Moscow, and so it fell to the level of... Muscovite ignorance. But also in Ukraine on the right bank of the Dnieper the Ruthenian nationality broke away from the new offshoot of European erudition which seemed to bud in Southern Ruthenia and was sending runners northwards. All of this declined, stamped out by the Cossack "rebellions." Thus Cossackdom became not the foundation of Ruthenia but its grave. What sort of backward influence this lack of a proper source of European culture was to have on the history of Russia, became soon manifest, when Muscovy was transforming into Russia and seeking cultural support beyond its natural cradle.

This region was already in decline when the Andrusovo armistice was signed in 1667. The diplomatic negotiations were conducted from the side of Moscow by Nashchokin, the famous Pskov *boyar* who merits to be called the first European in Moscow, a man of genuine righteousness, a great organizer of the eastern trade and a builder of the first ships on the Volga and the Caspian Sea. By a coincidence, perhaps not accidental, these ships were to be destroyed... by the Cossacks.

The Cossack wars took place not only within the Polish state. They also touched upon Muscovy even though there was no menace of the... Union of Brest there! The Don Cossacks organized rebellions no less frequently than the ones from Zaporozhye until in 1670 there was a general conflagration in the Moscow state led by the Cossack Stepan Razin, who organized a military society comparable to that of Khmelnytsky. The reality was the same, but only the circumstances were different. Razin was not exploited by the neighbours of the country for their own political aims and so everything happened as an internal affair of Muscovy. In the eastern arena of Cossack activity there was no national feeling, no sense of distinctiveness or national unity and there was no religious agitation. The "rebellions" of the Don Cossacks manifest the symptoms of oriental communal life, untarnished by any side influences, namely, the genesis of a political society on the basis of a military organization that simultaneously served as its economic substratum.

## **fRtR, p. 230-232**

The bureaucracy was expanding and became more powerful at a truly terrible rate, the example for which would have to be searched in the original source of this surrogate of a culture, namely in Mongolia! The families that were ruling the country "at the time", about which it could be said that they had "married" into the *самодержавие* [autocracy], were never sure of their own future. Thus they were interested in pushing the princely families as low as possible and in elevating the bureaucracy. Towards the end of the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. the bureaucracy already encroached on all fields of life constantly inventing for itself new issues and responsibili-

ties that were said to be essential for the state. There were already as many as fifty *приказы* [orders] i.e. governmental departments dealing with various matters and each one of them was densely populated with serving *boyars* and *dyaks* and had many subordinate regional offices in the provinces. The *dyaks* were the intelligentsia of these departments, but they were not in charge nor did they even run the regional offices in the numerous towns of the wide provinces of the Tsardom. The *boyars* were in charge even though as a rule they were illiterate. The *boyar* officers of the bureaucracy derived from the obligatory "service" of the distinguished families and the distribution of positions was determined basically by the *местничество* [placing, meaning the proximity with the most influential people in the state]. This principle was held onto so strictly that soon it brought the administration into an absurd condition, and there was no way how this principle could be bypassed. Increasingly frequently it was announced that in some branch of the service, a position would be assigned "without the placing", i.e. to a *dyak* or *boyar* that was competent for a given job regardless of birth. Such exceptions, through sheer necessity, happened increasingly frequently, and this enhanced the importance and fame of the *dyaks* and not the *boyars*.

The bloated bureaucracy was a force with which every "autocrat" had to deal. At times of crisis the Tsar would call a sort of parliament of his bureaucracy. These were the so called "land diets" in which the higher bureaucracy, both the *boyars*, only those who were "in service" and the *dyaks*, as well as the higher clergy took part *ex officio*. Elected members representing the lower clergy and the lower bureaucracy took part only when it was considered necessary to invite them, which was not always the case. Since the middle of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. until the

middle of the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. there were 17 such “land diets”. They flourished under Tsar Michael, and then slowly they declined as an institution of public life. They were never a representative organ of the population. Delegates of the people were allowed to take part only once, in 1613. In their genesis and their development and structure, the “land diets” had nothing in common with West-European institutions such as the Estates General, class parliaments etc. They ceased to be called because they were too inconvenient for the people “of the time”, who did not like to recall the memory of Adashev.

In order to have a free hand with respect to the bureaucracy, in 1682 a decisive step was taken. The “placing” was totally abolished. This basically was a positive step. It was announced then that priority in leadership positions would be given to the graduates of the Slav-Greek-Latin Academy.

The introduction of Latin as a compulsory subject for study for candidates to higher positions, both clerical and lay, was a true “window opening to Europe”!

The fashion deriving from the Tsar’s court was causing increasing objections amongst the wider masses who regarded the shaving of beards as a sin and the teaching of Latin as heresy. *Раскол*, the schism of the Old Believers increasingly was becoming an opposition against all innovations, a cultural, political, economic and moral opposition. It was a comprehensive, basic and total opposition, impervious to all arguments, all actions and to any logic of facts. This was so, because it was based on an erroneous understanding of the religious foundation.

The government did not hesitate in the employment of a radical solution against the schismatic *расколники*. They had to be exterminated. The measures turned out to be a failure even though in 1681 the burning at the stake was tried. Martyrdom added lustre to the cause

inviting ever new followers, generating fanaticism, finally reaching such a stage that some groups committed joint suicide burning to death. The persecution strengthened the foundations of the "Church of the Old Rite", which in time was to have its own hierarchy, both clerical and lay, set apart from the entire state system. The ranks of the schismatics grew in proportional reaction to the government's following of the course that later was referred to as the "Europeanisation of Russia". Various opposition groups joined together, even though they had little in common, with the net result being that modern Russian sectarianism was born. The initial "schism" was centred on the *Старообрядчество* [Old Rite]. After the death of Feodor Alexeyevich even more severe persecution followed, during which several new sects were discovered.

## **fRtR, p. 238-239**

Peter undertook the journey which in his days was tedious not only so as to learn the carpentry of ship building. He wanted to check out personally whether Moscow could use European contacts for its own internal and external needs.

The Tsars have always regarded Europe with contempt as a collection of countries that did not have any real monarchy, because even in the most absolute monarchies, the subjects had some rights. Thus the Tsars considered themselves to be much above all the Kings of the West. They despised Europe also because it was deprived of the true faith. Peter Alexeyevich was not a pious devotee of Orthodoxy, but he valued it for its being identified with the Tsardom. He had contempt for Catholic Kings whose power was so limited that they had

to share it with the Pope, they themselves being only sheep in the Church and not the pastors. In his eyes these were symptoms of profound inferiority. Thus he had respect only for Protestant rulers, because they were enemies of the greatest, as he understood, enemy of monarchism, namely, the Pope, who so impudently restrained the power of Kings in a field the importance of which he understood so well. For Moscow the Papacy implied setting limits on despotism, therefore it was a revolutionary and anti-social institution! Peter was well informed about Protestantism since his early years by the officers of the German Quarter. For this reason his whole journey was primarily focused on Protestant countries. It was there that Peter had political issues to settle, both internal and external, whereas Vienna, Venice and Warsaw were needed only for external purposes, but were unsuited to offer him any advice concerning internal policies due to their Catholicism.

Moscow was enchanted by the whole of Europe, both Protestant and Catholic in the field that always impresses the Orient, namely, in the technical side of their arrangements, particularly the military ones. Basing on his own fresh experience from Azov, Peter recognized the value of technology. He conquered the port city only thanks to the employment of a Western technique, as was earlier the case with Ivan III when he took Kazan. Peter was aware that Moscow would not supersede its European neighbours, Poland and Sweden, whom it would like to confront over Livonia, White Ruthenia [Belarus] and Ukraine west of the river Dnieper, so long as it was unable to produce its own craftsmen, officers and engineers in appropriate numbers. Peter understood that the secret why the European states could easily have a sufficient number of people in these professions lay somewhere beyond the army, in the some factors of the

civil life. He wanted to resolve this mystery and wrench it away from Europe and that is why he personally set out on the journey.

## **fRtR, p. 242-243**

Peter drew the models of his reforms from Protestant Germany. As from 1698 the Germanization of official Russia begins. Whenever there was a need to introduce some new administrative ordering, Peter profited from the opportunity to impose something German. This began with the copying of the German *Landeskirchen* [regional Churches] in which the monarch was at the same time the Head of the Church, not only factually but also in the legal sense. When in 1700 the Moscow Patriarch died, Peter forbade the filling of this post and so the Church remained without a leader until twenty years later, Peter declared himself to be the Head of the Church. Since in this time he had to deal with four Metropolitans all of whom were equal in rank (of Moscow, Novgorod, Rostov and Kiev) he managed the Church as if it was divided and he even used one Metropolitan against another. Thanks to this he succeeded in taking over Church property, in fact increasingly so. At the same time he imposed obligatory literacy on the clergy and required that bishops would run schools for the sons of priests. Whoever failed to attend a school was recruited to the army for twenty years. He ensured that the Church, from now on the prime institution in the state, would have state protection. Thus the state had to guarantee the orthodoxy of the citizens. As in German states, which jealously followed the principle *cuius regio, illius religio* [whose rule, his religion], it was the state authority which had to ascertain whether the citizens fulfil their religious obligations.

Thus Peter required that the state would control church attendance and the reception of the sacraments. The “Old Believers”, who did not recognize the Church and the clergy using new liturgical books, were oppressed even more. The officials liked to exaggerate when dealing with the *расколники* [schismatics], because then they could extort bribes from them. As a result Peter was becoming the heir of Patriarch Nikon as the “Anti-Christ”.

## **fRtR, p. 247-248**

Sweden had an ally in the South in Mazepa, the Hetman of the Cossacks who like Khmelnytsky dreamed about a principedom for himself. Also he was of Polish gentry, deriving from the Kołodyński family of Volhynia, and he too was educated in Jesuit schools. He was in contact with Charles XII and with King Stanisław Leszczyński since 1705, having agreed with them to carve out of Ukraine east of the river Dnieper a principedom under Polish protection. He also made a separate treaty with Sweden for the Swedish expedition of 1708, offering to submit all the forts in the Seversk region and bring in regiments not only from the Dnieper Cossacks but also from the Don. The political plans were changed. He was to obtain a principedom for himself not in Ukraine but in the North, namely in the Vitebsk and Polotsk regions while all possible acquisitions in the Ukraine were to be incorporated into Lithuania and Poland. This agreement is ample proof that the action of Mazepa had no national foundation, such as the differentiating of Southern Ruthenia from the Muscovites and that Mazepa did not represent any other interests apart from his own.

**fRtR, p. 256-258**

No less than dealing with foreign policy Peter was constantly engaged in introducing various reforms. He was systematic, full of energy and devoted to the task, but he was not always successful. He was impressed by the bureaucratic apparatus that he saw in Germany, which was so centralized that it facilitated the personal rule of the monarch. The King of Prussia could receive in audience just a few men and he was informed about every aspect of communal life in the state. This was so because the heads of administrative departments had wide competences. The Prussian King could confer daily with his handful of ministers, but how could the Tsar converse frequently with the 50 *boyars* or princes that were in charge of the 50 *приказы* [authorities] i.e. the governmental departments for various issues? Peter therefore started to combine a few or a dozen of his departments into a single dicastery until he ended up with only ten "governmental colleges" dependent upon a "governing senate". He divided his entire bureaucracy into eleven *чины* [tchini — ranks]. (The word came to Ruthenia from the bureaucracy of Tamerlane through the mediation of the Tatars.) Again following the German custom, he gave them special titles. From this moment the original terms such as the "serving *boyars*" or "*dyaks*" disappeared. The whole country was divided into twelve provinces each now referred to as a *губерния* [governance] according to the German terminology taken from the French (as almost the whole official German nomenclature). Peter made these reforms in the years 1711–1717, and just before his trip to France he introduced the "governmental colleges".

This whole reform was a major blunder and it could not serve its purpose. The Tsardom was too extensive to be governed in a way that was appropriate for relatively small states that were densely populated and had an educated and wealthy citizenry. In the extensive and unpopulated areas of the Tsardom personal rule could be maintained only through the system that had already been tested in the Orient, namely, through satraps, i.e. superiors over everything in a given region. This could not be done through ministries each having a strictly defined competence in the state. The grafting of a German bureaucracy onto the Russian soil so as to strengthen personal rule was only an illusion. Only forms were applied but without the content. On humus that derived from Chinese, Mongolian and Tatar traditions it was impossible to successfully graft what had developed from legalism, from a reception of the Roman law. Peter ignored all those aspects of Muscovite administration with which the reforms could be tied, if it is at all possible to reform a bureaucracy. Thus in fact he did not reform anything in the field of public administration. He only imposed a revolution in a field that was least suitable for revolutionary experimentation. As a result Peter's "reforms" led to chaos and administrative anarchy with the German system of administration distancing the Tsar from personal governance that soon was to be entirely in the hands of the bureaucracy.

But not in everything did Peter copy the Germans. He introduced the scheme of "three classes" in a different manner than was practiced in feudal Europe. The Orthodox clergy were not considered a "class". The "third" class according to Peter were the peasants, but the rural population became even more backward in comparison with the European agrarian system. Not only did he forbid the private property of the peasants, but it was

he who made the organisation of the *мир*, the peasant commune compulsory. He imposed throughout the entire country in all its settlements the joint responsibility of the local commune for the collection of taxes. The commune system was then extended beyond the Zalesye, in particular in the former Tatar territories in the North and among the new Cossack settlements near the Ural Mountains. The municipal population was divided by Peter into three "guilds" according to the Livonian model. He required that the *boyars* be considered as the *дворянство* [nobility] and he nominated profusely many counts and princes.

## fRtR, p. 260-262

Being secure on the outside and internally Peter finally moved to an open placing of the Tsar at the head of the Church. Imitating closely the German *Landeskirchen* (country Churches) **he assigned the central administration of the Church to a body called a "Synod", just as in Germany but with the added adjective "Holy". It was to be a body that was completely dependent on the monarch, composed of clerics and laymen, under the direct supervision of an ober-procurator, a lay person representing the Tsar** and dealing directly with the Tsar. The typically Muscovite mentality of Peter was evident here, in that he always attached excessive importance to the form. Also before, the grand princes of Muscovy were in fact the governors of the Orthodox Church which was always meekly subservient to the Tsar! Formally the head of the Church could only be somebody, who had the title to interpret the faith, thus a clergyman. Peter abolished this state of affairs and entered into the field of consciences so as to

be a Head of the Church even in the formal sense only out of the love for the formula.

From this moment there was an incurable disorder in the Church due to the divergence between its principles and governing order. Theologically Orthodoxy has nothing in common with Protestantism which allows for a free interpretation of the Bible. Just as Catholicism, it is based on the principle of authority. If Orthodoxy was not to be left dangling in the air and reduced to absurdity, it must have at its spiritual head a person of theological authority, residing in Constantinople or in Moscow, a Metropolitan or a Patriarch. No layman, not even the Tsar, could be such an authority. With this change in 1721 some of the most faithful Orthodox started to have doubts as to whether there was any visible structure of the true Church, or maybe it should be sought in the *раскол* [schism]. As a result sectarianism was on the increase to such an extent that soon only the dignitaries of the state officialdom could be counted as the flock of the "Holy Synod". **Since Peter's time religious indifference crept into the ranks of the bureaucracy and even among the clergy, tied with the hypocritical participation in the liturgy.** The "reform" of 1721 deprived the Church of its social value and in state life it was pushed aside from a leading and often creative position to a purely executive and passive function.

When in this way the power of the Tsar was adorned with the attributes of a German Protestant prince, in that very year 1721 Peter adopted the title of an Emperor so as to stress that he was not only ahead of all the princes but in fact he was equal to their titular Lord, the "Roman" Emperor. In the Russian language the new title was *императоръ* [Imperator] and it was used alongside the old title of the *Tsar* which was maintained. Thus Peter had in mind a title that was to be higher than that of

a Tsar. This was to be a decoration, an ennobling of the title of the Tsar. Not every Tsar was an *Imperator*, but he reached this altitude. In this there is some copying of antiquity, where the Caesars were given the title of Emperor by the Senate; in principle it was a personal title. This was how Peter understood it. In his mind each one of his successors had to personally prove his merit before adopting the title.

That was not the end of the titles. Both supreme authorities, the Senate and the Synod proclaimed Peter to be "Peter the Great, the Father of the Fatherland". It is obvious that the Slav-Greek-Latin Academy did not teach about the classical world in vain and that everything could be of use for "state" needs! This was the only monarch who was referred to as *Great* in his lifetime, because... he himself gave himself the title.

Death surprised him two and a half years later, on January 28<sup>th</sup> 1725. The final years of the constantly active Emperor were devoted to an expansion of his realm over Caspian countries at the expense of Persia. In 1722 Derbent was conquered for the Tsardom and in 1723 Baku.

## fRtR, p. 270-271

The relationship between the state and society that resulted was of a worse and lower type than the former discrepancy between society and state. **The state became something that was beyond society.** Never in the history of Europe did something similar come about. No European state would manage to persist in such a condition, but the Russian state emerged from this... strengthened. The conclusion is that **for the existence and development of this state, its relationship with society**

**was indifferent.** The state machine could function well beyond society, even in the period after 1725. The state consisted of two spheres: the court, and the triple bureaucracy, ecclesial, civil and military. Whenever these three factors would stick together and be at the disposal of the court, the state remaining outside of society could develop and flourish, follow an active foreign policy, make encroachments on neighbours and grow into an ever stronger power. But there was only one condition, but an essential one: this triple bureaucracy had to be affluent. This is the secret of the state system of Russia. The difference between Russian and European bureaucracy is manifest in this: in Russia, the military penetrates ever more the higher administration, whereas in Europe increasingly the soldiers were excluded from the governance of the state and from politics. The symbol of this state being beyond society was the armed bureaucrat, the general-cum-tax-collector. Having a monopoly in administrative routine and in power, the armed bureaucracy knew how to impose its will both down and up, upon the population and finally upon the court. Frequently, the court would submit, because it was unsure of its future, constantly in fear whether some new plot would bring in changes among the people at the top. It was only a question of who would wield power and not a question of policies.

### **fRtR, p. 279-284**

A great deal has been written about the supposed opposition of German and French cultural influences in Russia and conclusions were drawn from this so as to construct an image of the political history of Russia at the time. But the undeniable fact has to be noticed that the clos-

est source of French influences was the court of Frederic the Great of Prussia, who despised even publicly everything that was German. The difference in the attitude of Peter III and Catherine II to Frederic the Great was such that Peter was a clumsy, inept, thoughtless pupil of the Berlin master, copying him in a caricature manner, whereas Catherine was his best student, full of subtle understanding for his methods which she knew how to apply in a way that was suitable for the given time, place and circumstance. Nobody ever removed the Germans, and the French custom was furthered by the Germans themselves! The literary-advertising relationships with French writers were first established by Elisabeth, and then they were continued by Catherine. The Germans that were brought back, after having been expelled by Peter III and the new Tsarina willingly employed them in state service. Münnich became responsible for the Baltic ports and dozens of new Germans were hired.

In the period of the state being beyond society the whole superficiality of the "reforms" of Peter the Great came to the open. These were only bureaucratic reforms which did not lead the Moscow world towards Europe, because in the entire next generation a truly Asiatic relationship of the state to society was possible. A typical example for this period was the "humanitarian" decree of 1754 that abolished the death penalty, but with the exception for political crimes! If the mark of "Europeanization" were the bureaucratic forms, then Peter III, the most ardent admirer of European uniforms, was perhaps an even greater reformer than Peter the Great!

European influences were coming in, but not from the offices but from books. Peter the Great had a certain role here, even though it was similarly superficial. The heretical Latin brought deeper changes than all the official "reforms"! And Latin had been introduced or rather

permitted to be used by Feodor Alexeyevich. In the days of Peter the Great it continued to exert its influence. It had such a potency that once the embryonic leaves were allowed to bud their development was not retarded even in the disgraceful times of most horrid orientalism, the years 1725–1762.

In this period society manifested its existence in three fields of life:

a) Sectarianism proliferated enormously. This had nothing to do with “religious creativity” frequently attributed to Russia. It would be a strange “creativity” the main condition for which was ignorance. Not a single sect appeared that could be appropriate for intelligent people. The main cause for the appearance of numerous sects was the fact that no one in Russia knew the catechism, not even the parish clergy. As the Bible in Germany so in Russia the dogmas were left to the good will of society that was ignorant.

b) The second field of life that was flourishing at the time was trade. Internal custom duties were abolished and thanks to the Asiatic acquisitions and the access to the sea there was a fantastic increase of prosperity. The struggle for material existence became easy not requiring any exertion of mind, will or nerves. Even the lazy were not endangered by poverty in Russia — and this always is the greatest calamity of society. (Famines appeared later for other reasons. They will be discussed in time.)

c) The intellectual life was slowly flowing, although following a narrow rivulet, but it had a constant influence, even beyond the awareness of society. Latin was playing its role. In 1755 Shuvalov set the foundations for the Moscow University. This was true “Europeanization”! What results it provided we shall soon see. We

must remember that the essence of universities is criticism, thus also scepticism...

To begin with one consequence became apparent that seemingly was casual and yet it was fundamental and important. The study of Latin grammar for two generations greatly developed the native language and did more for literacy than several previous centuries. In the third generation writing was on the increase, and thus literature was born. Lomonosov (1711-1765) is a representative of the second generation. He was an encyclopaedist dealing with mathematics, history and novel writing. He was a legislator for the written language and the creator of artistic verse. In this period several private theatres were set up and in 1756 a court theatre was established in St. Petersburg. There the first follower of Molière, Sumarokov worked. Tsarina Catherine II wrote comedies and demonstrated literary ambitions even in her letters which were deliberately written... to be printed. With her person was associated the entire biography of a representative of the third generation of Latin in Russia. Derzhavin (1743-1816) was the man, the first inspired Russian poet, who started to publish in 1779.

In this way the Russian literary language appeared, thanks to the school of Latin and without any genetic connection with anything that had been written in the eastern Slav lands since the days of Nestor. Thus a second national consciousness appeared in the eastern Slav lands, which was soon to become manifest to the full in the person of Karamzin (1765-1826). It is to his credit that literacy was soundly and finally based upon the folk language of the people of the former Zalesye.

The nationality of Lomonosov, Derzhavin and Karamzin was not in any contrast with the former nationality of prince Ostrogski or the Academies of Ostróg or Kiev in the days of Mogila. There could not be any opposition to

them for the simple reason that the initiators of the new formation knew nothing about the former. There was no memory of the former centres or even the slightest continued tradition. Both these movements formed spontaneously, independently, with absolutely no connection, to such an extent that there was no occasion for any antagonism. The earlier achievements died out and so the initiators of the new Russian literary language had no knowledge of them.

From the days of Catherine II, the term "Russia", a noun without an adjective became common in the Russian language. In the Polish language we immediately differentiated between the adjectives "Russian" and "Ruthenian", while throughout Ruthenia, for the whole of the eastern Slav lands, both notions have the same adjective *Русские* [Russian, Ruthenian]. According to the Polish understanding of national issues these were two nations, but since the national consciousness of the Ruthenians did not develop, having disappeared after a short episode, thus besides the Russian nation there were the Ruthenian people, the nationality of which was to be settled only in the distant future.<sup>79</sup>

Latin, the mother of nations in the West raised a national consciousness even there in the East, in spite of the fact that the notion of nationality absolutely does not belong to the attributes of oriental culture. Thus in Russia the perplexity of two cultures began, leading to a crisis that so far has not been resolved.

---

<sup>79</sup> [The Ruthenian people have now developed into the Belarus and Ukrainian nations.]

## **fRtR, p. 284-286**

The state functioning beyond society that Catherine II had inherited viewed society only in one case: when there was a rebellion. Thus the Cossacks were most commonly remembered. Their revolts against Russia were not any less common or less violent or in any way different from their rebellions against Poland. After the revolt of Mazepa, his "Sich" was transferred deeper into the steppes onto a Tatar region. In the days of Anna Ivanovna they were allowed to return to their original sites, but at the same time their "Cossack rights", that is their camp-social arrangements were restricted even more. But the prospect of autonomy moved the Cossack masses less and less. In the days of Elisabeth the revolts were caused only by issues tied with the forms of their struggle for existence which the Cossack liked to be easy. The main reason for their dissatisfaction was the unavoidable historical process of colonising the steppes which the Cossacks considered as their property as a whole and in every respect. All restrictions pertaining to their presence on the steppes were considered by them government abuse. On the extensive steppes on both sides of the Urals the Cossacks claimed that they had not only freedom of trade with the whole of Yugra and with wandering tradesmen of various ethnic groups, but also they had a monopoly so long as the trader and his wares were on the steppe. A Cossack considered himself to be free to raid and rob on the steppe and the state had no right to intervene. Whoever settled on the steppe should pay the Cossacks for the privilege and not impose any restrictions of movement on them without paying anything in exchange! The regular systematic colonisation of the steppes begun during the days of Peter the Great

and continued under Elisabeth and even more energetically so under Catherine II seemed to the Cossacks to be an attack on their wellbeing, on their "Cossack freedom". Should the whole steppe be gradually colonised, where then could he be a Cossack? Thus this was a constant struggle of a semi-settled and semi-nomadic element with modern arrangements that were eliminating their customary laws, their method in the struggle for existence. A Cossack liked to see travellers across the steppes but hated to see settlers who were not members of his Cossack fellowship.

In 1771 as many as 170 000 wanderers set out to cross the steppes. What a harvest for the Cossacks! When the Tsar's government forbade the robbing of travellers across the steppe a rebellion erupted, which due to its ties with a number of other circumstances became an important historical event, while several dozen earlier revolts had only a local significance.

The western Mongols, known as the Kalmyk people moved from Dzungaria onto the Volga having conducted this migration in a most regular march over a 12 year period in the years 1618-1630. When permanent colonisation and the regular authority of the Tsar came too closely to their settlements they decided to return to Asia. In 1771 the return migration numbering 170 000 heads began. A small portion of them remained on the left bank of the Volga, because they were prevented by an unexpected flood. The Cossacks were ordered to withhold the Kalmyk emigration, but they were forbidden to rob them. The government wanted to force the Kalmyks to return with their whole property, and it was precisely in this point that the interest of the Cossacks directly clashed with the projects of the St. Petersburg ministries.

Since Cossacks refused obedience, a regular army regiment was sent to chase the Kalmyks. The Cossacks did not want to renounce their "rights" and from misunderstandings there came clashes that ultimately resulted in a universal Cossack rebellion. The entire "Cossack army" moved against the Kalmyks so as to plunder the wandering people or force them to pay a ransom. The issue concerned the whole Cossack community. They killed one German general and submitted to another. It seemed that the revolt was quashed but it continued to simmer. In 1773 it erupted again with dual force.

## **fRtR, p. 288-290**

The substratum of the Pugachev rebellion was not political or ethnographic but exclusively economical. The peasant people supported him because just a few years earlier, in 1767 they were handed over as plunder to the arbitrary will of the landowners and forbidden to place complaints against them. The "schism" supported any action against the government which relied upon the "untrue faith", because they were persecuted. Catherine II herself was completely indifferent in religious matters. Externally she manifested her Orthodoxy but she understood that the state had no interest in generating an opposition on an ecclesial basis and so she refused to continue the persecution of the schismatic Old Believers. During the Pugachev rebellion, she proclaimed an edict of tolerance (1773) freeing the sectarians from all bureaucratic exploitation. **She allowed for all religious organisations except the Catholic.** But a reservation was made that the clergy of any tolerated denomination cannot be subordinate to some superior authority that would be abroad. Thus Catherine introduced the

German-Protestant principle of a *Landeskirche* [country Church], and she held on to this rule all the more willingly because it placed all ecclesiastical property at the disposal of the monarch. Most Tsars eyed the enormous properties of the monasteries with envy, but it was finally Catherine who devised a harmless way of secularising them without raising the suspicion of being unorthodox. She changed the subjects of the monasteries into subjects of the state by imposing upon them a head tax of one and a half rouble annually, and this was to serve the maintenance of the monasteries. Thus the management of monastic estates and agrarian issues in them were now handled by the state drawing benefits from this.

There was no need of the Pugachev rebellion to perceive that the administration did not enjoy the confidence and attachment of the populace. Catherine had serious intentions to reform the bureaucracy of the administrative system of Peter the Great. That bureaucracy led to the horror of a state that was beyond society. It has to be admitted that the Orlovs and Catherine tried to establish some bond between the state and society, but they failed to do so. One of these efforts was the oldest Russian law against bribe taking officials (1763) and the new organisation of the Senate that truly wanted to prevent abuses, even though this was completely unsuccessful (1763).

The beginning of the rule of Catherine had also a beautiful face. This German princess was Europeanising Russia, because she opened many schools, with all her authority she supported the Academy of Sciences and the Moscow University and made preparations for the establishment of three further universities in St. Petersburg, Kazan and Kharkov. She organized a Cadet College (1762) and what is most characteristic she was interested in the establishment of schools for girls (1764–

1765), hoping to have the title of the "Semiramis of the North". She was very attentive that progress in the state would be treated as her personal achievement and that Russia would not be considered to be a part of Asia. More and more diverse cultural elements were being intermingled mechanically. How could universities for whom criticism is fundamental be reconciled with a despotic form of government? A compromise between critique and blind obedience was an absurdity. Thus the next generations were to gather the bitter fruits of these compromises. In the meantime Catherine was happy to hear compliments from the luminaries of French literature in which she delighted as much as she cherished those of the most "enlightened" princes of the German Reich. In the literary market, she was ranked higher than those who were abroad, because... she was richer. She also supported the sciences, and gave impulses for historical research (Schlözer, Miller, Shcherbatov), but woe to anybody who would write something about the not completely European origin of the Russian nation, particularly of its gentry. The order came that Russia from its very beginning was to be viewed as ethnographically and culturally European and if any academic found something else, he immediately fell into disfavour. This was an indication what the future Russian universities would be like...

### **fRtR, p. 291-293**

A "reform" was introduced a few years later in 1775 and this was entirely in the bureaucratic spirit. Not taking into account the historical specifics of the provinces, the entire state was divided into 50 *губернии* [governorates, provinces], with several of them tied into

general-governorates. The military element was increasingly entering the administration, and a major part of the judiciary was separated from the administration. The centralisation, ever more systematic, was constantly putting into practice with greater precision the old motto that "everything has to be as in Moscow". This greatly facilitated things for the rank officials. The entire country stood open to them and when they were transferred to a different governorate they did not have to learn anything new. Also they did not even have to show any interest in knowing the governorate to which they were sent. It was the responsibility of the region to adapt itself in some fortunate way to the official.

In the provinces those who had the right and duty to serve the state and who since Peter the Great were called the *дворянство* [gentry] were organized. It was again the same class of ranking officials, but in a different form. The obligation of "service" was supposedly abolished but electoral rights in gatherings of the nobility were given only to those who at least reached the rank of sub-lieutenant in the state or military service. Thus full nobility was continuously dependent on "service" and at the bottom of everything there were the official ranks evermore comfortably and widely taking over everything.

The bureaucracy willingly evened everything out, whatever it could, failing to comprehend unity without uniformity. When in 1775, Potemkin abolished the Cossack *Sich* this did not have to be considered a consequence of the Pugachev rebellion. Even without the rebellion this would have happened, because everywhere the mode of action was to be the same following the old motto that "everywhere things should be as in Moscow". But the abolition of Cossack licence was a genuine necessity for the state and a sign of progress of public law and order... The steppes had to be colonised!

Having such a background of the internal situation Catherine II waged her foreign policy, the aim of which was imperialism with a truly expansive swing, because she decided on the conquest of Poland and Turkey. Whether these acquisitions were necessary for Russian society, for its development in any field, is another question. Was the Russian nation ultimately to benefit from these aggressive conquests or not, no one at the time could predict. For historical studies the fact that Catherine II had no intention of easing her despotic power and no one in the whole country ever thought of this is of decisive importance. With all these "European" reforms the system of the "Russian Empire" was to remain the same as it was in the earlier Muscovy times: it was to be a military oriental despotism. **Such a state can exist only if it is engaged in conquests, and once it ceases to do so, it has to crash.**

The rebellion of Pugachev provided ample proof that the internal structure of the Russian state was not strong. Basic reforms turned out to be unfeasible. The state should have crashed, because after all it had already entered the poisonous atmosphere of a state being beyond the society. It would have fallen had it not received support and new steam in the new conquests. The imperialistic plans of Catherine II saved the Russian state. Turkey survived, but Poland became the fuel of Tsardom in the coming century. The Russia of Peter the Great would have fallen to pieces had it not been consolidated by the acquisitions of Catherine, the partitions of Poland.

## **fRtR, p. 310-312**

The greatest crime ever committed in the history of the world was the glory of the reign of Catherine II and

for this she obtained the title "Great". This "moral misunderstanding" entered deeply Russian mentality and it revenged itself by the fact that in a slavish way the greatness of Russia became dependent on the ruling over Poland and from this time onwards the entire Russian politics had to deal uniquely with this issue. And this uniqueness drew with it increasingly worse consequences for the society and finally it undermined the entire state. From this moment not a single issue that was important for the state could be taken care of properly because everything was always devoted to only one question, subordinated to only one concern: how could the domination over Polish territories be maintained? Ever since, the history of the Russian state is a history of political neglect. The only vitality of the state was its expansionism. In consequence the state developed in such a way that it did not serve its own nation in anything. Thus the development of society took place beyond the state and again there was a discrepancy between society and the state.

Through the partitions of Poland, Russia geographically entered Europe. From this moment onwards Russia had to succumb to European influences; this would have happened even without the reforms of Peter the Great.

In the partitions of Poland Russia did not obtain any region that was ethnographically Polish. It only had Lithuania and the old Lithuanian Ruthenia, but the culture of these regions was decidedly Polish with a fair percentage of ethnically Polish population, in some regions coming up to 50%. There was no Ruthenian culture or any Ruthenian national consciousness in these lands. What had previously developed in this direction in the meantime had vanished. The Russian state could not acquire anything of this at all. This was a great loss for the Russian nation and state, because its significant Europeanization

could have taken place only through appropriate influences coming from the Orthodox Ruthenian people. The direct contact with Polish culture only generated a centrifugal scepticism. It sparked envy and hatred, deprived of any positive action which on principle was excluded. **As a result of the partitions of Poland Russia came too much into contact with the culture of the West.** The lack of some intermediary element, of some bridge brought in consequence a terrible disorientation.

In the Russian zone of partitioned Poland only the peasants were Ruthenian and yet at every step there was a cultural difference, even though an unconscious, passive one. In the Ruthenian lands of Poland the peasants were subjected to the lords but there was never any *муp* (the Russian peasant commune). The land was assigned to each peasant personally, individually. There were different notions about land ownership and the attitude of the people to the state was different. Above the peasants there was a class of people who for the first time appeared in the Muscovite-Russian state, namely, a real gentry. The notion of citizenship clashed with the notion of state subordination, and no compromise between these notions was possible. Polish culture was more distant from the Russian in this respect than the notions of societies living further in the West, who having passed through the reception of Roman law, the fall of feudalism and enlightened absolutism may have seemed to Russia at least initially to be closer. But there were mutual illusions on this issue with the belief that western absolutism was identical with eastern despotism.

## **fRtR, p. 335-338**

Russia decidedly had a greater influence on Europe due to the Napoleonic wars than Europe had on Russia.

Hardly any Russian officer during the Napoleonic advances had sufficient intelligence to observe, compare, draw conclusions and perceive where exactly lies the difference between the European way of life and that of the Russians. Dissatisfaction was only among the most intelligent, as a rule among the aristocrats. Freemasonry moved from the West to Russia and other secret societies developed from it, but fruitlessly. The Napoleonic wars brought some Western “revolutionary” elements into Russia just enough to organise conspiracies... that proved useless. A plot against the life of somebody, be he even the monarch, does not need many participants, but it cannot bring about a change in public life, if the necessary background in society is lacking. The Russian majority was in full solidarity with the *самодержавие* [autocracy].

Once Napoleon, the promoter of revolution in Europe was defeated, Alexander was relieved. Now and then he still pretended to be a liberal, but he persecuted liberalism systematically. In conquered Paris he established the “Holy Alliance” — a united policy of Russia, Prussia, Austria and the Bourbons, which declared absolute rule and political oppression to be a... religious duty. This was a continuation of the ideology of Philotheus of Pskov articulated in his letters to Vasily Ivanovich, based on the same religious motives.

After the Napoleonic wars the most authentic tradition of Muscovy revived, capable of new life, because it was modernized. Thus Russian hegemony in Europe ensued, the adapting of Europe to Russia.

The monarchs frequently came together so as to discuss the suppression of “revolution”. Under the leadership and protectorate of the Tsar there were congresses on this issue, in 1818 in Aachen, in 1819 in Carlsbad and Opava, and in 1820 in Ljubljana. In 1822 in Verona the

subject matter of the deliberations was the maintenance of the "divine order" not only for the good of one's own subjects, since the care was extended over all nations staving off "godlessness" here or there, as for example in Naples in 1820 or in Spain 1822 wherever emerged the spectre of constitutionalism. Everywhere "legitimism" was claimed, a term invented by Talleyrand, previously Napoleon's minister, who later served under the Bourbon Louis XVIII. This slogan was taken very seriously by Alexander. He advanced the principle of noncontestation of "legitimate" rule (i.e. the one existing at the time when the "Holy Alliance" was established) to such an extent that he even condemned the Greek uprising against the Turks in 1821.

The whole of Europe became covered with a network of conspiracies against the "Holy Alliance". Congresses and conspiracies were typical of the times. The three dynasties of the partitioning powers [Prussia, Russia and Austria] were the backbone of the "Holy Alliance". For them the holding of partitioned Poland had to be the primary end. This was understood very well in all countries and so by contrast, if for no other reason, the Polish issue up to somewhere around 1850 was linked with the "question of the peoples".

Alexander gave the Congress Kingdom a constitution, but he was not in a hurry to swear on it or even to be crowned King of Poland. The constitutions of Finland and Poland became a problem for the Russian state. Necessarily they had to be tolerated and sometimes even some word had to be said for the benefit of the Russian malcontents. It is true that Speransky went into exile in 1812 when war against Napoleon was approaching, but now he returned to offices although he had no political influence. In 1818 when the country was already covered by a network of secret organizations, Alexander

finally decided for a coronation in Warsaw. In his throne speech he included a fragment about the extension of the constitution, but this was done in such a way that for a long time there were polemics in Poland and in Russia whether he had in mind only the occupied territories (Lithuania and Ruthenia) or whether he thought about the whole Russian Empire. So as to dispel the doubts, whether a constitution could be tied with autocracy, the Tsar ordered that a project of a Russian constitution be prepared. The task was given not to Speransky but to a subservient courtier, Novosilcov, who was a small but exact copy of the Tsar himself. The latter did not treat the task committed to him seriously and he leaned upon his secretary, a Frenchman Deschamps. (The draft prepared by him was "discovered" later, that is, in 1830.)

The major part of Russian public opinion followed Karamzin claiming and believing that autocracy ensures the safety of Russia, that its unquestioned continuation was essential for the country's happiness and that "salutary fear" was a beneficial factor of public life. The vast majority of Russian liberals started to hesitate. They were outraged by the fact that the Poles were to have "privileges", namely constitutional arrangements, which the Russians did not have. Their envy was turning into hatred. The hatred of the West that had been cultivated for long centuries now had the object of this hatred at hand! Not only the "Emperor" but also the entire nation wanted to abolish the state distinctiveness of the Congress Kingdom and change it into a province dependent uniquely on Russian arrangements. The old Russian principle that everything everywhere "has to be as in Moscow" again became actual and with vehement force. The majority of Russians interpreted the distinctiveness of the Kingdom as a personal offence. The hatred of Poland generated the unity of the state and so-

ciety. Something hitherto unknown in Russian history emerged, a state based on society.

## **fRtR, p. 343-347**

As every Tsar also Nicholas I was engaged in the reform of the bureaucracy. He understood the administration of the state in his own way. "During his long reign he was convinced that the country and nation are governed just like a military unit". Nicholas has been described as the "first disciple of Karamzin". Among the despotic Tsars he was the most despotic and so he understood governance in a military fashion. "He considered the nation as a gathering of common soldiers and the bureaucracy as an obedient, hierarchically organised detachment of commanders of various ranks". The ranking officers not only had no right to object in any issue, but they were also not to have their own mind, because it is the task of the command to think for the subordinates. Thus under Nicholas I "the police and censorship followed carefully every sign of independent thought, every more noble beating of the heart". The censorship consisted of ever more obvious servility coupled with stupidity. This was a period when "literature in Russia was burdened by this strange, obnoxious for human dignity condition which the fable writer Shchedrin, described as being obliged to use the language of Aesop, and being forced to tangle thought to such an extent that ultimately it became incomprehensible". Gogol only once managed to speak out openly and clearly in his *The Government Inspector*. This comedy characterises well the oppression of the administrative ranks in the days of Nicholas I. All outstanding Russian writers came to know prisons from their own experience and furthermore, all their lives they were

tortured by the censorship. The greatest Russian poet, Pushkin (1790–1837) after suffering various kinds of persecutions experienced the dangerous honour of having as his censor... the Tsar himself.

Having confidence only in the military, Nicholas greatly increased the role of the soldiers in the administration. The result was that bureaucratic habits were moved to the management of the army. The disastrous effects of this were to become clear already during the reign of this Tsar. He set up a committee under the leadership of Kochubey for the reform of the administration and started work on a general codification that had been abandoned already during the reign of the previous Tsar. These works lasted 14 years. They were begun in 1827 and the first volume of the *Свод законов* [Code of laws] was ready in 1832 with the following ones appearing up to 1840. Speransky as an expert advisor was allowed to take part in this project but no liberal notions were permitted. Finally, in spite of the great apparatus working on them the reforms of Nicholas I were limited to only a few details, the most important of which was the further separation of the judiciary from the administration and a reform of gubernatorial offices, introduced in 1830.

The “most famous” part of “the reforms of Nicholas” concerned the field of education. He simply decided to restrict scientific activity and reduce school attendance to the minimum that was required for the appointment of administrative positions. The Tsar never understood the value of science as such, beyond the sphere of governmental exams, and he always considered it as politically suspicious. In 1835 a special law was passed for universities reducing them to an absurdity and in 1850 lectures in philosophy were directly forbidden, because it was deemed that this field unnecessarily disturbs the

minds. Books from abroad were forbidden and the Tsar's subjects were not allowed to travel abroad so that they would not bring back any depravity from there. In 1851 a passport law full of restrictions was introduced.

Holding on to the tradition of his father Nicholas staunchly rejected the idea of giving property rights to the peasants, even though he was not against improving their situation through some partial decrees. The condition of crown peasants improved greatly during his reign, but it deteriorated in private properties because of the increasing arbitrariness of the owners of estates and the provincial ranking administrators. There were even some local peasant revolts.

A novelty of the reign of Nicholas was the government's adoption of the program of furthering the Russian identity. Forcing people to be Russian primarily meant the obligatory imposition of Orthodoxy. Thus all the sects were persecuted, the Protestants were "converted" and the Uniates who did not want to convert were oppressed. In 1827 came the idea of the complete abolition of the Church Union. The Union had always been sustained artificially, in that Poles were becoming Uniates so as to assure that there would be no shortage of clergy in the eastern rite attached to the universal Church. Thus the government cut down the Union in its root, when in 1827 it forbade Latin rite vocations to the Basilians. But the consequences of this decree were not awaited because already the next year the abolition of religious houses and parishes began, and in 1832 the Uniate Basilians were completely abolished. The ignoble treachery of the apostate Siemashko who had been appointed bishop through government support ultimately attributed the semblance of a *воссоединение* [reunion] with Orthodoxy to the violence which Siemashko officially imposed in 1839 in the incorporated territories. As

a result, the Union remained only within the Congress Kingdom. The reign of Nicholas differed from that of the tolerant Alexander I primarily in this religious persecution.

Nicholas was also different from his brother in that he was not concerned about "legitimism". He firmly held onto the Holy Alliance because he considered it beneficial for himself. Also he saw himself as a protector of all monarchs against all constitutional parties and all secret organisations, but he treated all this as a form of Russian hegemony over Europe and as a strengthening of his own autocracy. He articulated these issues with extraordinary clarity and honestly without inventing personally any theories. Alexander, exhausted by the Napoleonic wars could have or even had to retreat from imperial expansionism and so he saw it proper to define this or rather conceal it under the theory of legitimism. Alexander had expanded the borders of his state earlier by taking Białystok, Bessarabia and the Grand Duchy of Finland, even though it remained autonomous. He declared a termination of acquisitions when he received the Polish Kingdom! Russia at this moment was satiated with Europe and it needed peace to digest the acquisitions. Legitimism anyway was held to be binding only in respect to Europe, and not in respect to Asia! Nicholas could not proclaim this formula because every Tsar had to extend the boundaries of the state. Conquests could not stop, because that would be the end of Tsardom. It would then crash.

## **fRtR, p. 354**

[T]he protective spirit of Tsardom prevailed over the whole of Europe. Tsar Nicholas indeed was the monarch

of monarchs. Nothing was happening not only against him but even without him. It seemed that finally Europe was "organised as it should be" and that the order of the world was established for good. The years 1832-1848 were the zenith of absolute rule. The system of Nicholas was extended over the whole of the European continent. That was the summit of Europe's adapting to Russia.

## **fRtR, p. 358-360**

Not all people reached the foundations of the critique. There were many more who settled with the reality without thinking about changes. But since human nature cannot manage without the formulation of something that would be worthy of acceptance, something that even if it is not ideal is at least praiseworthy (because otherwise the spiritual life dies out and the inability for intellectual development ensues), many started to come up with theories about Russian issues claiming that the features of Russian life seem to be wrong and negative only to the pathological pessimists, simply because they do not understand them. It is impossible to measure the Russian way according to notions taken from the West, because Russian culture is distinct and its pillars are those things that are criticised in the West, namely Orthodoxy, Tsardom, autocracy and the uniqueness of relationships among the rural population. The Russian features were thus justified and even praised by the Aksakov brothers (Ivan and Konstantin), Khomyakov and the Kireyevsky brothers, who gathered a circle of writers and journalists. They perceived in the defects and insufficiencies of Russian life, its originality, as if, some specific Slav element of culture and hence they were known as the *славянофилы* [Slavophiles]. Even joint

land ownership with its periodic partitioning in the Russian peasant *мур* [commune] was considered by them to be something specifically “Slav”! They convinced themselves that Russia having such a rich basis for its own culture did not need to learn anything from the West. On the contrary, standing higher it could liberate the West from its inevitable doom that would come as a result of its revolutionary inclinations. This new trend tried to reconcile Tsardom with society. Soon the Slavophiles came to terms with the most modest reaction considering it a flourishing of the specific Slav culture, while the *западники* [Westernizers] (Byelinsky, the historian Granovsky, and the philosopher Herzen) tried to assimilate the achievements of Western science.

Since the expression of political views was forbidden this was maybe precisely the reason why nowhere else as in Russia the thoughts of the general public were tied vehemently and in a lively manner with every move of the government in foreign policy, hoping that the success or failure of the government may support the followers of one viewpoint and hinder those who held the opposite view. Since the days of Nicholas the Russian intelligentsia was interested in foreign policy almost exclusively from this point of view.

Around the year 1850 for the first time on the Russian horizon, hesitatingly at first, there appeared the question whether the mission of Russia was to civilise Asia? If that was the case should not everything that distinguishes Russia from the West-European culture be cultivated? This line of thought was on the increase because Nicholas I was decidedly proceeding towards the conquest of Central Asia. In 1839 the Kyrgyz steppes were incorporated into the “Empire of the white Tsar” and the action against Khiva began. Soon the famous advance of general Perovsky along Syr Darya took place.

Throughout the reign of Nicholas I further battles over the Caucasian countries continued. Around 1850 major advances were made in the easterly direction seeking an extension and an addendum of Siberia as far as the left bank of river Amur. Russia pressed onto Asia in two directions so as to become an Asiatic power.

Soon the tendency to separate from Europe found a political basis in European politics, when the Tsar resumed his advances into the Balkans. Those who tried to formulate a Slav culture for Russia could not fail to notice that in the Balkans there were Slav peoples and Orthodox at that, thus they were suitable for the "Slav" culture in particular because since under the rule of the Sultans they had no opportunity to be infected by the Western revolutionary spirit. Thanks to the Balkan wars the Slavophile current became also a political doctrine.

### **fRtR, p. 362**

During the siege of Sevastopol Tsar Nicholas died on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1855. He was forced to admit that "the command required improvement". The Tsar's headquarters were already hearing opinions coming from Europe that Russia was "a colossus on clay feet" and that Russian hegemony over Europe had ended with the Crimean war.

### **fRtR, p. 365-367**

Meanwhile in spite of all police efforts, during the reign of Nicholas I Western influences were affecting Russia and the more, normal contacts between Europe and Russia were prevented, the more abnormal cultural misunderstandings were facilitated. Criticism of things Western degenerated in Russia into a hatred of all authorities

and Russian thinkers competed in their aggressive critical fervour, which led to the denial of everything. Western European notions adopted without the mediation of Southern Ruthenia or even Poland generated dizzy confusion in the minds and caused disorganisation.

Towards the end of the reign of Nicholas, the journalist Dobrolubov claimed that “apart from government autocracy there is also a whole legion of family, class and society despotisms”. Why should the struggle be only against the autocracy of the Tsar, why not against all of them? Thus a current was born that was not interested in a constitution, because that was... a trivial, marginal issue. What they wanted was the destruction of absolutely all existing institutions of communal life, so that on the ruins of the old world a completely new one would be built. What sort of order? This would be the problem of the next generations; for the moment what was clear was that now destruction had to prevail so that those who would follow would not be bound by anything.

Thus nihilism, a typically Russian speciality appeared. Pisarev, a successor of Dobrolubov whose doctrine had a universal impact on vast sectors of the Russian intelligentsia in the years 1860–1877 overturned the “authorities of tradition” in the name “of liberating the human personality from all shackles”. He desired “an individuality unrepressed by service to some ideals”. He negated everything and decisively opposed the “striving for common ideals”. In his *Scholastics of the XIX century* of 1861, he even declared himself against the furthering of literacy among the peasants. He rejected all European science and art, all philosophy. He only tolerated the natural sciences according to the naive view that the “natural sciences had not built anything and destroyed so much!”

Such followers and further disciples of Pisarev were not interested in a constitution! As a result the constitutionalist current declined in Russia. For a long time the last project that was proposed was that of Valuyev in 1863, which had a modest request of a parliament having only an advisory role. From then on no one spoke of a constitution until 1880. The "liberals" of this generation such as Suvorin or Katkov restricted themselves to the call for granting property rights and local governments. They asked for reforms but did not touch the autocracy. In this they were similar to the Slavophiles, who included despotic Tsardom among the basic conditions of the culture which they liked to call "Slav."

## **fRtR, p. 372-375**

The passionate enmity of the Russians towards Poland, since it was a representative of the "Latin world", took on after 1863 such a dynamic and such vehemence, that it became as if a basic dogma of Russian patriotism and this has never since subsided. There were some more reasonable and more ethically educated individuals such as Alexander Pypin, who wrote *Польский вопрос в русской литературе* [The Polish Issue in Russian Literature] or Boris Chicherin, the famous professor of law at Moscow University, but these were exceptions and voices calling out in the wilderness. The liberals who previously had called for autonomy for Poland, such as Suvorin (*Новое Время* [The New Times]) and Katkov (*Московские Вестники* [Moscow News]) became vehement supporters of the most violent oppression of the Poles and if this contradicted the principles that they had held earlier they renounced them and promptly joined the camp of the reactionaries. It was dangerous to risk

being accused of supporting the Poles, and so steps were taken so as to avoid such an accusation. Only the revolutionary *Колокол* [Bell] of Herzen, who resided in London, supported the Poles, but this circumstance only added fire to the general hatred. Fidelity towards the Tsar was measured by the degree of virulence against the Poles.

The earlier "Slavophile movement", that initially was a mere theory glorifying the peasant *мир* [commune], gradually changed into the political doctrine of Pan-Slavism. The essence of the Russian identity was defined in three terms: autocracy, Orthodoxy and *народность* [populism]. Aksakov saw the expansion of the Russian state as a religious mission. Translated into the language of the administrative ranks this meant that Orthodoxy had to be furthered by force eradicating in particular any remnants of the Church Union. In 1864 the Basilian Order was abolished in the Chełm region and forced "conversions" were imposed. In this there was also some voluntary participation of Orthodox clergy from neighbouring Galicia. There since 1848 sympathy for Moscow was being spread against the wishes of the Austrian government which tried to strengthen a national consciousness of Ruthenians as distinct from that of the Russians. Hatred of Catholicism was articulated in the form of a doctrine of the "true" Slav lands and the "dissenters". Only the Orthodox could be true Slavs and those who were not Orthodox were "traitors of the Slav cause." From there there was an easy step towards the conclusion that Russia, the defender of Orthodoxy was at the same time the protector of all the Slavs, having the right, or rather the duty, to punish the traitors among whom of course in the first place there were the Poles. Other Catholic Slav nations had still such a low level of self-consciousness that in every one of them it was possible to easily find a fair number of "representatives" who

would be willing to convert to Orthodoxy and even adopt the Russian language as the common language of all the Slavs, the only permitted literary language in all the Slav lands with all other languages being only "local dialects" not excluding the "dialect" of the Poles, the "rebels and traitors".

On the basis of such shallow, child-like doctrines the famous "pilgrimage to Moscow" and the "Slav assembly" were organised in 1867, the focus of which was directed against Poland and indirectly also against Austria, while Prussia was increasingly viewed favourably by the government spheres. Scarcely two years after the fall of the Polish uprising, Austria was defeated totally by Prussia in the war of 1866. Bismarck could undertake this campaign only because he was sure of Russian support<sup>80</sup>.

Amidst such foreign affairs there were the beginnings of local government in Russia. Land assemblies were organised at county and gubernatorial level composed of representatives of all three Russian legally sanctioned classes: the land owners, the peasants and the town people. The assemblies were introduced by a decree dated January 1<sup>st</sup> 1864, but only for the 33 gubernyas [governorates] east of the river Dnieper. The former Polish territories were excluded as a punishment. The decree was published because the matter had been prepared earlier and postponed much too long and for this reason there were fears of the "liberals." But when after the Polish uprising the liberals inclined to come to terms with the government on their own, searching for points of accord, the court of Alexander II started to regret the publishing of the decree. Thus the authorities undertook

---

<sup>80</sup> [At that time Russia was withdrawing from its easterly expansions. It sold in 1867 Alaska to the USA.]

steps to repress the activity of the land assemblies that had just been established.

At the celebration of the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the land assemblies somebody referred to them as a Cape of Good Hope, but... the Cape was “ever more frozen”. Already in 1866 the St. Petersburg assemblies were disbanded due to a conflict with the administrative ranks. Around 1870 the satirist Shchedrin said that showing disgust towards the land assemblies was “something like a letter of recommendation” among the official spheres. The struggle of the bureaucracy against the self-governing bodies increasingly manifested the inequality of power to the detriment of the land assemblies. In particular their activity in the field of education was curtailed.

## **fRtR, p. 376-378**

There were hopes that the entire opposition would be drawn into the government bandwagon. Amongst the “Slavophiles” there was no longer any opposition. In 1871 Nikolay Danilevsky published *Россия и Европа* [Russia and Europe], a book which entered the bloodstream of the Russian society. He claimed that Russia was not Europe and did not need to be a part of it, because it was superior and better than the “rotten West”. Danilevsky formulated the political aim of Russia that was to be the conquest of Constantinople and the establishment of a “Pan-Slavic union” under Russian leadership, whereas the Poles were destined to be annihilated. Even Konstantin Leontyev who ridiculed the Slavophiles and in many ways was closer to nihilism smoothly came to an agreement with the government becoming truly the philosopher of political reaction. He made the discovery that “the search for a universal equality of rights and an

all-human truth... is a terrible poison that is decomposing European societies through its gradual philosophical influence". In his book *Восток, Россия и Славянство* [The East, Russia and the Slav Lands] Leontyev competed with Pisarev in proposing the theory that denies the value of all work in favour of individual interests.

He dreamt about ways of "desecrating the obnoxious ideal of universal equality and idiotic universal progress". He directly expressed his hatred for the "ideals of universal prosperity and happiness". He predicted that Western Europe would soon be destroyed by anarchism and socialism and for this reason Russia must seek salvation in... Byzantinism against the "wild encroachment of international Europe". According to him "true Christianity teaches that all earthly hierarchies are a reflection of the celestial one" and "the building of strong characters requires grave social injustices, i.e. despotism, danger, strong passions, superstitions, fanaticism etc., namely everything against which the XIX<sup>th</sup> c. was struggling". According to him "the state must permanently be severe, sometimes cruel and pitiless, because society always and everywhere is too fidgety, poor in thought and too passionate". Thus Leontyev began with nihilism and arrived at the mysticism of despotism. Even Katkov thought that he was too extreme, but only because he expressed himself in such a wild way. The very gist of his reasoning was fully espoused by a substantial sector of society. Many nihilists approved of autocracy praising it as liberation from "rotten constitutionalism".

The opposition expressed itself increasingly clearly with the help of... sectarianism. Sectarian movements were always present and the attitude of the government to them varied: sometimes it provoked persecutions and in other moments it was indifferently tolerant.

The main issue was the *раскол* [schism] that was in constant expansion. Finally they were given the right to hold "Old Style" religious services privately, in private homes. Other sects were not of major importance. But in this period this changed. Sectarianism was increasingly engulfing the minds of the entire Russian nation, being the only direction which in the absence of education could alleviate the spirit and lead it to ideals. Since illiteracy was universal, strange sects, often vile ones appeared that in fact were anti-social, a true second arm of nihilism possessed by the denial of everything and intertwined with religious frenzy. This began around 1866 and expanded till our days [early XX<sup>th</sup> c.]. Apart from the evolutionary sects the *Штунда* [Shtundists, Evangelicals, Baptists] appeared in Ukraine in 1868. They were a rationalist sect formed under the influence of Protestant German colonists. Their name derives from a prayer book written by Zschokke *Stunden der Andacht* [Hours of Worship]. This interesting peasant rationalism spread with great vehemence from the western side of the river Dnieper.

The official Orthodox Church was completely incapable of combating the sects. "The religious mission of Tsardom" restricted itself to persecutions and "missionary activity" among the Uniates of Podlasie promoted with the assistance of police structures functioning since 1875 and again with the help of Orthodox priests from Galicia. These Uniates were the final remnants of the Church Union under Russian rule. The Union remained only in eastern Galicia [under Austria] heartily supported by the Poles. Having obtained autonomy in Galicia the Poles started to share the national rights with the Ruthenians, wanting to make an ally out of them so as to combat Moscow. This was the genesis of the "camp of friends of Ukraine" and as a consequence of the "Ukrainian nation" which in its struggle against the Poles competed in

ferocity with Russian "nationalism". In Russia however, Ruthenian publications were made illegal in 1876.

## **fRtR, p. 384-386**

Pobedonostsev continued as an advisor to Alexander III throughout the Tsar's reign. Russia had never had a more vehement enemy of the freedom of thought, a more virulent persecutor of everything that was not Orthodox or Russian and was yet under Russian rule. In particular he was against everything that was Polish! Pobedonostsev was appointed the Ober-Procurator of the Most Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. Having a wide discretionary authority, permanent access to the Tsar at any moment and a decisive influence on his mind, he combined, as if, in his person Karamzin, Arakcheyev and Leontyev.

A true orgy of administrative rank power began in the name of reaction and Russification. A decree of 1883 placed the universities under police control and since then "the door was wide open for administrative intervention in all fields of university life". The land assemblies were paralysed in a similar way. A new decree of 1890 established "gubernatorial offices for issues concerned with the land assemblies", rank bureaucratic bodies that stood above the autonomous assemblies having power of control. Thus the officials of the assemblies were incorporated into the state administrative hierarchy. All individuals "who did not have the right to be in state service" were dismissed from the executive departments of the assemblies. As a result of the tragic way in which the agricultural issues were dealt with, there were severe famines which were more painful than ever before. The most severe famine was in 1891. When

the land assemblies initiated energetic help action the question of feeding the starving population was removed from their competence. Thus the role of autonomous local governments in every field was reduced to nothing with increasing restrictions on their responsibility disrupting thereby the tie between the assemblies and the population. Nevertheless these assemblies became the main seat of non-nihilistic opposition and thus the constitutional current was reborn anew. When in 1894 they were asked to express an opinion about the reform of legislation pertaining to rural life, they knew that the state needed a general reform and not partial modifications of an outdated system.

The rule of Alexander III was rightly characterised as being "absolute in all spheres of life, mitigated only by the freedom for official patriotism, that is, the freedom to praise the government and assist it by word and writing in combating liberalism within the country and foreign elements on the peripheries of the state". Against such a background, nihilism spread. Even though in these years it was disorganized and less capable of "action", it gained an increasing number of followers also among the officers' ranks. There were two types of terror that overpowered the "Empire", the red, and the white. The latter, namely government terror was directed against some Russians and against absolutely all who were not ethnic Russians. The official patriotism which consisted in the oppression of other nationalities has been described as "cannibalism" and rightly so, because it was "a cannibalism that intended to consume within the borders of Russia the multimillion communities of cultural nations". There was the bullying of everything Polish and vexations against the Germans of Livonia. The constitution of Finland with increasingly calculated consistency was

gradually abolished. The oppression of the Poles was explained abroad and to the Poles as well... as a penalty for the uprising. But was there ever any slightest preparation for an uprising in Livonia or Finland? The "cannibalistic ferocity of zoological patriotism" went so far as to discourage against Russia even the so far inexhaustible resource of the best bureaucratic aristocracy and the most faithful tools of Tsardom, namely, that deriving from Livonia.

The only "benefit" of this truly thoughtless reign was the granting of greater tolerance for the "Old Faith" community, allowing them to hold public religious services. This was expected to offer support for the government coming from "the most conservative elements in the state". The future however was to show that the state failed to distinguish among the various kinds of conservatism.

## **fRtR, p. 389**

Meanwhile in Asia the advances continued uninterrupted as if by force of inertia. In 1881 the Turkmen were beaten and Merv was incorporated. In 1886, after long negotiations with England the Afghan Punjab was occupied and in the next year the Kerki region on the Amu-Darya river. In the summer of 1891 a Russian exploratory expeditionary appeared on the Pamir plateau. Through various means there were attempts to gradually weaken the position of the Afghan emir and a diplomatic invasion of Persia began countering the initiatives of English diplomacy at each step. This series of successes was crowned by two triumphs, favourable trade agreements with Korea and Japan. Central Asia was now undoubtedly in Russian hands and there were no more territories for further Russian expansionism!

Russia was becoming an Asiatic power to such an extent that in St. Petersburg itself there were doubts as to whether with such a great expansion in Asia the interests of the state, that is, its expansion in Europe could be taken care of. Russian journalism started to debate which expansion should be given priority and whether Russia was to be considered more a European or an Asiatic country? Pan-Asiatism was appearing as a rival to Pan-Slavism.

### **fRtR, p. 394-395**

It is impossible to persist economically in one environment and culturally or politically in another. Since Russia was adopting European forms of economic life it also had to be imbued with the European spirit, or else take the risk of an inevitable decomposition resulting from the discrepancies of the forces of communal life, that were operating in contrary directions. To the cultural incongruity that had been introduced at the greatest risk for the state with the partitions of Poland and greatly intensified by the incorporation of the Congress Kingdom, now there were added divergences present within Russian society itself. There was a deliberate distancing from European culture in the name of Pan-Slavism or Pan-Asiatism and at the same time there was a desire to join the European economic life.

Those who wanted to follow the Western European state and social system in every respect, the so called *западники* [Westerners] were becoming a decreasing minority. Only extreme currents were flourishing, both within the ruling circles and amongst the opposition. On the one hand, Bogolepov (1898-1901), the minister of education complained that university professors were re-

moving themselves into fields of pure science: "It is the duty of professors to follow in their activities the views of the government and not to stay at the side. After all, a professor is not only a scientist, but also an element of the bureaucratic system". On the other hand, the consequences of this were such that Bogolepov himself was the victim of an assassination and the following five year period (1901-1906) habituated Russian public opinion with political murder that was viewed as something common, almost ordinary. The government however did not want to allow society to have any influence on state issues and Witte himself until the end of 1904 was opposed to any expansion of even the local government.

## **fRtR, p. 399-401**

The first limelight of a constitutional system appeared already during the peace negotiations initiated at the proposal of President Roosevelt of the United States made on June 8<sup>th</sup> [1905]. The negotiations took place in America, in Portsmouth and they moved slowly until the beginning of September. Meanwhile a manifesto was issued proclaiming the calling of a *государственная дума* [the state assembly] in January 1906, which however was to have only an advisory role. This project was called a "fig leaf for absolutism". At the same time the autonomy of universities was restored so as to pacify... those who were most vociferous. What happened was totally unexpected. The university lecture rooms served as the place for meetings of various corporations (railwaymen, factory workers, physicians, as well as cab-drivers etc.). There in the evenings various petitions were drafted and specific programs of... strikes were prepared. The more moderate parties were gradually pushed out of the pro-

paganda, while revolutionaries were ever more visibly in charge of the situation. The general public was increasingly engrossed in fanatical utopias of the specifically Russian socialism, which considered Western socialism as being too timorous and backward. Not only social ownership of factories and land was the subject of discussion, but also the abolition of all private property. The agitation was moving ever more visibly towards the outbreak of a revolution that would be not political but social, a proletarian revolution that was being prepared with "extremism at the verge of licentiousness".

While the revolution was preparing itself for "action", the agreement at Portsmouth was maturing. On September 5<sup>th</sup>, 1905 a peace agreement was reached. The conditions were relatively good for Russia. It lost only Port Arthur, the southern part of Sakhalin Island and the southern part of the railway in eastern China, recognising also Japanese hegemony over Korea. At the same time Russia lost all respect in East Asia. The Asians noted that Russia could be beaten.

Pan-Asiatism which had dreamt of a universal state, of taking over India and China had to retreat to Pan-Slavism. If the state was not to give up its expansion, the Balkan issue waited again for its turn. Under the influence of liberalism aiming for a constitutional system, thus basing itself on models drawn from the West, the *западничество* [Westernist movement] was revived. For a time it had associated in the opposition camp with the epigones of the Slavophile movement. This resulted in the temporary change of Pan-Slavism into Neo-Slavism. The difference consisted in the fact that the movement did not restrict itself to the Slavs of the Balkans and in the construction of the doctrine also western Slavs were included. This had to bring back the Polish issue. In contrast to Pan-Slavism, Neo-Slavism did

not condemn the Poles to oblivion. It allowed them to maintain their language and cultural distinctiveness and even considered a national autonomy but under two conditions: that the Polish question be an internal Russian issue and that Catholic "fanaticism" be abandoned.

## **fRtR, p. 409-410**

In October 1905 the revolution broke out, which was to be a "specifically Russian one", not copying the great French Revolution, but greater, more bloody and severe. The prophecy was fulfilled. The formula of the revolution was new, though not of an original idea. This was a rebellion in the form of a general strike in which all the classes participated, all kinds of professions, even physicians and pharmacists! In villages the revolutionary licentiousness reached the stage of an "agricultural delirium", while the strike on the railways, executed with great precision undercut all the arteries of modern life in the entire country. Also the students went on strike and when a professor of the Moscow university, prince S. Trubetskoy expressed doubts whether it was progressive and helpful when the young bring partisan infighting within the university walls through various meetings, he was told by the students that "social interests are above the scientific".

The strike spreading gradually led to a culminating point in the days from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> of October 1905. Not only factories and workshops were closed, but also shops, pharmacies, and even the waterworks were not functioning. Then a counter-organisation led by the police appeared in Moscow, supposedly only against the revolution but in fact against everything that was unsympathetic towards the police. This organisation called

the *Черносотенцы* ["Black Hundreds"] organised a true storm of the University in Moscow on October 14<sup>th</sup>. There was much barbarity in the strike which literally deprived people of heat and water. It needs to be pointed out as a fact of first order historical importance that the movement did not cross the Dvina and Dnieper rivers. This line continued to be the border between two civilisations.

## **fRtR, p. 414**

"Binding decisions" were decreed, imposing severe fines and prison penalties for criticising the government. Furthermore a solution that was very typical of Russian notions was found. The establishment of parties without the permission of the government was forbidden. The ministry announced that all parties are associations and thus they require permission of the authorities, i.e. a legalisation. Without this they were treated as secret organisations and fell under the criminal code. The *Kadets* were refused legalisation and even more so all the parties of the true left. As a result in November 1907 there was a Duma, which had only 33 *Kadets*, 113 Octobrists and 189 right-wingers, that is, deputies who were opposed to the parliamentary system and by and large were friends of the Black Hundreds.

The government took steps to make even such a Duma unpopular. The government charged the Duma with some chancellery details so as to ridicule it and prove that in spite of being hard working in fact it was useless. Issues that should have been dependent on the parliament were settled in the ministry offices without it. Thus the bureaucracy continued to have legislative power, while the Duma was given only bureaucratic details to settle.

# Excerpts from “The Development of Morality”

Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2016

## **DoM, p. 38-39**

Greatest ethical imbroglios result from the mixtures of civilizations. We know that every civilization has its own ethics. The Latin civilization follows Catholic ethics. In five civilizations (the Chinese, Brahman, Turanian, Arab and Byzantine) there is a discrepancy between the ethics of private and public life. Only the Latin civilization insists that ethical principles are binding also in public life.

The Chinese civilization attributes to the emperor (or now the president) the role of a patriarch over the entire society. In principle, it is very conservative, but it allows the ruler to introduce the greatest possible changes, in fact, even revolutions. In the Brahman civilization, in issues concerning the cult, a maharaja must follow his advisor, who is knowledgeable in sacral matters, but apart from that, he has despotic power. An Arab sheik combines despotic secular authority with the right to interpret the Quran. The Turanian civilization derives the entire public life from the system of a military camp, which basically is not bound by any ethics. In the Brahman civilization ethics does not extend beyond formalistic sacral rules and there is the possibility of shedding all moral obligations at any moment. The Jewish civilization has produced three ethics: one is for their own in Palestine,

the second is for their own in the Diaspora, and the third is for dealings with non-Jews.

As a result, many issues are treated differently from the point of view of ethics in each civilization.

## **DoM, p. 79-80**

The type and level of a civilization and so indirectly therefore the level of ethics depend also on what is understood there by work, and in particular whether apart from the struggle for material existence work is appreciated at all, and furthermore what is the attitude of people working intellectually towards physical work. Has not every one of us met with the conviction that people such as for example the author of this study as well as its readers “are not doing anything”? This leads to the direct conclusion that “we live of the work of others,” thus it would be good to send scholars to the wheelbarrow and spade so that in justice they would not eat the bread of others. On top of that, there is the contempt of physical workers and on their side the dream to liberate themselves from it *per fas et nefas* [through right or wrong]. This was the case in antiquity, even among the Greeks and Romans, where the “disdain for work that was dominant among the higher class was accompanied by an extraordinary dislike of it and its persistent avoidance among the masses”. Currently four civilizations look down with contempt at physical work: the Chinese, Brahman, Arab and Turanian. The spheres of intellectual and physical work are as if severed from one another forming two worlds full of mutual contempt and hatred. In the Brahman and Chinese civilizations demonstrably arch-long fingernails are cultivated so that everyone could see from a distance that this hand is not destined to work

## **DoM, p. 84**

This relationship [between ethics and time] is visible throughout the world. In the Muslim world there is a colossal difference between the peoples of the Turanian civilization who reached no further than the measuring of time (not very accurately at that) and those of the Arab civilization who arrived at the notion of an historical era.

## **DoM, p. 100**

But there are even worse examples [of the cult of the insane]. What sort of capacity for moral progress can exist where madmen are considered to be saints? The Turanian civilization, both in Islam and in oriental Christianity has such a veneration of the mentally deranged. This continues to this day. A Polish pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1934 while passing through Egypt had the opportunity to see in Cairo such an Islamic saint. We know that also eastern Slav countries venerate the *юродивый* [whacky, God's fool]. This was adopted together with the Turanian civilization. Unfortunately in recent years much of the Turanian civilization is pouring into Polish lands and the cult of madmen is appearing not only in Ruthenia<sup>81</sup>.

---

<sup>81</sup> [This is reference to the junta which ruled Poland at the time, which Koneczny considered deranged].

## **DoM, p. 101-102**

Finland in its Grand Duchy rose to the summits of culture while on the Russian side an ethnic Finn was “an undoubted pariah.” In St. Petersburg a “Chukhna<sup>82</sup> was the personification of dirt, scruffiness, debauchery (a great proportion of street prostitutes of the lowest class were recruited from the Chukhnas), drunkenness, and in general of something primitive that has nothing to do with any civilization. A Chukhna, compared even with a neglected and backward Russian, manifested some lower race”. This can be explained simply: the Finns all belonged to the Turanian civilization, but when Finland went under the rule of Sweden and later having attained its autonomy, it changed its civilization to the Latin one, in spite of being Protestant, while the rest of the Finns still living beyond the Grand Duchy remained within the Turanian civilization which was not elevated at all by Orthodoxy, and furthermore oppression and poverty lowered them. The former were moving ever higher in the Latin civilization, while the latter were falling to the bottom of Turanianism. This caused the complete rift, the absence of any bond at all between them. Among the former, ethical education was making progress, while among the latter, the Chukhnas, there was no education at all; these differences deepened due to the dissimilarities of civilization.

## **DoM, p. 188**

Let us return, however, to the military *ex lex* [law] among the primitive peoples. Amongst many of them, it is re-

---

<sup>82</sup> [An abusive Russian term for the Finns].

stricted to men only. It is not directed against women in the Fiji Islands, and in Africa a woman is protected among the Kabyle and the Tuaregs. There is a tremendous difference in this between the Arabs and the Turks who belong to the Turanian civilization. This was noticed during the great world war by the famous colonel Lawrence. He wrote: "This bitter taste of the Turkish mode of war sent a shock across Arabia; for the first rule of Arab war was that women were inviolable: the second that the lives and honour of children too young to fight with men were to be spared: the third, that property impossible to carry off should be left undamaged." There are inklings of the laws of nations lingering among some peoples.

### **DoM, p. 268-269**

The contrast between the Turanian and Latin civilization manifests the entire dissimilarity between the East and the West. In the Orient, the state prevented the communities from developing properly into societies, and the oriental notion of the state had to lead to a notion of a law that is indifferent to ethics. This is the *ex oriente lux* [light from the East]! The arbitrary will of the ruler is the only source of law, and whoever succeeds in removing him by sword, gallows or poison has the right to become the next ruler... of the same kind.

### **DoM, p. 300-302**

If we will not wake up in time from this grasping of the world upside down, we shall land in legal monism, which for the progress of morality is much more dangerous, a hundredfold more so, than biological monism.

This type of monism is appearing not for the first time in history, but it is acquiring a form that so far was unknown. The public law may be engulfed by the private law. The monopoly of the private law may be to such an extent that the public law, if it will exist at all, will be derived from the private law and be based upon it. The ruler then is the owner of the entire state, of all and of everything, and the whole population is enslaved by him. He may, if he so wishes, allow others a part in this ownership and in personal freedom, both always and only on the condition that this may be revoked at any moment. This is the decisive feature of the Turanian civilization.

The observing of how this type of Turanian statehood was adopted in Muscovy and Zalesye is extremely interesting. The princedoms were enterprises of individuals belonging to the princely class and wars consisted in having the greatest possible number of serfs of the opponent brought into the serfdom of the invader. This was done through the keeping of the so called *закупы* [*zakups*, hired men], who were receiving some remuneration in advance, in agriculture and in trade, for work done in somebody else's interest, also in the interest of a foreign prince. Antagonisms between Novgorod the Great and Moscow concerned primarily such *закладничество* [contracts]. Ivan Kalita introduced such contracts also among members of the princely class and he started to trade in the rights of princes. A prince was a privileged landowner in his princedom and he maintained supremacy over the descendants of his soldiers by granting them the right to use the princely *сел* [villages]. The principle of the *кормлене* [feeding], that is, the attribution to the official of a prince the right to gather profits from the office itself, was taken over from the Turanian civilization. All of this and also other characteristics, from which the Muscovy *самовластие* [autocracy] was

born, were worked out on the principles of private law. This is clearly evident in all three editions of the *Русская Правда* [Russian Truth]. The development of private law went very far in Zalesye, when there still was no public law there and the establishment of the state of Ivan III (1462-1503) was done uniquely on the basis of private law that was expanded for the needs of the ruler.

The Turanian civilization aims at ensuring that each inhabitant of the state is considered as being personally dependent on the ruler. The private law of the ruler in respect to the population becomes the public law, but it is not something distinct, something basically different from private law. In fact, it is only an extension of the private law in the interest of the ruler.

Thus, the Turanian civilization is based on the principle of legal monism.

## **DoM, p. 440**

Entire civilizations exist without science, as for example, the Turanian. Nevertheless a great deal of reasoning was required, when the general staff of Genghis-khan planned out and calculated strategic operations over extensive areas in such a way that both battles in 1241, on the river Sajó in Hungary and in Legnica in Poland took place simultaneously, with a difference of scarcely eight days — which was no difference if we take into account the means of communication and contact that were available then. With us mathematics for a long time has been a necessary instrument of strategy, but the military commanders of Temujin were not mathematicians and almost until yesterday generals in China were illiterate. Also Turkey did not produce scholars and yet three parts of the world trembled before it.



# Excerpts from “The Byzantine Civilization” vol. 2

Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2014

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 15-18**

Other civilizations were growing around it [the Byzantine civilization] as new competitors on the arena of universal history. Mercenary armies of peoples of the Turanian civilization progressed under the leadership of Byzantine and Persian generals. There was already mention about its origin in the “Genesis” of *The Byzantine Civilization* [Vol. I, there are few words on this in chapter V]. Its position was still secondary. The Turanian civilization was repressed by the Hellenistic, Iranian, Syrian and later Arab civilizations and it entered onto a wide historical scene only in the second half of our Middle Ages. Being inferior to them all, it was in the end to achieve dominance and enter triumphantly into Constantinople.

Since antiquity the Turanian branch of peoples underwent various transformations of locations, races and cultures before around the beginning of our Middle Ages the relationships settled in such a manner that it became possible to distinguish four stocks: the Ugro-Finnish, the Turkish, the Mongolian and the Manchurian. They were all nomads, pugnacious and engulfed in constant tribal wars because plunder was the essence of their life and maintenance. A victorious leader would find ready obedience among neighbouring tribes, thus under his command larger associations would form, and if they proved

permanent they became a new people. As a rule the Turanian peoples formed not as a consequence of a natural affinity of origin but in robbing expeditions during which the first leader would become the “originator” and frequently he gave his name as the *heros-eponymos* [hero-surname] to the association that he organized (the Seljuqs, Nogais etc.). This would survive for centuries on the condition that the originator had fortunate successors; if not, the new military association would disintegrate and so scholars are faced with the ungrateful task of explaining where a whole “nation” disappeared; in fact it scattered among new ones, under new leaders!

Such constant warring had nothing to do with the vendetta, which existed also but was restricted to clans, at best to tribes. These separated themselves out frequently by moving to fight under another banner, and thus the vendetta was then terminated and did not develop into a historical continuity. The vendetta is connected with tradition and among the Turanians traditions would terminate as soon as a new successful distributor of spoils would through his fame gather people from all sides. Warriors would join him from everywhere, abandoning everything that till now was their spiritual property and going for new plunders they would acquire new horizons.

A method of communal life based uniquely on plunder generated a specific social structure. **If one were to summarize the entire Turanian civilization and all its cultures in one word it would be: a camp!** Whoever is not a warrior depending on some leader, he is totally beyond any social organization, an outcast. Turanian associations always hold onto arrangements and laws of war, even during peacetime. The constant camp organisation with all its consequences is a basic feature of the Turanian civilization. The second feature is the

weakness of traditions, thus the volatility of the factor that is the backbone of any civilization.

For example the Manchurians were nomadic warriors until the end of the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. and their division into eight regiments persisted till the early XX<sup>th</sup> c. They adopted the Chinese language but they remained distant from the Chinese civilization in spite of the fact that since 1644 the Manchurian dynasty was ruling China. They distinguished and continue to distinguish people, granting honours to "those of a regiment", the *chi-jen*, as distinct from the civilians, the *min-jen*. It is known that in the Bolshevik army the Manchurian regiments were the most brutal and they entered the mercenary forces eagerly. They retained a great deal of the savagery for which they have been known for centuries.

People who live of robbery are not good in husbandry and they reduce all productive work to a minimum. From such associations societies will never form<sup>83</sup> and a state will be formed only to the extent that the camp will manage it. Turanian states are run by the military. In times of long peace Turanian states decline and finally they disintegrate. Only a drive towards some new territorial acquisitions under a new militarily successful leader can be a revitalising force. If this does not happen the rebuilding of the state proves impossible.

The Turkish peoples adopted the Turanian civilization. When and in what way? This is unknown. What is known is that they did not raise its level, if anything, they lowered it. It was mentioned above that Byzantium allied with these peoples against Persia. This early bonding of the Byzantine civilization with the Turanian is intriguing. After all in the distant future an interesting mixture

---

<sup>83</sup> I use in my books the term "society" only for a differentiated association [as distinct from a community].

of civilizations was to be formed, namely the Byzantine-Turanian culture with its centre in Istanbul. Before that, for many centuries the Turanian civilization tried to enter as a wedge between the Byzantine and Iranian civilizations that were in conflict, and later (with better results) between the Byzantine and the Arab one.

### **BC, vol. 2, p. 80**

The Islam of the Arab civilization was tolerant. The Arabs did not persecute the subdued peoples for religious reasons (this was to be done only by Islam of the Turanian civilization, that is by the Turks), nor did they encourage apostasy.

### **BC, vol. 2, p.98**

This name [Khazaria] denotes a state and has nothing to do with ethnography. Thus when the state fell also the name Khazaria disappeared. The native population of Khazaria was of Fino-Ural origin and the Turanian peoples were always indifferent in religious matters, and this was well into the Middle Ages (only the Turks became fanatics of Islam).

### **BC, vol. 2, p. 251-252**

Ruthenia was lost to the Latin cause but also to the Byzantine one. It was moving in the direction of the Turanian civilization. The hegemony of the Polovtsy [Cumans] was already visibly obvious, but what was worse, the Polovtsy by then belonged to the internal history of Ruthenia. Since the Polovtsy culture was allowed equal

status, being the lower one it had to become dominant. (This is what history teaches.)

The Turanian exclusiveness of physical force, which was not used for any deeper purpose (due to a lack of intellectual development), degenerated into brutality, into a love for destruction for the sole pleasure of destruction, as a manifestation of physical superiority. At the end of the XII<sup>th</sup> c. it attained colossal dimensions including the burning of towns, the compulsory shifting of populations, the deportation of entire regions, the taking prisoner of women and children in order to trade them and so on.

Finally Turanian influences together with the Ruriks and their troops reached the lands of the Poles. When Mstislav the Bold came to Halych (called there from Novgorod the Great as a famous warrior), he first established an alliance with the Polovtsy, obtained their approval and married a daughter of the Polovtsy *Kotian* (supreme commander), so as to have help from him against the Halych nobles. The rebelling nobles accused him of wishing to hand them over to the *Kotian*.

The impetuous antagonism of the population against the Ruriks in the lands of the Poles was provoked by the diversity of social structure. All the sources unanimously name the local gentry, i.e. the more outstanding landowners as the initiators of the permanent rebellions, which led finally to the hanging of the princes there. Throughout Ruthenia from Kiev to Novgorod, or in the new Ruthenia known as Zalesye [Vladimir-Suzdal region] such a social class of political significance did not exist. The agricultural element represented an inferior class. Only in the land of the Poles this was otherwise because in this ethnographically Polish area the entire social system was radically different. Apart from the garrisons of the prince there was nothing Ruthenian there and the characteristics of Polish society continued. The land of

the Poles was "Ruthenia" only in the dynastic sense; it was under the authority of the Ruriks.

Once the exclusiveness of the physical forces became dominant in Ruthenia it became insensitive to spiritual forces. It could be possible to regain it or a part of it for the Latin or the Byzantine civilization only by way of force. Uniquely political considerations, the state borders and the results of military conflicts with neighbours were to determine the civilizational affiliation of Ruthenia. Ruthenia itself became passive and could not shake itself away from passivity since it had no appropriate points of attachment in intellectual forces.

Thus the competition between the Latin and Byzantine civilizations in Ruthenia gave a specific fruit: the victory of a third one, the Turanian.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 292-297**

It has been mentioned above that the various political possibilities in Asia Minor were disrupted by the Mongolian invasion. Besides the Turkish one (the Seljuqs), a second distinct branch of the Turanian civilization, the Mongolians appeared on the historical scene. When they met, they were usually hostile to one another. In the XIII<sup>th</sup> c. the Mongolians attained a higher level of civilizational development.

Their invasions greatly restricted the expansion of the Byzantine civilization by depriving it of the eastern Slavs.

Deep in Asia the Kerait *Kagan* Temujin united together several Turanian peoples into a single state and he became the great *Kagan*, the *Genghis Khan* ruling from Korea to Turkmenistan. He was educated according to the Chinese civilization, holding even a Chinese scientific degree. He ruled with the help of a bureaucracy composed

initially almost exclusively of Chinese. His central administrative office in Kohistan discovered that the range of the Turanian and Mongolian peoples and also those related to the Mongolians extended far into the West all the way to the valley of the lower river Dnieper.

For the first time in universal history the notion of race appeared as a program. All the Turanian peoples from the Pacific to the Dnieper were united into a single state under the Genghis Khans. This scenario included several language groups, thus it was not language that bonded this "whole". As far as religion goes the organizers of this state were completely indifferent. There were no historical links between these peoples. Only anthropological features remained, that could be easily observed as an object of state interest. They were acting in the name of race.

We are concerned here with the western part of the Mongolian state. These vast steppe regions had been termed "Kipchak" already by the Persians and this name persisted. The population was sparse, composed of two kinds of nomads. Some were organized into clans and tribes maintaining themselves through the raising of cattle and they called themselves Tatars, i.e. steppe shepherds. They recognized the administration of the Genghis Khans and they willingly served in the army. The second group on the contrary did not want to serve in the army that was being constantly moved over regions from China to Transoxania and everywhere they fled to the steppes so as to free themselves from rigor and compulsion. They wandered in the steppes in loose gangs operating on their own account with their own or stolen flocks and herds. They were looked down upon with a high contempt by the Uyghurs who reached the highest culture in the Turanian world, which had such

an extensive statehood. Even more so, they were despised by the Blue Mongols, who formed the core of the army of Genghis Khan. They referred to these bands contemptuously as the "Cossacks". This was a term used to describe pieces of cattle that had left the herd and this term passed onto the people. But the days of their free roaming were to end, when in Kohistan it was decided that the entire Kipchak was to be conquered and placed under the Genghis Khans.

The intent was to unify politically all the Turanian peoples but nothing more. The instruction given to chief Subutai restricted the westward advance of the army to the steppes between the rivers Don and Dnieper. Thus the invasion plans included the nomadic regions of the Polovtsy. Their leader, the *Kotyan* i.e. Kutai Bastyi, called on Ruthenia for help and the *Kotyan's* son-in-law Mstislav the Bold of Halych gathered reinforcements from almost all the Rurik princes. The relationships between Ruthenia and the Polovtsy, their true overlords, tightened. Let us add that already the *двовере* [double faith] was common in the south. Around the year 1220 we find steppe Khans named George or Daniel.

Subutai sent a legation announcing that he had no intentions of war against Ruthenia, in vain. These legates were... killed. Subutai then sent others. The new ambassadors were sent back alive, but with nothing.

The Ruriks went eastward in defence of the Polovtsy, attacking the Mongols first. And when it proved possible to defeat a part of the frontal guard south of Kiev they went further into the steppes not finding the enemy anywhere until finally they found them on river Kalka, a tributary of the Sea of Azov. After a short encounter the Mongols retreated. None of the Polovtsy or Ruriks realized that this was only an insignificant reconnaissance

unit. Thus when the basic army appeared, Ruthenia suffered a major defeat on June 16<sup>th</sup>, 1224, a defeat of the highest order.

Subutai did not cross the Dnieper. He turned northwards towards the Volga and Kama conquering the state of the northern Bulgarians. Even from there he did not move in the direction of the Rurik princedoms.

A major part of the Polovtsy fled to their brothers in Hungary, to the Cumans. By this they pointed out to the Mongolian administration the existence of further kin, the Magyars. And when the scouts reported that there are also steppes there suitable for Tatars an expedition to Hungary became only a question of time. This was to be a second Kipchak.

In 1237 a second expedition on the Volga Bulgars was organized and in the process Ugro-Finnish territories were invaded which were the New Ruthenia, a settlement area. Having reached Torjek, in 1238, where there was an ethnographic border between the Slavs and the Finns they receded in the southerly direction in order to take revenge on the Ruriks of the south for their aggressive march towards Kalka. However the whole army was called back to Asia from Kozelsk and this expedition was delayed until late in the autumn of 1240. The whole of southern Ruthenia was in one hand at the time. Daniel of Halych ruled also in Kiev. As far as Ruthenia was concerned this was a great state, but it collapsed under one surge of the Mongolian advance. Kiev was levelled to the ground and in December the charred remains of Halych were still smouldering.

All of this was just the preparation for the main aim of the expedition, the conquest of Hungary which strategically required also the disempowerment of Poland. Batu Khan, the great leader of this expedition came to the

Magyars as a kin, their rightful ruler, and he had supporters. A whole Magyar chancellery was prepared beforehand producing quite formal documents. Local leaders were nominated, local courts were appointed and a special copper currency was emitted that was similar to the Chinese *sapeca*. In the Mongolian administration of Hungary there was perfect order. The soldiers of the "Kagan of Kipchak" paid for everything in cash. But there was no pity for those who resisted.

The fact that there were none of these arrangements in Poland indicates that in 1241 there was no intention to occupy Polish territory for good. They traversed Poland as a hurricane in order to isolate and encircle Hungary. Both expeditions, to Poland and Hungary, took place simultaneously according to a predetermined plan that was executed with precision and extreme efficiency. The major battle at Legnica [Poland] took place on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 1241 and the one on Mohi Heath in Hungary was three days later. These Mongolians, the "Blue" ones were not at all barbarians. They belonged to the Uyghur culture, the highest level of the Turanian civilization.

Southern Ruthenia and Zalesie became from that time a part of the universal state of the Genghis Khans who transferred power to the Khans of Kipchak. Soon Kipchak was to become an independent state. The Chinese disappeared from the administration and Tatar statehood developed.

Whoever considers a state as the highest historical criterion should consider also the Tatars as benefactors and civilizers of eastern Slav territories. It was they who transformed the loose rule of the Rurik princess into a state. They established the authority of a Grand Prince over the whole of Ruthenia that was subject to them. Thus immediately the Ruriks began racing to the Kipchak Horde for this title, competing for the honorary

tunic (*yarlyk*) [*ярлык* — tag, label, license, certificate]. The princes expressed their submissiveness with exaggeration, eager to present the highest donation — because in the process they also enriched themselves.

It paid to be within the Turanian civilization. Besides the Chinese taxation system (which was a little “wild”) various levies appeared and locally ways to thrive were developed. Thus, for example, the Cossacks found a most remunerative source of income. From 1235 they were engaged in the wholesale trade in youth, captured in western Kipchak, that is, in Ruthenia. These slaves [the word comes from Slavs] were sold to the Venetians on Crimea from where they were transported to Egypt to serve as *mamelukes* [slaves]. This is the genesis of the future Ottoman deportations, in which the hunting for men was extended to include also women.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 361**

After the conquest of Novgorod the Great in 1472 the [Ruthenian] state expanded rapidly. All the new provinces were immediately deprived of their local rights. The administration knew only one rule: “everything must be like in Moscow”. The pressing of all and everything into the unique Moscow mode entered even the smallest details. This zeal for uniformity is proper to both the Byzantine and the Turanian civilizations. That the Turanian civilization was supreme is clear from another circumstance, namely that the supreme power was based upon the direct subservience of every inhabitant in the state to the person of the Grand Duke. This is a symptom of the legal monism of private law, proper to the Turanian civilization. The transfer of populations was practiced on a large scale (for example in 1486 si-

multaneously 8 000 Novgorod traders were all deported) because the principle of personal subservience of all to the head of state allowed the latter to decide about the fate of each individual.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 369-370**

Meanwhile in Moscow there was increasing evidence that the last assault of the Byzantine civilization was to be conquered by the winning Turanian one. The monism of private law was confirmed in 1494 when Ivan adopted the title of *государь всей Руси* [owner of the whole of Ruthenia]. This title, beginning with the *Русская Правда* [*Ruthenian Truth* — the oldest collection of Kiev laws] implied a personal overlord in respect to whom all the subjects are in a direct personal subservience. Until then each prince was the *государь* in his principedom. Ivan lowered the rank of all these regional rulers and made each one them a *служилый* [servile] prince imposing himself as the *государь* [owner] of all the princes and all their subjects.

Soon Turanian notions were to apply to the succession to the throne. At first Ivan III decided to hold onto the primogeniture and thus he declared that Dimitri, the “son of the Jewess” will succeed him. Ivan proved to be submitting to Byzantine notions when he allowed his grandson to be crowned in 1498 and declared a *Tsar*. The adoption of this title amounted to the renunciation of subservience towards the *Khans* of Kipchak. Ivan was careful not to crown himself and he arranged the crowning ceremony in such a fashion that, if necessary, he could show his innocence in respect to the *Khan-Tsar*, as somebody surprised by the event and then sacrifice his grandson. In fact this is what he did only four years later.

**BC, vol. 2, p. 371**

Thus Ivan III proclaimed that his successor was to be his son Vasili. He ordered his other four sons to sign a *dogovor* [agreement] that the father has the right to appoint a successor regardless of primogeniture. This was the practice among the *Khans*; the *Khan* could pass his heritage to any member of his dynasty.

Finally Ivan married off Vasili, organizing first a beauty contest. This was both a Byzantine and a Turanian custom, but Moscow of the time could not draw the example from Byzantium, thus the custom of the *Khan* was followed. A Tatar woman was chosen, Solomoniya Saburova coming from the Golden Horde.

**BC, vol. 2, p. 377-378**

The Kazan Tatars had the highest level of Turanian culture in Kipchak. Their influence therefore on society in Moscow was tremendous. Many Kazan families entered the class of the nobility as well as some from the former Golden Horde. A mixing of blood among the higher classes occurred. The locking up of women practiced at first only at the imperial court (half-heartedly already during Ivan III) and then sporadically among the highest aristocracy, became the obligatory rule in every house that wished to be in vogue. This custom however did not reach the common people ever. Also, following the Muslim practice dances became something impossible in higher society, while the simple people had a great liking for dancing.

In the second half of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. Tatar influence progressed on a grand scale in Muscovy. At a rapid rate

Moscow was changing not only into an Asiatic state but also into an Asiatic society. In Kazan a strict social hierarchy was maintained and access to public life and importance came only through offices, the service to the *Khan*. In Moscow this same principle was beginning to function in the second half of the reign of Ivan III and now this was introduced with full consistency according to the *чины* [ranks], which the Tatars had from the old tradition of Tamerlane.

The extensive acquisitions in the east affected the character of Muscovy. Much of the Slav population moved into the wide spaces in the conquered Volga region in search for easy trade of all kinds. A true extensive migration of the population began. From then the extensive nature of the Muscovy and later Russian form of life began, and it persists till this day against a background of a relatively easy struggle for existence.

After a short time there was a shortage of hands for agriculture. In the Kazan *Khanate* the agricultural people were tied to the soil for a long time, because otherwise there would be no agriculture there. Shortly Muscovy was to imitate the Tatars also in this respect.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 427-428**

Thus the Byzantine civilization was once again entering an alliance with the Turanian against the Latin civilization [in the Balkans]. In this alliance the Byzantine civilization was being pushed to a second plan by the lower civilization, i.e. the Turanian. At an earlier stage it proved unable to compete with the influences of the Yugra, the Pechenegs and the Polovtsy in Ruthenia and at the second stage it allowed itself to be completely eliminated from the Moscow culture. Beginning with the

second half of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. this process was to repeat itself for a third time and again the Turanian civilization was to turn out to be the winner.

This time the Turanian civilization was represented by the Ottomans.

There is no question of any civilizational work coming from the Ottomans. Fivefold daily prayers and ablutions prevent a devout Muslim from doing any intensive continuous and systematic work. What is the point of caring about one's future and how can it be done, since that future depends upon the whim of those who are in authority. Everyone at moment's notice can be elevated from the rank of a servant to that of a dignitary and the reverse may happen too. Nowhere, for example did the Turanians have an aristocracy, because in the camp social system that is impossible. The Ottomans represented an almost completely passive element. Their only activity in the sphere of organization of social life consisted in the imposition of uniformity so as to ensure that the sacral Muslim sharia law will be followed everywhere. Whatever concerned matters that are beyond the sharia law was of no interest to them (unless there were some urgent political needs) and so in complete passivism they were ready to leave the subjugated peoples a free hand. But the sharia law, applied towards the conquered peoples influenced them very deeply, because it led to a change of the social structure.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 457-459**

The Cossacks formed a Slav-Turanian culture, a second one, besides the one in Muscovy and quite independent of it. The Turanian civilization operated amongst the eastern Slavs with such strength that from its influences

two cultures developed. How much stronger was it than the Byzantine one, and how great was its fecundity! The Byzantine civilization acted in the Slav east during the XVI<sup>th</sup> and XVII<sup>th</sup> centuries but... not for itself. *Sic oves non vobis* [So the sheep are not yours]; the fruits were gathered by the Turanian civilization.

The word "Cossack" till the mid-XVI<sup>th</sup> c. had the same meaning as during the days of the Genghis Khans: a fugitive wishing to live from brigandage. Originally the Cossacks were Mongols or Tatars. There were too many of them and so they became a source for mercenaries, quite in the Turanian tradition. Moscow was first to have its Cossacks, from Ryazan. They grew in number supplementing themselves not only from among the Tatars but also from the ethnographic kaleidoscope of peoples in the watersheds of the Oka and Don Rivers. In the days of Ivan the Terrible military formations were made of them on the Don against the Khans. From there the Cossacks moved further west. A second centre opened on the Dnieper River composed of fugitives from all the neighbouring countries: Wallachians, Ruthenians and Poles. They organized themselves in a military fashion as if re-enacting the regimental peoples of mediaeval Mongolian times, an echo of the Manchurian social structure.

This typically steppe culture was endangered with extinction when the steppes were colonized and this was the cause of their hatred of those engaged in the great settling business, the Polish lords. But there was still a great deal of free steppes. It was only much later in the second half of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> c. that the Polish Cossacks placed the issue at knife's point. In the mid XVII<sup>th</sup> c. the Polish Cossacks would have been satisfied were a permanent army formed out of them, had Poland placed them all (several tens of thousands) on its pay.

Following the example of Muscovy they started to be conscripted by Poland. From the days of Sigismund the Old, since 1531 there began a "registry" of them. Batory [Polish King] wanted to make a permanent army out of them at the limits of the Kiev province. The charm of military life enticed great numbers. The King's "registry" could cover only a part of them. It was immaterial to them whom they fought. They went against Moscow with the False Dimitri and later with prince Władysław (20 000 of them).

For them the camp was the ideal, as in the entire Turanian world, but even in this respect, they had an exceptional position among the Turanians. These were truly people-regiments, the most extreme structures of this kind. They were composed of individuals who had severed all blood links and had left for good the localities of their families. A Cossack did not know the clan system and his tribe was the military unit to which he belonged; the commander was his prince. The Muscovites lived in clans and it was from a clan that they moved to a camp as a service to the prince, after which they returned to the clan. A Cossack spent his whole life in the camp and he never had anything to do with the clans. A Muscovite had real estate while a Cossack only movable property. The land was the property of the *sotnia* [centuria], sub-unit or the regiment. A Cossack knew no other service than a military one, no administration, or any statehood. For the entire Cossack region from the Dnieper to the Volga it sufficed to have only a few dozen literates. The Tatars transformed Muscovy into a state, but not the Cossacks. They remained a steppe people just as the Tatars, but with the basic difference that they never produced a higher association with some common authority. They never had a *Khan*. The institution of the *Hetman* was of later date and it was of Polish origin.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 488**

Even the famous treaty of Hadiach negotiated in 1658 with Khmelnytsky's successor Wyhowski did not help. The treaty called for the establishment of a distinct Ruthenian state comprising the voivodships of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernigov, a state having its own army, treasury, its own ministers and offices and with the restriction that only the Orthodox could hold public offices there. The Cossacks were given the rights of the nobility. But this new nobility was illiterate and the majority understood "Cossack freedoms" to mean the unlimited right to brew vodka. The Turanian civilization manages completely without any books.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 496**

The end of the expansion of the Ottoman state was approaching [latter part of the XVII<sup>th</sup> c.]. Thus the expansion of the particular mixture, the Turanian-Byzantine culture which developed on the Balkans was also ending. A blow against its Turanianism would be at the same time a blow against its Byzantinism.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 663-664**

As a result the whole great [First World] War was a decisive clash of civilizations that had been in combat for centuries. When in 1917 Russia became Bolshevik, this meant that within the mixture of several civilizations fighting one another the lowest one won. Such is the law of history that when several civilizations have equal

rights, the one that is at the lowest level wins. In Russia the Turanian civilization, supported by socialism was victorious. In general, Bolshevism is closer to Asia than to Europe. It became a disruptive force even in China. It is worth noting however that Bolshevism did not affect Mongolia. Outer Mongolia rejected it outright and Inner Mongolia, wanting to unite with Manchuria was engaged in political manoeuvres.

Since in the Turanian civilization there is no national consciousness and the Latin civilization was completely eradicated from Russian life, thus in all probability national consciousness, the achievements and gift of the influence of the Latin civilization have been lost for centuries to come.

## **BC, vol. 2, p. 681-682**

On the surface of Russia there is no longer any trace of Byzantinism, not to mention Latin traces, but Turanian elements have remained there. The present [1945] state of the civilization in Russia has to be described as a Turanian-Jewish mixture.

There are less Jewish influences in the Cossack culture, thus it is almost exclusively Turanian. The camp system resulted in the weakening of clan links and this feature has survived among the Cossacks till this day. A very characteristic episode from the First World War was described by the author [Zofia Kossak-Szczucka] of *Požoga* [*Conflagration*]. A Cossack sergeant wanted to take and adopt her elder son: "You are young you can still have many children. I am old, my wife is old, we have no son and he is a strong boy, he could be a good Cossack. What do you have? Neither life nor wealth! When I will leave him 360 best horses and an area in the steppes

that he will not be able to traverse in a matter of two days, he will keep gold in a sack under the tent, and he will know what life is. You are the mother. A mother wants what is best for her son, and so, give him to me... Why should he live here in slavery and work as a farm hand?" (Kossak-Szczucka 1923, *Požoga*, 29-30). In this small fragment there is everything: a camp mentality, hereditary professional soldiery, steppe wealth consisting in a herd of horses, contempt for agriculture and farm work, the need for an extensive space and weak consciousness of clan or even family ties. This culture may survive all the currents of history precisely due to its simplicity.

## Excerpts from “The Jewish Civilization”

Publ. Antyk, Warsaw, 1999

### **JC, p. 84**

This [Judaic feature] includes a collective relation to God and from this follows the principle of exclusive collectiveness in community life. What results is a method that does not permit personalism. This is exactly the same in the Brahmin civilization and in that part of Islam that remained in the Turanian civilization.

Without personalism there is no creativity.

### **JC, p. 299**

On the basis of many entries in the Talmud contemptuous, purely formalistic ideas about marriage developed. The same is not lacking among the Muslims. Characteristic is the tradition about rabbis Abba-Arich and Nachman, operating around the year A.D. 200, who are said to have been marrying wives in every town they visited, «for one day only», giving them a divorce in the morning. This is similar to the customs in Kashgaria, among the Turanian Muslims, where prostitution is employed, dressed in the form of marriage; in the evening wedding, in the morning divorce and the same day she can get married again in another part of the town. General

Grąbczewski (one of the most eminent travellers) describes vividly a characteristic scene of divorcing in the street while you wait.

In Islam and in Judaism polygamy is permitted. European Jews adopt monogamy from the XI<sup>th</sup> c. onwards and today the vast majority of Muslims also live with a single wife. In both religions it was allowed to punish adulterous wives with death. Also in both the husband can give a divorce to his wife but not the other way round.

## **JC, p. 350**

Turkey, that Boeotia<sup>84</sup> of Islam, did not know the Arab civilization and the Arabic language was studied only by those who officially had to deal with the Quran. Turkey belongs to the Turanian civilization the main characteristic of which is camp life and dislike of books. This was to change only after the Young Turks took over, of which at least half were Jews.

## **JC, p. 437**

In other civilizations there are not so many features that would lead to conflict as in our own [Latin]. None has historicism and some have features similar to those present in the Jewish civilization. In the Brahmin civilization, in the Turanian and Chinese, even in the Byzantine, collectivism is obvious to all. These civilizations are also devoid of historicism, and not even the Byzantine has developed it much.

---

<sup>84</sup> [A part of ancient Greece looked upon with derision by neighbouring city states. Used as a pejorative term indicating stupidity.]

**JC, p. 488-490**

Jewish memory accompanies almost the very birth of Russia, this being so because of the dependence on the Khazars, who are considered to be Jews. This however has to be placed among fairy tales.

Khazaria and the Khazars are geographic and political terms, not ethnographic. In the formation of large Asiatic societies ethnographic factors were of little importance, while political factors were much more important than in Europe. There never existed any ethnographic society of the Huns, Mongols, Manchurians, Turks or Khazars. These were political associations of peoples functioning under these names and very non-monolithic in their ethnic composition. What decided was the possibility of sustaining themselves by the military profession, starting from a local conquest of neighbouring tribes all the way to the conquest and the establishment of gigantic states. Let us imagine a condottiere army of paid mercenaries encompassing whole groups of peoples and this will give us more than a half of the history of Asia. As can be recorded as early as the VI<sup>th</sup> c. a military entrepreneur often turned into a ruler who will carry the title of *Khagan* which developed among a Turkish group of Turanians.

Some VII<sup>th</sup> c. *Khagan* led the Khazars from the Caucasus onto the Azov Sea area. His successors conquered Crimea and extended their rule further, so far that eventually the Khazar state ranged from the Volga delta almost beyond the Oka and it spread also westwards towards the Dnieper region. It was inhabited by various peoples as is evidenced by the variety of religions practised.

The Khazar lands represented a distant extension of the universal Baghdad trade and they were exploited by Arab traders, that is, by Jews using the Arab language. Did the trade follow the Khazar conquests or were the expeditions towards the Dnieper conducted for «Arab» money and the *Khagan* was a mercenary condottiere of the great international trade? The fact remains that it was during this Khazar period that the forgotten antique trade route on to the Dnieper was rediscovered.

The traders from the distant caliphates were not the first Jews in the Khazar state. The diaspora reached there also. Proselytism also functioned there and apparently it achieved much since in the VIII<sup>th</sup> c. some *Khagans* practised Judaism. Jewish propaganda encompassed also the nomadic Burtas neighbouring from the North where remnants of Judaism were found as late as the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. and signs of it persisted till the early XX<sup>th</sup> c. in some interesting sects found in the Tambov and Penza provinces.

There was a place for Judaism in the Khazar state and it held an important position but the Khazars did not represent some ethnographic variety of Jews. The very title of *Khagan* suffices to place the Khazars not under Judaism but among the Turanians.

A similar indication comes from the concentric structure of their former capital the Atil on the mouth of the Volga. In mid IX<sup>th</sup> c. the capital was moved further west to Sarkel on the Don River. Byzantine builders participated in its construction. Both Atil and Sarkel were composed of concentric rings. We know that Atil had seven of them. This was the pattern for all more important encampments of the Avars, Mongols, Huns and Tatars. Moscow developed later in the same way (copying the Sarai of the Golden Horde). This clearly indicates that the Khazars were Turanian.

Suddenly the Khazars disappear. What became of them? Similarly the Avars and Huns disappeared and many other states of the Turanian group. When fortune turned against the *Khagan* his armies chose livelihood under some other banner, if necessary a hundred miles away. The shining or waning star of the *Khagan* determined the formation or disappearance of a «people» who were no more than a military society.



## Excerpts from “The Latin Civilization”

Publ. Antyk, Komorów, 2018

### **LC, p. 19-20**

The Turanian civilization knows nothing about the conflict between spiritual and physical forces, nor does it have any ethical doubts. The entire life is based on the camp principle. The commander is master of life and property, because the subjects remain in the condition of personal dependency towards him. This civilization attained its summit in the Uyghur culture (the Mongols of Genghis Khan). It took over the Tatars of Kipchak, Ruthenia and Muscovy. Its purest form emerged among the Cossacks. In Russia it mixed with other civilizations, particularly with the Byzantine. The Turanian influences on Poland came from three directions, from the Islamic Turanians (the Tatars and Ottoman Turks); and from the Cossacks who developed a civilizational mixture that was expressed in Sarmatism<sup>85</sup>. Later, when Poland was partitioned a third source of Turanian influences came from the Russian statehood. These influences continue to have an impact (a very strong one), even after our having regained independence.

---

<sup>85</sup> [The term “Sarmatism” denotes a deformed hedonist cultural current in baroque Poland that referred to the ancient Sarmatians.]

**LC, p. 90-97**

Some rapacious states managed to expand. How many failed to do so? Was there ever a small state that did not wish to become greater? We do not need to prove to what extent the making of conquests was a universal ideal of the entire antiquity and later of the major part of Christendom. Violence, aggression and armed force decided about the fate of states and established new ones. Even great states began following a method that we can truly say was worked out by thugs.

Another issue is the fact that a state built only on brutality will not survive long. History gives us interesting examples of brigandage that led to the establishment of states. And it is a fact that organised thievery often meets with glorification. Have we not heard fables about Ondrzajnik, Janosik, Dobosz [Robin Hood-type characters, who robbed the rich and gave to the poor]? We enjoy them in literary, poetical pieces, whereas the peasants hold them to be absolute heroes. The issue merits a monographic study made by some ethnologist with a historical education, because it is a theme that repeats itself in all countries, peoples and times. The ideal of brigandage was always present and by no means has it cooled down today. Naval bandits, pirates established a state in the Mediterranean in the 1<sup>st</sup> c. B.C. (Pompey fought against them). The Norman Vikings who are so praised even in scientific works were simply pirates. Later Moorish pirates were robbing for two centuries and... they attained fame. All of them established coastal states. And what a pirate is on the sea and in coastal regions, so further inland is a soldier, occupant and conqueror. Half of the history of Asia consists of such or-

ganized military brigandage raised to a highest possible extent.

In closer times a number of purely bandit states appeared in Asia and Africa. Towards the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> c. several hundred Spanish renegades in the service of the Moroccan king Ahmed the Magnificent by way of conquest set up for themselves a great Negro state called Songhai with a capital in Gao. The fate of Laos in the north-western part of French Indochina is notable. The original population was expelled by invaders from Assam. In the XVII<sup>th</sup> c. the Laos state was an empire with a standing army of half a million. At the beginning of the XIX<sup>th</sup> c. Laos was conquered by the Siamese, who destroyed the capital and ruled over the country in such a way that in our times, after a longish French administration the entire population in 1927 was no more than 3.5 million, that is, scarcely seven times the size of the army alone three centuries earlier. This means that the size of the population has not yet returned to what it was three centuries ago.

In South Africa, among the Zulus<sup>86</sup>, in the years 1812-1828 there was a ruler called Shaka, known to the Europeans as the Zulu Attila. He gathered troops in order to capture cattle, giving several of them away to his soldiers for their faithful service. In this manner, he formed an army of more than 30 thousand men. He united 78 tribes under his rule, but he exterminated 40 others in the process. There were many such one-generation powers in Africa. For example, in Uganda there was one having four million inhabitants and 150 000 soldiers. Those who were allowed an audience had to crawl on the ground to

---

<sup>86</sup> [Koneczny uses here the term Kaffir, which was the name for all Negroes in South Africa. Now the term is considered derogatory.]

the ruler. Later the whites abolished these states. Kashgaria [in Asia] was the last one. It was established in 1865 by Yakoob Beg who was given the nickname "Bed-snlet", that is the lucky one. In 1877 he was murdered by his brother, who did not enjoy the succession for long.

It was always the principle in such states that the ruler could do everything according to his whim, meaning that all the people were his slaves and everything was his property. This in fact is the governing principle for the whole of Orient with the exception of China. The Arab world was no better. In Egypt, Caliph Hakim ordered that one half of a town be burned, while the other half was destined for slaughter and robbery. All this was during peace time, just for fun. In the XII<sup>th</sup> c. the vizier Shawar ordered that Cairo be burned and the fire lasted for 40 days, obviously not extinguished.

An idea of the extent of authority of an oriental despot is provided by Safder-Ali, the Khan of Kandzhut in Central Asia. In a letter to gen. Grąbczewski he wrote: "Know that you are in a country where even the birds begin to have strength in their wings after having received my orders" (Grąbczewski 1924, *Podróże [Travels]*, II, 98).

Not all states are born from brigandage. Their genesis may be various, but I want to stress that they can also be established following this method. Something of this method is present in every oriental absolutism and influences coming from there have reached the West already in the first centuries A. D. The seed of brigandage has produced weeds throughout the centuries and has this ended? Let us give a moment of reflection to this as well as to the German theories trying to convince us that a state is almost of divine origin! Unfortunately there is no shortage of statehoods that are clearly anti-social.

In all this, the Turanian civilization is leading. No other can compare with it, in the basing of state law exclusively

on violence. This is all the more significant because the very notion of supreme authority among these people is derived from the monism of private law.

Central Asia is the birthplace of this civilization. It is there that a specific camp-type system developed, being the greatest and most outstanding mechanism in history.

In the formation of Asiatic communities and societies, political factors played a much greater role than in Europe. There was never any ethnic community that was Hun, Turkish, Mongol, Khazar or Manchurian. These were only "political" associations of peoples, appearing under these general names, but of a heterogeneous ethnic composition. In their struggle for material existence a certain method came to the fore that was known in Europe, but only in a miniature scale. This was the self-maintenance through the warring profession. In consequence, this led to a permanent, systematic rapacity treated as the supreme reason for life. The warring profession spread across Asia to such an extent that our own European condottiere's life-style seems to be child's play in comparison. In Asia great associations based their entire existence on this. Constant warring, at times was limited to banditry among neighbours, and at other times it contributed to the establishment of great aggressor states. They either fought, or they decayed in stagnant inactivity. Engaging in conquests has been a first order creative factor for societies and states in Asia and this was so since many centuries. They flourished with conquests and fell or even deteriorated, whenever they stopped making conquests. Particularly amongst the peoples of the Turanian civilization, the fullness of life consists in living at the cost of others as far as possible.

Military entrepreneurs won states for themselves, becoming their rulers and distributing the spoils taken

from the conquered peoples among their soldiers. When fortune turned away from such a condottiere leader and he was no longer able to assure his soldiers the expected riches, he disbanded them or they left him on their own. The people then searched for life under some other banner. The fate of war, the shining or fading star of the condottiere, decided about the formation or disappearance of peoples, particularly those of Turkish origin, who were most eager to engage in professional soldiery.

These peoples were in fact regiments. Their names, recorded in the chronicles, do not refer to "peoples" in our understanding of this word, i.e. ethnographic entities, but at least originally they described a strictly military association regardless of its ethnic composition, which frequently was a very varied collection picked up from all sides. When their generals failed to win, they would succumb to total ignorance and apathy. These people-regiments changed their place of settlement easily, wandering over hundreds of miles with their wives, children and property, frequently only because they were ordered to do so by their leader or also in search of a new one.

Temujin, the Genghis Khan was such a warring entrepreneur and with his armies he managed to occupy half of Asia, from Korea to Turkestan.

These were warring nomads, exclusively volunteers. Entire clans could go together, or the clans could disintegrate with each warrior setting out or staying according to his whim. They looked for fortune in the world as circumstances would offer it, leaving everything to chance. As a result the clan ties had to loosen and new ones would be formed, but they would not be lasting. Everyone was constantly prepared to face changes. The lack of any tradition meant that the clan structure and even more so the tribal one could never fully develop.

These in fact were semi-clan structures and so they never had a tribal consciousness. The military regiment became the tribe.

In this way a specific camp culture developed within the Turanian civilization. Its exceptional expansion entitles us to consider the entire Turanian civilization as being a camp one, because this feature is predominant.

The people-regiments cannot have the consciousness of belonging to some special place or having the properties of some local ethnic group. As a rule they have no personal name. They identify themselves through their condottiere, e.g. as the Nogai, Ottomans etc. The name will stick if their entrepreneur will succeed with long-term fortune. The Manchurians and Ottomans, having persisted for a long time on even ground became an ethnographic community, because their features became genetically fixed over several generations. Thus they acquired the characteristic of a common origin becoming as it were a small race. The Avars and the Huns never reached this stage. Their short-term states had a great variety in their ethnographic composition.

The camp organization generates certain similarities regardless of its ethnic origin. This can be perceived in the military troops of the eastern Slavs, in the military colonies of Apraksin, in the Austrian "Military Border Land" (on the lower Drava and Sava Rivers), etc. Everywhere soldiery was combined with agriculture — and always without much success.

Where the social bond consists in warring, a higher spiritual level cannot be attained. This is because large scale banditry is the basic element of such societies and states and even their ideal.

In the Turanian civilization larger states can exist only so long as they expand their borders. They perish when they cannot afford further conquests and they flourish

again when they resume them. This was the case with the Mongols, the Tatars, the Turks and this is what happened throughout the history of Russia. Since the conquered spoils must eventually run out, such states cannot flourish for long, but only episodically. The brigandage method intrinsically contains the roots of its own decline.

### **LC, p. 99-100**

If there is to be order at least within a community, and even more so in a society, nation or state, there has to be commensurability between the private and public life. Both one and the other have to be governed by the methods of the same civilization. Whenever, for example, a Turanian statehood is imposed upon a population that is holding onto the Latin civilization in private life, the statehood is then treated as alien and all the people try to have as little contact with it as possible. They close themselves against this foreign state system. Should this distancing from the state cease, private life will acquire Turanian characteristics, accepting what is considered by the Latin civilization to be a vice. Since, for example, family life cannot be organized simultaneously according to both Latin and Turanian civilizational norms, it will disintegrate or become Turanian. In marriage, in family life, in private life and in public life, it is impossible to be civilized in two different ways.

### **LC, p. 113**

When the omnipotence of the state will take control over all issues that previously were under the private law, it

will also acquire the right to restrict the private law, to modify or suspend it. In practice, this will amount to leaving it to the free decision of every official in the field of his responsibility. And, in theory? There will be no other theoretical way out than the recognition that all people and everything are left to the free decision of the ruler, who at the same time will be given the right to dispose of all and everything at whim. The result will be completely Turanian with the entire state and its whole population being as if the private property of the head of state.

## **LC, p. 501**

One of the features of the Latin statehood is a separate state law, the distinctiveness of public law in general. The private law is one thing and the public law is something else. This legal dualism is the corner stone of our civilization and so it is also a foundation of our political notions.

The antipode of our notions in this field is legal monism, which knows of only one type of law, either solely private or solely public. Such monism derives from the Turanian civilization. There the ruler is the owner of the entire state and its whole population. Such legal expressions, which we would refer to as the public law, are derived there from an amplification of the private property of the head of state. In other words, within the Turanian civilization, the private law of the ruler towards the population becomes the public law, which does not differ from the private law, but is only its expansion in view of the interests of the ruler.



## Excerpt from “Obronić cywilizację łacińską!” [“To Defend the Latin Civilization!”]

Publ. Fundacja Rozwoju Kultury Polskiej, Lublin, 2002

### **The chapter: “Religie a cywilizacje” [“Religions and Civilizations”], p. 79-83**

The Mongol state had freedom of conscience and the equality of all religions under an irreligious government. It was only when the grandson of Temujin, Kublai adopted Buddhism that the relationships changed. For a while Temujin himself tried to be the inventor of a political religion, a state one for his pagan subjects, which was to be based strictly upon the Genghis Khan. He derived his origin and power from heaven. The title *Sutu Bogdo* adopted in 1189 means nothing less than the incarnation of a god. In this artificial religion there was a mixture of information about the flood and Noah with Buddhist legends about the miraculous conception of Buddha. Chronologically this was the second example of the forming of an artificial religion that failed to function (about the first one we shall speak below<sup>87</sup>).

The universal Asiatic Mongol state disintegrated for religious reasons. Genghis Khan Hulagu, the son of a Nestorian and married to a Nestorian was a vehement opponent of Islam. An Armenian chronicle places

---

<sup>87</sup> [In the same essay Koneczny later analyses the post-Alexandrian attempt to artificially unify Asiatic credences with the Hellenic.]

this couple on a par with Constantine the Great and Helen, and in Nestorian churches funeral religious ceremonies were celebrated for the repose of the soul of Hulagu in spite of the fact that he was not baptized. (He died in 1264.) His second son and successor, Nigudar, the Genghis Khan and ruler over Persia was an openly baptized Christian. Nestorianism triumphed! But then a reaction of Islam came about, because it cannot subsist under tolerance. It declines whenever it has only equal rights and is not privileged. Nigudar himself converted to Islam. His successor Arghun returned to the Mongolian "Yassack" (religious custom and civil law) in 1289. He sent a delegation to the Pope, to England and France proposing an alliance against Islam which was spreading from Egypt, but his son Ghazan adopted Islam. His successor Uljaitu (since 1304) was baptized in childhood, but this was the end of wavering. Uljaitu heads a whole series of Shiite rulers. Persia became totally Islamic and the Mongolian-Turkish elements combined politically and religiously with the Iranian autochthonous population and all Mongolian tradition vanished there. The situation was similar in Transoxiana and in Turkestan. Around the year 1320 Islam started to expand all the way to China. But in central Asia Islam underwent various perversions.

The Mongols who had established an enormous universal state, from the Dniester River [in Ukraine] to the Pacific Ocean, were not some wild horde. The conquerors of Ruthenia [1223], the victors over Poland and Hungary [1241] had the first regular army since Roman times and Temujin was not only an excellent soldier, but also a great administrator and lawgiver. These Mongols referred to themselves as the "Blue", or "Uyghur". They worked out a distinct civilization, which may be called Mongolian or

Uyghur. It did not last long; fragments of it remain in present desert Mongolia.

In the universal history of the East, one aspect of the Mongolian contribution survived: the bureaucracy. They established it in the East, they drew their bureaucratic servants, the Chinese, leading them westwards, (the first *baskaks* in Ruthenia were Chinese), and later when they conquered China they made it completely bureaucratic, thereby suppressing the creativity of the Chinese civilization. In any case this is not the place to explain the differences between northern and southern China, to point out the fact that a righteous Chinese considers himself to be oppressed by the Mongolians, etc.

Let us move further to the West. From the Genghis Khanate the separate state of Kipchak developed covering more or less Eurasia together with the whole of [non-Lithuanian] Ruthenia. This was the classical state of the Tatars. Nestorianism was spreading there and Kagan Sartaq, the successor of Batu Khan was baptized. His successor, Berek adopted Islam in 1262.

The Kipchak Islam was somewhat crass, as if deprived of its spike. It adopted some features that are contrary to Islam, for example, they did not consider it necessary to convert through the sword. Thus, they did not have the fanaticism of religious conquests. The Quran was assimilated only half-heartedly since some of the Yassack tolerance was maintained. The Tatars retained much of the Uyghur culture in the sense that they continued to be organized as military nomads, and in many respects it is difficult to say whether they should be listed among the Mongolian world or the Islamic. Before the Turks settled in the Balkans, before the idea of a new Caliphate started to spread from Istanbul, the Islam of Kipchak was not aggressive. In fact, it was tolerant. Polish historians know

for how long the Crimean and trans-Volga Khans hesitated whether to stand on the side of Turkey or against it.

Kipchak disintegrated as a result of the competition between Islam, the Yassack and Nestorianism. Nogai stood at the head of the ancient Yassack (hence we speak of the Nogai Tatars), while the rest established the "Golden Horde" which later broke up into several smaller Hordes. These were organisms of a lower order. Within the Uyghur civilization, Kipchak was on the lowest level, even though it maintained it longest, but only of the most inferior kind. These were all caricatures of the tradition of the Genghis Khanate. The military art declined and the art of public administration disappeared completely. The Tatars became wild and in this they had a strong and fatal impact on Muscovy that was subservient to them.

At the court of the Khan, nomadic in the summer, and settled in Sarai in the winter, there was always a resident representative of the Greek-Slav Church, known as the bishop of Sarai. He had a clerical entourage and celebrated religious ceremonies just as in the whole of Ruthenia. There was no shortage of Orthodox propaganda among the Tatars, but we note something specific here: the court of the Khan did not distinguish between the Orthodox and the Nestorians! The eastern sources considered Ruthenia to be simply Nestorian. The Orthodox clergy, and in particular the bishops of Sarai could not have been unaware of the existence of "the Uyghur Christians", i.e. the Nestorians, particularly since 1267, the Caucasian Nestorian Christians belonged to the Sarai diocese. Ruthenian sources were very sensitive to any form of heresies, but there was never any mention of the Nestorians! Never ever had any dignitary of the Orthodox Church corrected the misunderstanding, as if Orthodoxy and Nestorianism were the

same. The Orthodox Church had no problem with this. They were not bothered by the differences. Nestorianism had a profound influence on the Church of Muscovy. This can be seen in various details of the mediaeval Orthodox canon law (for example in various issues pertaining to the marriages of the clergy, the question of the consumption of veal, etc.). This issue that is so important for the universal history has not been touched upon yet. It would be appropriate to point out here that both Nestorianism and Orthodoxy had a similarly cherished devotion to St. Nicholas, (the Christian name of Nigudar was Nicholas), but initially the Nestorians of the Mongol state placed St. Andrew in the first place, in accord with the proper Byzantine Church. (Banners with the cross of St. Andrew were seen both in Legnica and in Dalmatia.) It is probable also that later the Ruthenian Church had an influence on the "Uyghur" Nestorians. Thus Orthodoxy was close to Asiatic Christianity. And the culture of Ruthenia was it not in a close historical tie with the Mongolian and Turanian civilizations? The notion of statehood was taken from the Mongols and the internal state order and later also the court etiquette were taken from the Kipchak Tatars. The domestic customs of the higher classes were taken from the Kazan Tatars. Frequently it is not possible to distinguish Muscovy from the Tatars! The Muscovite culture is a variant of the Turanian civilization; it is a Turano-Slav culture.

Religious and civilizational issues in the whole of Eurasia were close to one another. Orthodoxy was not distinguished from Nestorianism and the whole of XVI<sup>th</sup> century Russian history is an extension of western Tatarism. The integration of Eastern influences began very early. It is erroneous to claim that it was only under the Genghis Khans that Ruthenia found itself under Turanian supremacy, because the Cumans had dominated it

earlier and since the XII<sup>th</sup> c. Cuman notions and even customs had a profound influence on Southern Ruthenia. Mixed marriages of the higher classes of Ruthenia with the Cumans were most common. The Mongol invasion was provoked by the fact that Ruthenian princes moved onto the River Kalka... in defence of the Cumans who were endangered by Mongol supremacy.

There were also Byzantine influences on the Ruthenian Orthodox Church. They were never very strong, and their impact on the statehood and the spiritual life was negligible! The Church was under Bulgarian influence, and so as a consequence the Byzantine influence was only indirect. Direct contacts were rare events. It is therefore erroneous to consider Muscovy-Russia as belonging to the orbit of the Byzantine civilization. There was much more Byzantinism in Turkey than in Russia. But some Byzantine influences were present.

# Excerpts from “The Laws of History”

Antyk, Komorów, 2013

## **LoH, p. 81**

Succession after the clan head was decided variously. Despots assure it for their sons according to twofold principles: favouring the oldest or the youngest son. The favouring of the youngest occurs in Oceania, among the Mongols, Tatars, in Siberia and in the Turanian areas of European Russia from where it migrated to the Novgorod “Ruthenian Law”. We also find the favouring of the youngest in small areas scattered over Belgium, France, Germany and England.

## **LoH, p. 86-89**

Until this day nomads like to live at other peoples’ expense. Tribes do not rob one another but enrich themselves by robbing settled people (e.g. on African oases). As a result among many nomadic peoples, especially Turanian ones, military organization dominates all other types of organization. People attach themselves willingly to successfully warring entrepreneurs and as it were peoples-regiments form, composed of various Turanian peoples. If such a camp association exists for three generations or more, it becomes a new people by itself. However the Turanian system destroys everywhere the

natural course of events, from a clan, through tribe, to a people and it causes extraordinary deviations in the developmental sequence.

The eastern Mongols referred to as *khalkha* live in clans known as *khoshumas* and these unite into tribal *aymags* (regiments). The *nojoes* lead the *khoshumas* and the *aymags* are led by the *chans*. An association of *aymags* makes a people. Since there used to be and still are many such associations one could draw the conclusion that there were several east-Mongolian peoples. These associations however are very mobile among the Mongols, they do not last long, are variable, and all of this because of their camp civilization. They change a leader moving from camp to camp.

These peoples have maintained a camp organization even though the circumstances allowing them to conduct independently wars have disappeared.

“The Buryats even today during their great hunts that have the characteristics of great military operations arrange themselves according to the same order. The *uluses* take up their respective positions and each separate clan knows beforehand where it is to stand, where to go and what to do. This allows them to extend the hunting line for over a dozen or so kilometres, not to obstruct one another and to encroach in an organized manner upon the given sector of the woodland. A traveller, N. Potanin has told me that among the Kyrgyzstan people war cries are still maintained that are very useful in all kinds of difficulties. When a Kyrgyz is unable to deal with a situation during war, hunt or in the parliament he shouts his clan cry *uran* and his clansmen run immediately to his help. When the danger to the clan persists they give a cry of their association of clans. When the clan association is unable to cope with the situation,

then the fighting men cry out the summons of the horde" (quote from Sieroszewski).

"The Yakut clans have also had their own war cries, *uran*, their own military songs and signs. These signs have completely disappeared but memory of them persists" (Sieroszewski).

The majority of the Russian army consists of such Turanian peoples. They are happy when they can fight. For what, and at what price? This they do not think about since it is indifferent for them. If such a soldier were to be provided with military equipment for a hundred years he would happily spend all that time at war.

Already in the First World War the Manchurians were noticed for their wildness and cruelty in which they obviously relished (they were confused with the Chinese with great harm to the Chinese). Still today the organization of their community is strictly regimental. They divide themselves into "standards" (regiments) as others do into tribes.

Obviously wherever there is an army everyone belongs to some regiment, and since we all have begun within some clan organization then under war conditions everyone rushed to his clan standard. They have fluttered at Grunwald<sup>88</sup>. The clan cry was attached to each crest for a long time, even when the tradition about what they meant was forgotten. In time clan regiments changed into county and regional ones because the emancipation of the family fractured the clan organization. In the Turanian civilization clans changed into regiments and the camp structure became the basic feature of social organization, also during peace time, hindering markedly the development of a community,

---

<sup>88</sup> [The decisive battle of 1410 between Poland and the Teutonic Knights.]

its progress towards a society and frequently making it completely impossible. The commensurability of camp characteristics became so rigid that it did not permit any others, stifling at germ level any elements of a true society. Higher stages of development would be incommensurable with the camp structure and thus they have not developed.

The natural expansion of an association from a clan to a tribe and then to people takes place therefore according to different methods.

## **LoH, p. 129-131**

There was a strong opposition against Islam among the Kipchak Tatars. As soon as Berke signed an alliance with the Mameluks of Egypt against Hulagu who sympathized with the Christians, Kipchak divided and later fell apart. Nogai, the organiser of a new Horde, stood up in defence of the *yassack*. There was no more any concern for the title of Genghis Khan. The empty title remained among the nomads of the Mongolian steppes.

All these peoples were characterized by... a lack of religious devotion! The Chinese became areligious. The Islam of Kipchak was strangely half and half. The Nestorians were unable to make sacrifices for their faith. Buddhism soon became a caricature and the dwindling "Blue" Mongols of Uyghur culture were unable to define which religion they followed. And yet these peoples fought with one another and separated because of religious differences. Even in the Turanian civilization, the least concerned with abstracts, abstracts have dominated minds and actions, and these were religious abstracts.

The Tatar Kipchak had a profound influence on ideas about the state among the eastern Slavs. It was Karamzin who made the observation: "Moscow is the product of the Khans". The basic outcome of these concepts, despotism, was common to the Turanian Mongols and to the Byzantines. Thus the Tatar influences developed simultaneously with the influences of the Byzantine Church onto the "Church of Kiev and the whole of Ruthenia". Perhaps some future studies will enlighten us as to the proportion of influences in mediaeval times coming truly and directly from the Byzantine patriarchate and of those coming from the Nestorians. At the court of the Khan there were always official representatives of the Muscovy Orthodoxy and of Nestorianism and yet no one knew how to distinguish them. When they were confused the Eastern Orthodox bishop residing at the Khan court never protested. After all views of the Tatar dignitaries and the Orthodox monks about the state coincided and continued to yield fruits. So long as the Tatar supremacy continued the Khan was the "Tsar", and then later the grand duke of Muscovy became the Tsar. At no time in Moscow was the Byzantine emperor considered a "Tsar" and often there were suspicions that the Ruthenian faith (i.e. schism within a schism) is indeed better than the "Greek" one. In both these churches distant echoes of gnosis resounded and with time its most distant branch, the eastern-Slavic one, took over primacy. The passivity of the clergy and the population in respect to the excesses of the Tsars (not only of Ivan the Terrible) can only be explained by emanationistic notions. The behaviour of the Tsars was no better than the excesses of the rulers of Central Asia. The Tsar was an emanation of a deity and opposition to him was considered a sin. The most recent research indicates that Gnosticism can be found in the whole history of Eastern Orthodoxy, throughout

all the centuries all the way to Dostoevsky and as far as Berdyaev. However gnosis did not link with Islam and it was even expelled from its very source, from SW Asia (primarily Syria) by Mohammedanism thanks to its half way position between creationism and emanationism.

## **LoH, p. 210**

The Turanians have no literature at all. The only art they have is building construction and about science they do not even know that it exists. This is a civilization typical for individualists (very few of them) and the most closed to personalism. The Muscovy culture while it was exclusively under the Turanian influence had no literature; also the second Turanian-Slav culture, the Cossack one, had none. We observe also in Polish history how literary production declined even in number during the Sarmatian period. In Moscow and in Ruthenia fine literature appeared under the influence of Latin civilization, through the mediation of Polish culture. Both these literatures are a good subject for study so as to perceive how far the Latin civilization had an influence there, to what sort of depth it has reached and whether it has not been warped in any characteristic way.

## **LoH, p. 220-221**

We shall not deny love of learning to the Brahman, who can quote by heart several thousand verses; nor to the Jew, who in great poverty bordering on penury will nod his whole life over the Talmud; nor to a Chinese, who until late age continues to learn how to write. What is at issue is the method in science. Some civilizations block

science by sacralism, others by utilitarianism. The whole of the Turanian civilization manages without care for Truth and has never had anything to do with sciences. But both of the decisive battles in 1241, on the River Sajo in Hungary and near Legnica [in Poland] took place simultaneously, within a time space of eight days. Considering the means of communication at the time this required a great deal of practical reasoning in the staff of the Genghis Khan's army. Neither Mongolia nor Turkey has ever produced scholars. In Russia for two and a half centuries the ruling principle stated that "thinking is the beginning of evil". Yet, the Mongols did establish a state of universal proportions; three parts of the world trembled in fear of Turkey, and Russia exerted hegemony over Europe in spite of the fact that Nicholas I did not depart much from the principle of Philotheus of Pskov.

Does that mean that Mongols, Turks and Muscovites lacked a world view? They had it in their own manner, completely without any science, and yet how effective they were! But so single-tracked! This single-tracked mind is a defect and so it is all the more interesting. They seemed to have been ruled by peculiar abstracts.

The entire Turanian civilization is extremely one-sided because its highest ideal is an aggressive warlike spirit and this is the prime aim of its large associations. It is here that the main line of their world view is centred. It is composed of primitive, not very complicated military abstracts.

## **LoH, p. 247-248**

We know of communities in which over ages the changes were few and of no great significance; and yet even though so insignificant they still occurred very slowly.

Some Siberian indigenous peoples, the Turanian “Cosacks” (e.g. in Kyrgyzstan), the Berber Hamites and many other peoples are examples of this type. Where nothing is changing there is no history; where special investigators can only with difficulty find some changes, because they are invisible, there is also little history to be found, scarcely enough for special investigations to notice. There are peoples whose histories can only be chronicles of contingent events; and there are others that are constantly in the same state in which they were first found by the first discoverers (e.g. in Patagonia). Among these peoples historical velocity is equal to zero.

## **LoH, p. 276**

The culture of action has its own method in each civilization. In the Turanian civilization one becomes eminent in a very different way than in the Latin one. Should one using a magic carpet transfer today Stalin to London and Attlee (a socialist) to Moscow, they would both prove useless; they would not be able to do anything. Stalin would be considered in England an enemy of the society and Attlee would astonish the intelligentsia in Moscow as somebody who knows nothing about the essence and the structure of a state. This is so because the abstracts that grasp the relationships of societies and states are completely different in Anglo-Saxon heads from those in Moscow heads. This was so for centuries and this cannot be changed so long as the former belong to the Latin civilization and the latter to the Turanian one.

## **LoH, p. 283**

Best examples of this are provided by the history of the Turanian civilization. Has not the establishment of new social groups evidenced the existence of exceptional individualities? Nogai, Osman, Temujin, Tamerlane and a long list of lesser not so successful figures were all such, but not even the greatest of them has made a dent on the structures of communalism. New Hordes were established, but only Hordes.

The individuality of a person disappears, when he is not successful. Thus he has no qualms when he is acting or choosing means, and in particular he is far from trying to control himself. He always promotes his own person and thus readily degenerates to the level of sowing disension.

In the middle, between individualism and personalism lies egocentrism. This is not selfishness, but such a person feels and acts altruistically only when great personal individual emotions play a role, some personal incentive. In his actions, an egocentric is as if the centre of the world. Everything begins from him and aims towards him; otherwise everything is immaterial to him.

## **LoH, p. 296**

The most important act of clan law is the establishment who is the son of who. We know the long genealogies contained in the Bible. We can still frequently meet them among the Arabs, less frequently so among the Turanians. In more eminent families everyone knows his genealogy by heart. A Chinese will fix it on tablets decorating the wall of the common room. One of the most

fascinating tasks of ethnology is the observing of how the primitives peoples of our times care for their genealogy and to what extent they feel a need for it. There are different degrees of this. The more a tribe arises, the more attention it pays to genealogy. Very rare is communalism so extreme that there are no such individualistic drives within it.

### **LoH, p. 315**

History teaches us that in the Turanian civilization which is extreme in its communalism there was never any liberty apart from the freedom to plunder, attributed to the one who is stronger. Nowhere were there so many hordes of robbers as among the Turanians. Was the whole Ottoman state anything else?

### **LoH, p. 420**

An analogous example is provided by the Mongolian Genghis Khanate. After the state that had encompassed the two parts of the world there remained only the sheer title of Genghis Khan used by the Khan of one of the second order Mongolian nomadic tribes. The Turanian civilization rose to its peak culture in Asia, in the Uyghur culture of the "Blue Mongolians", the organizers of a universal state. Not a trace of this remains. The indigenous element of the Turanian civilization was composed of the Mongolians, Tatars, Turks and then in the West the "multi-tribe" Yugra, but two cultures have been gained through westward expansion into Slav territory and they have prolonged the existence of this civilization. They are the Muscovite and the Cossack cultures, with considerable influence in Southern Ruthenia. It expanded

finally even to Poland generating the cultural formation known as "Sarmatism." Currently it extends also from eastern Siberia, through Central Asia to Asia Minor on the one hand and from the Baikal westwards over the Urals and Volga far to the west onto the Ruthenians on the San River. It entered again into Poland yielding the Piłsudskite formation [the regime of Józef Piłsudski and his adherents who ruled Poland dictatorially in 1926-1939].

Thus civilizations may not only spread out beyond their first centre of gravity but in the process they gain in longevity. Expansion results. The wider the expansion of a civilization the greater is the prospect of its durability.

As regards expansion however there is one condition. A civilization cannot be introduced by force. Whenever this was tried it was always unsuccessful; what is more, usually those who tried this violence perished.

## **LoH, p. 430-432**

The *ius connubi* [marriage law] appears to be a perfect criterion for integration, but also it is insufficient. One can retain it and yet not follow it; one can stand by it in theory and abandon it in practice. This has happened and happens variously. The Lithuanian Muslims readily marry Christian girls. Without any legislation the practice developed that such marriages are monogamous and for life and the religious education of children, their religious denomination officially written into the documents is according to sex [the girls follow the religion of the mother and the boys that of the father]. The Church tacitly accepts such marriages. In a civilizational sense among these Tatars there is complete chaos. Some have adopted the Latin civilization and these usually finalize

their evolution by receiving baptism; their link to Islam is in its final stages. Among the Catholic clergy in Lithuania there is no shortage of priests of Tatar origin. These have absolutely no Tatar characteristics apart from the anthropological. (I speak here from personal experience.) But the majority of the Tatars have maintained their Turanian civilization, which is manifested among them by a strange sympathy towards Muscovy and in the adoption of its customs. Polishness has no impact upon them and does not attract them. The common view about the patriotism of the Lithuanian Muslims is completely false. Finally there is one other category; the non-civilizational, and this is most numerous. Even among the Tatar intelligentsia in Lithuania one frequently meets with total ignorance about national issues, which are completely indifferent to them; by the term civilization they understand the tailor and European *savoir-vivre*. If they make some anti-Polish moves they are usually quite unaware of this and will not notice them at all.

It is difficult to imagine that Islam could integrate itself into Christianity. These two religions under one roof are a curiosity. No faithful Catholic will marry a Muslim, unless in the hope of converting him. Such a marriage can be easily identified by the fact that both sons and daughters are brought up as Catholics, thus if there is Islam it is present here in residual form. But it has to be noted that the Islam of our Tatars is extremely superficial. Has anyone met such a Muslim who would have known the Quran? They continue with the religion of the forefathers because Islam is so much easier to follow than Catholicism. In fact, they do not appear to have any religious instincts. But we need to abandon the fairy tale that they are proof of the attractiveness of the Polish identity.

Integration outside the dominant religion happens only exceptionally and individually. The adoption of a new religion is no proof of integration, unless it is accompanied by the adoption of the law of the land. When foreign laws are abandoned, also the old religion has to be abandoned. These are hard conditions, almost impossible to attain, where there is a civilizational difference.

## **LoH, p. 475-477**

Let us restrict ourselves to Asia and ask whether a synthesis between the Brahman, Chinese and Turanian civilizations is possible. The latter two are very different: The Chinese is very learned with a constant passing of examinations while the Turanian does not collect books. The Mongolian and Turkish people are a true personification of barbarity for the Chinese. The Brahmin in turn, views the Chinese as an agglomeration of people of a lower kind, because they are a-religious. All these three main Asiatic civilizations have a clan system but the Hindus link it with the caste system which distinguishes their social structure. All the Turanians, both the Mongols and the Turks, have very little social differentiation while the Chinese society is extremely differentiated. There is also the following difference between them, namely that the Brahman and Chinese have a social structure, while the Turanian has its own completely different and specific social system, that of a military camp. Cooperation between various social structures is difficult; the more so when there are various methods of associating.

Even in measuring time one can see civilizational differences in Asia, in this case to the disadvantage of the Brahman civilization; the Chinese, Arab and even Tu-

ranian civilizations have cycles, but the Brahman has stopped at the level of the calendar.

The Chinese civilization was characterized by an extraordinary expansion, yet it never tried syntheses. About the Turanian civilization, one can say that no one has ever tried a synthesis with it. The only country of such experiments was India. There have been attempts there, and still today some common elements with the Arab civilization as even the Turanian one are searched for. The initiative came at various times from each of these three civilizations but so far unsuccessfully. Every one constantly continues with its own distinct model. Projects of cooperation were always short lasting and conflicts lasted for long periods. The state of war subsided only when one of the combating civilizations managed to establish a powerful state that forced peace upon the conquered. Finally, British rule imposed a compulsory peace on the whole of India and it does not hamper any civilization, even granting some consideration to the Brahman one. Should British hegemony end there, there would be war in India of everyone with everyone. There is no possibility of any civilizational synthesis in India or even of peaceful cooperation of their diverse ethnic groups torn apart by the incommensurability of opposed civilizations. There is constantly a state of unfriendly tension there that is suppressed by the British supremacy. In spite of this brake imposed upon them the eruption of conflicts is not uncommon.

This happens in spite of the fact that all the four main Asiatic civilizations derive from the same point of attachment, namely from communalism and they reach the same result, that is, a mechanism. And what could be said of syntheses between civilizations that hold onto different lines of primary concepts?! The impossibility of

syntheses shows up in such a case even more starkly. How can a mechanism be conciliated with an organism?

### **LoH, p. 484**

Increasingly greater civilizational differences developed on both sides of the Lithuanian-Muscovy border. The methods of social life organization progressively diverged. The Muscovy statehood based itself on the monism of private law. The Prince basically was a land owner having great privileges. Various trading monopolies belonged also to the head of state, and these covered foreign trade in its entirety. This always appears wherever the Turanian civilization extends. Ivan III had his commissars in Crimea for trade in dried fish and silk. Steven the Great of Moldavia (1456–1504) traded in prisoners of war. Later the Cossack headmen and atamans traded in oxen till the XVIII<sup>th</sup> c. maintaining commissars for this purpose even as far away as Brzeg in Silesia. Could we imagine the Polish king ... engaged in trade?

### **LoH, p. 491**

Was this [Cossack rebellion] defence of Eastern Orthodoxy? The Cossacks came to us from Muscovy and the Cossack wars within the Moscow state were by no means simpler than in Poland (e.g. Ryazan etc.). Was this also in defence of Eastern Orthodoxy?

The cause lied in the inevitable conflict between the Turanian and Latin civilizations. The Cossack wars dismantled the anti-Turkish league that had been under Polish leadership. The Cossack community had a strictly camp organization, the purest expression of the Turanian civilization.

The new Polish subjects, half and half Cossack, did not sufficiently acquire the Latin culture to free themselves from Turanian notions altogether. This led to Sarmatism, which soon spread to Lithuania and Radziwiłł nick-named "Panie Kochanku" [Darling] was a model example of this. Even oriental attire was adopted. This was our synthesis of the West with the East!

## LoH, p. 537-538

Since the Great French Revolution we have a civilizational mixture in the whole of Europe with increasing influences of the Jewish civilization and with a visible expansion of Turanian notions. In the years 1815-1850 Europe was under Russian hegemony. One could say that German Byzantinism, introduced into Russia by Peter the Great, allowed for a better organization of the Turanian system there, for its perfection. A particular historical phenomenon developed: as Russia was more and more marked by German Byzantinism, undoubtedly Byzantine ideas that were budding in Germany had an inclination towards the Turanian civilization.

In 1800 J. G. Fichte in his book *Der geschlossene Handelsstaat* [*The Closed Commercial State*] came up with a number of Byzantine ideas, but he stumbled also into Turanian ones. For example he proposed impediments to the changing of a profession, the transfer of all foreign trade to the state, and the nationalization of the land, forests and mines. Half a century before Marx, Fichte came up with projects of the later socialist program and with what in our days is referred to as the "planned economy." He reasoned aprioristically and meditatively. He turned directly against personalism in 1806 in his *Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters* [Ba-

*sic Features of the Present Age*] claiming that "a reasonable life consists in the forgetting about oneself within the species." Never has communalism been expressed more accurately. Finally in his *Reden an die deutsche Nation* [*Speeches to the German Nation*] he claimed that the ideal state should be composed of only one class. Was he not the predecessor of Bolshevism?

The mixture in Fichte can serve as proof that through the meditative method it is possible to arrive at absolutely anything, at any moment.

## **LoH, p. 540-541**

On the very wide basis of the Turanian civilization something unusual was to develop there [in Muscovy] ... a national consciousness! The civilizational indecision however deepened. The state continued to function like an Oriental military despotism, but such a state can develop only when it is making new conquests. When it ceases to make them it has to crash. Those who wished to overthrow the despotic Tsardom, to make society more European and to reorganize the state according to a European model stumbled into the whirlpool of a mixture in which they drowned. For two hundred years European influences were trickling into Russia, primarily from Poland and at the same time the hatred of Poland was officially promoted, hatred towards that part of Europe that was under Russian domination. To maintain this hatred, to justify violence against Poland, various theories were devised including the very specific Russian Slavophile ideology, which led to the thesis about the "rotten West" and finally to the glorification of everything in Russia that was not of European origin. Russian thought succumbed into a vicious circle from which there was no way out.

What began was the going round in a circle of a being that has lost the sense of direction.

Ever since Russia could no longer remain in the Turanian civilization, in the Slav Turanian culture of Muscovy, and the other mutually contradicting civilizations could no longer face each other in any other way apart from clashing with one another and causing internal conflicts, ever since that moment the horoscopes for Russia were focused on the question: Which civilization will Russia finally abandon and which will it adopt? Or will it remain forever bogged in an a-civilizational state?

The fruit of the Russian mixture is Bolshevism. After the establishment of the socialist state in Russia Byzantine influences were annihilated and an interesting Turanian-Jewish mixture was formed, being very close to an a-civilizational state.

## **LoH, p. 571-572**

Whenever the Byzantine Church civilization was involved, it always allied with the Turanian against the Latin one. In the north it frequently sought alliance with the Teutonic Knights (e.g. against the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, against Mindaugas who received baptism and against Gediminas who was favourable towards Christianity).

In the XIV<sup>th</sup> c. Turkish rule expanded over the Balkan peninsula. Their capital was Adrianople since 1365. The distance separating various cultures of the Turanian civilization were diminishing. There was no shortage of these elements in Wallachia which was also under Tatar influences. A part of Wallachia, namely Moldova was as it were a southern extension of Ruthenia at that time and for many years later. The Ruthenian princedoms

were liberated from Tatar yoke by the Lithuanian dynasty, but this had no effect on the civilization, particularly since the ruling descendants of Gediminas were adopting Christianity in the eastern rite. The Ruthenian Church inclined towards the Turanian civilization no less so than towards Byzantinism. In any case throughout Ruthenia there remained a Turanian civilizational background.

There were grounds therefore for the development of the Turanian civilization all along the great line from the Balkans up to Pskov. These prospects increased substantially when Jagiełło was ready to adopt Christianity of the eastern rite in 1381. The ethnically Lithuanian part of the Grand Duchy was to join civilizationaly to the Ruthenian one and to increase the area of the Byzantine-Turanian mixture, with a clear predominance of the Turanian.

In the next year, in 1382, an idea emerged to call Jagiełło to the Polish throne; four years later he was baptized a Catholic in Kraków.

The above comments underline the enormous significance of the Polish-Lithuanian union. Ethnic Lithuania radically changed its civilizational direction. Not only did it join the Latin civilization, but it began to influence the whole of Ruthenia in the Latin direction. Since then the linking up of the Turanian sphere of influence from the south with the north ceased to be possible. This was to occur much later in changed circumstances (during the Cossack wars) but referring to southern Ruthenia only.

## **LoH, p. 578-579**

Byzantium always succumbed to the Orient. The African subjects of the Empire submitted willingly and readily to the Islamic conquest and finally even the European

Byzantines, even those living in the capital, preferred the “turban to the tiara.” They had acquired such civilizational notions that they preferred the Turanian over the Latin. (The Turks did not belong to the Arab civilization, but to the Turanian one.)

In antiquity the Turanian civilization was subdued by the Hellenistic one, the Iranian, the Syrian and finally the Arab, and yet it survived to enter onto great historical routes in the mid XIII<sup>th</sup> c. The lowest one of all those with which it was in contact was to triumph and finally enter Constantinople.

When three civilizations in the “Trebizond Empire” met, the Byzantine, Turanian (in the Seljuq culture) and the remnants of the Latin left by the crusaders, the Turanian proved victorious and not only on the battle field.

When later the Turanian and the Arab civilizations clashed in Asia not only were the Arab Caliphates abolished, but the Arab civilization was expelled completely. But the clash of the Arab with the Latin civilization during the crusades was only an episode without much significance for the history of Asia. The Byzantine civilization survived for a while on scarce territories of western Asia but it continuously aimed towards an alliance with the Arab and Turanian ones against the Latin.

Already since the XI<sup>th</sup> c. the Byzantine civilization was being driven aside by the Turanian one. In Ruthenia it proved incapable of competing with the influences of the Yugra, Pechenegs, Polovtsy, Mongols and Tatars. Later it allowed itself to be expelled completely from the Muscovy culture, which increasingly accepted the Turanian influences, particular after the conquest of Kazan [1552]. The Kazan culture was the highest among the Turanian Kipchak, but it stood much lower than the Christian Muscovy. In the Kazan Empire the peasant was bound to the soil and the upper classes were grouped in *чины*

[ranks]. Women were closed in harems. It is not possible to consider these factors as anything else but evidence of a lower method of communal life organization, and yet the Moscow culture adopted all of this. The judgment that a higher civilization of a subdued people was always adopted by the victors is contradicted here by the fact that a lower civilization can also succeed to attain a cultural victory. Since this can be either this way or that way, there is no rule here.

## **LoH, p. 611-612**

In the Latin civilization the source and basis of prosperity is production. Social wealth is proportional to the capabilities of production of the general public. The Latin civilization is based upon personal productive work, both in the field of material production and in the spiritual. The situation is different in the Byzantine and Turanian civilizations, which try to live as much as possible at other peoples' expense, through conquests and looting.

The Hordes and Sultanates were organized for the purpose of looting. The state of the Genghis Khans and later the Ottoman state that together covered one third of the world were based upon the systematic exploitation of conquered lands and peoples. The administration was only interested in the collection of taxes and the officials managed to extract supplementary benefits for themselves. The military officers were given land donations in the conquered countries and the locals had to work for them. These ideas and arrangements passed on from the Turanian civilization to the Arab one. Since only the persecuted were producing anything, productivity was continuously declining. Thus a state based upon looting constantly requires new conquests, otherwise it

will not survive. In such countries the producing spheres would be allowed to increase their turnover only when the ruling class was enriched i.e. after a victorious military expedition. It is for this reason that with time the entire population favoured wars.

The conquest period lasted in the Arab civilization for a shorter time, because the Arab was not a farmer but a trader. Traders also benefited from successful military expeditions, but even more during peace, and they preferred to organize their trade routes by themselves. In the Turanian civilization trade was state controlled; if private trade existed, it was in the hands of foreigners who came from outside of this civilization.

## **LoH, p. 639-640**

The situation is very different in the Byzantine and Turanian civilizations [compared to the Latin one]. They generate political power directly, because the state is a goal for itself and always has at its disposal absolutely all and everything; at all times — that is, also during peace time. In the Turanian and Byzantine civilizations the power of the state is always ready at its maximal level, while in the Latin civilization it is hidden in the social strength from where it has to be extracted when needed. Thus there are great misunderstandings when the observations are superficial, as is often the case with professional politicians. Frequently it seems for example that a Turanian association is basically more powerful, because it has a stronger army ready for immediate use, or because the government of the Turanian state does not have to take into account any considerations. It does not have to remove any obstacles or struggle against any difficulties. A Turanian state has as ready, what the Latin state will have to forge from its social strength.

If we were to follow the examples taken from great Turanian associations we would arrive at the total ruin of our civilization. The powerful Turanian associations are based entirely on physical strength — and it is in these that they have the seeds of their inevitable crash. Power is expensive; the maintenance of a power requires a full treasury. The filling up of the state treasury becomes the unique goal of internal policy in the Turanian, Byzantine or Arab states. To arrive at this end directly, wealth has to be drawn, as much as possible, from whatever source, and immediately, the sooner the better! Of course, wealth is drawn from society, looting it as much as is possible. How long will the community sustain such an economy of plunder depends upon the natural resources of the country and the economic proficiency of its people. It is clear however that in an economy of plunder, even the greatest riches must finally be exhausted. Wherever the social economy is governed not by society but by the state, there the economy will falter (at least due to the lack of sufficient competence), and finally society must become impoverished, and so the state treasury will diminish, whereas in countries organized according to the principles of the Latin civilization the treasury can grow without limit. The moment will have to come when the Turanian state will not have sufficient resources to maintain the army at a proper level. This is how the Byzantine Empire crashed, how the Ottoman Empire did, and finally the same will happen with Russia.

## **LoH, p. 678**

In order to ascertain more precisely the world in which a nation is possible, we shall begin with the introductory condition, namely that a nation can develop only in a so-

ciety that has an emancipated family. Thus a nation is not possible not only among peoples of the Turanian civilization but also of the Chinese. In fact, China till this day has not shown any interest in the national idea. It is thus easier to understand this lack in Afghanistan or Turkmenistan.

## **LoH, p. 752**

That which is cosmopolitan cannot at the same time be national. If the revolutionary spirit (for example socialism) refers in any place to nationalism it obviously needs some artificial support. Even Turkish communism confirms this: Kar Alibek referred to in Turkey as a second Marx, a communist, proclaimed that "Turkish communism must serve as a tool for the interests, happiness and power of the Turanian race. Today communism is a necessity, tomorrow its program may change. But nationalism is unchangeable. A change of nationalism is equivalent to its collapse. Communism is not a final ideal but only a tool of pan-Turanianism."

## **LoH, p. 773-774**

The only example of a successful solution for peace known to all history is the Polish-Lithuanian union, due to which permanent peace was established from Kraków up to the Dnieper River. This became possible because Lithuania adopted the Latin civilization and Lithuanian Ruthenia succumbed to Latin influences. This peace ended when the Turanian civilization, proper to Ruthenia for centuries, but receding before the Latin one, received support from Turanian countries, first from the

Crimean Tatars, then from Turkey itself and finally due to the efforts of Constantinople (both the Fanar and the Caliphate) also from the Muscovy Tsarsdom, which belongs to the Turanian civilization too. Two Slav-Turanian cultures, the Cossacks and Muscovy united with the entire Turanian civilization against the Latin one represented by Poland. The peace that had existed thanks to the Polish-Lithuanian union vanished as soon as the hegemony of the Latin civilization in those regions subsided.

Perpetual peace, which always and everywhere is rather unlikely, becomes absolutely improbable between associations of different civilizations.

## **LoH, p. 778-779**

Thus the simultaneous decline of the Latin civilization and of the Catholic Church in Europe or the simultaneous raising of them both to prominence in European history are written into the picture. The Church admittedly is universal, regardless of civilization, but here in Europe it is strictly linked with the Latin civilization which it generated and which is in fact the Catholic civilization. One can of course imagine the Church tied with the Chinese civilization, but in no way tied with the Byzantine, Turanian or Jewish one. Could the dreamed international union belong to any of these three mentioned civilizations?! It will belong to the Latin civilization or it will not be achieved at all.

Perpetual peace in Europe outside the Latin civilization is a utopia. Thus it requires a revival of this civilization<sup>89</sup>.

---

<sup>89</sup> [This comment is of significance for the European Union.]

## LoH, p. 840-841

Finally Latin knocked at the doors of Moscow. During the days of Fedor Alekseyevich (1676–1682) a “Slav-Greek-Latin Academy” was established, i.e. a school in which Old Church Slavonic as well as Greek and Latin were taught. In 1682 it was proclaimed that graduates of this academy will have priority for higher offices in the state.

This was truly the “opening of a window towards Europe”!

This process of natural development was blocked by Peter the Great (1682–1725). His reforms introduced German Byzantinism to Russia. Even the Orthodox Church was reorganized according to the model of a Protestant *Landeskirche* [regional church] and all the more so the German model in organizing state administration was followed. Purely German names of offices were introduced and they were in use until the very end of tsarist Russia. An official Germanization of Russia took place.

After these “reforms” what resulted was a typically oriental tyranny. Politics became dependent upon the personal whims of the ruler, the economy consisted in wasteful exploitation, and in the court the most heinous debauchery reigned. The throne passed on to the female line, and indirectly to some German princes. The “Brunswick” times were notorious. Besides the Byzantinism in the higher ranks and the weak rays of the Latin civilization among the more intelligent aristocracy, the whole court and the entire country at large were still deeply rooted within the Turanian civilization. The state was maintained through expansion (in the Asian direction), as is proper for the Turanian model.

When however Latin grammar was taught for two generations, in the third generation a true literature appeared. Thus the development of the Russian language made enormous strides. An interest in science and education followed.



# Excerpts from “On the Plurality of Civilizations”

Polonica Publications, London, 1962

## **oPoC, p. 269**

The scholarliness of Arabic civilisation (they rescued Aristotle) is often erroneously extended to Islam as such. Some even regard Islam as a religion (and civilisation) which is specifically intellectual, “directed exclusively to pure reason”. But not everything “Arab” belongs to the whole of Islam, and not all that is Moslem to Arabic civilisation! It is also necessary to distinguish peoples who received the Quran from Arabs and from Turanians. These are two worlds as far as civilisation goes. For example, Arab scholars regard Turks as something worse than *giaours*, as the barbarians of Islam. And between them there is a whole range of Islamic cultures: Baghdad, Persian, Hindu, Kipchak and Dzungarian (in China).

In Islam such great shifts and changes are permissible that it is not possible to speak of a necessary identity between religion and civilisation as is the case with Jews and Brahmins. The fully sacral civilisation seems to appear only in the most extreme of the Shiite sects, among the Mozabites of the oases in the Algerian Sahara. Ethnically these are Berbers. They are indissolubly bound to their holy cities; emigrating temporarily for business reasons they must return, because it is not permitted their women to leave. Here too the face is covered as closely as

possible. In their towns there are no cafes, it is not permitted to smoke tobacco. The supreme authority, to be appealed to in all matters, is the college of men learned in the Quran (*tolba*) existing in every town.

Apart from this single example, Islam is not in itself a distinct civilisation, but is compatible with various civilisations. Whenever a trend emerges in Islam which would make of it a civilisation, the latter is always defective.

## **oPoC, p. 270**

Asiatic Christianity was characterised by a submissiveness towards local civilisations which resulted in a strange Christianity, defective, truly crippled. Historically the most considerable sect in Asia was the Nestorian. In the eighth century it reached China, but did not last long; sinking culturally ever lower, it fell below the level of the Chinese intellect. Nestorians were of incomparably greater importance among the Turanians, in the Uyghur culture and in the Mongol State of the Genghis Khans, several of whom were Nestorian. There were Nestorian as well as Catholic crusades for the recovery of the Holy Land. These same Christians were the most ardent supporters of the expansion of the Mongol Empire (they decided the battle of Legnica).<sup>90</sup> In Kipchak there were also Nestorian rulers, and the great Tatar Khanate fell because of the rivalry of Islam, Yassack (Mongolian) and Nestorianism; finally Buddhism was victorious in Mongolia and Islam in Kipchak. The Nestorians were imbued in Turanian civilisation and the Uyghur culture, adopted from the "Blue" Mongols.

---

<sup>90</sup> [In Poland in 1241.]

**oPoC, p. 296-297**

With this is connected the question of the mutual relation of society and State. For such a mutual relation to exist, a social organisation must exist alongside the State organisation. Not every community is a society; it becomes so only through suitable-differentiation. This does not take place in Turanian civilisation, among the regiment-peoples organised exclusively in camping style or sunk in disorganisation. These are simply communities which sometimes turn into an army, but never (at least until now) into a society. For them the State is all, although in miniature and caricature. Even in its best periods — in the Uyghur culture, in the universal State of Genghis Khan, and later at Kipchak among the Tatar hordes — this civilisation always practised the camp system of communal life. The leader is a demi-god, lord of life and death for every man without exception, and his rights suffer no kind of diminution in peacetime. The community, however, experiences stagnation and disorder, for peoples of this civilisation rot if they are not waging war. The cult of the leader, that is, of the man who in the event of war would be their commander, continues uninterrupted. The whims of his bad or good humour replace all public law. The sphere of his authority was characterised in splendid Turanian style by the Khan of Kandzhut in Central Asia, Safder-Alie, in a letter to General Grąbczewski. "Know that you are in a land where even the birds begin to have power in their wings only when they have received my command".

Turanian civilisation reached Ruthenia and Muscovy through Mongolian and Tatar influences. The military camp organisation which finally crystallised in obligatory State service under Ivan III, began with the Khazar

centuries. In Russia a mixed civilisation developed, but with a background which always remained Turanian. The Turanian mark lasts to this day. When after the naval defeat at Tsushima [1904] the temper of the press over the loss of the fleet was represented to Nicholas II, he exclaimed: "What does that rabble want, why does it interfere? It is *my* fleet!"

### **oPoC, p. 302-303**

In Turanian civilisation the head of the State was always the sole source of law; this has survived even among Islamic members of the civilisation. The whole of Arabic civilisation enjoys non-sacral law as well; but Moslems of other civilisations recognise only sacral law, whose interpretation is for the ruler. In Arabic civilisation the fount of law is in principle learning, popularised with the aid of special schools of a superior type. Some recognise that law can exist outside the Quran, provided it is not in conflict with it. (...)

In Turanian civilisation public life is in general non-ethical, so that there occurs a constant ethical divergence between the practice of the State, and private affairs which always need some kind of ethic. It was this feature of the East which, on its arrival in Rome with the Syrian gods, devastated Roman civilisation.

### **oPoC, p. 308**

The nation is an association above the people, an association of peoples, and so it only appears where tribal life and the joining together (usually in a State) of tribes to form a people belong to the past. From this it follows that

societies still at the clan or even at the tribal stage cannot constitute a nation. **Nationality can only appear after the total emancipation of the family.** This circumstance of itself excludes from the idea of nationality the Turanian, Arabic, Brahmin and Chinese civilisation.

## **oPoC, p. 315**

Turanian civilisation has the clan organisation, is polygamous, measures time up to the cycle, is composed of communities which have not become differentiated into societies, organises public life on camp lines with anthropolatry of the leader-ruler, is without ethics in public life.



# Index of names and place names

- Aachen 342  
Abaqa 95, 96  
Abba-Arich 395  
Adalbert 21  
Adam 159  
Adashev Alexey 288, 318  
Adrianople 121, 434  
Aegean 120  
Aesop 345  
Afghanistan 118, 440  
Africa 371, 403  
African 249, 417, 435  
Agalak 217  
Agripina 211  
Ahmed the Magnificent 403  
Ain-Jalut 87  
Akhtuba river 79  
Aksakov Ivan 349  
Aksakov Konstantin 349  
Alangoy (Luminous Doe) 71, 74, 75, 81  
Alans 75  
Alaska 355  
Albania 121  
Albert 53, 178  
Aleppo 131  
Alevis 206  
Alexander Constantinovich 133  
Alexander I 342, 343, 348, 355, 359, 360  
Alexander II 355, 359, 360  
Alexander III 359, 360  
Alexander Ivanovich 157  
Alexander Jagiellon 161, 164, 233, 234, 239, 244-246  
Alexander Nevsky 102, 103  
Alexander of Dubrovica 78  
Alexander Pypin 353  
Alexander the Great 71  
Alexander V 153  
Alexei 304  
Alexius 123, 124, 129, 130, 145, 160, 240  
Alexy 108  
Algerian 445  
Algirdas 119, 120, 126-130, 135, 145, 155, 160, 163, 164, 201  
Algu 96  
Altai 65, 221  
America 363  
Amin 249, 250  
Amu-Darya river 361  
Amur river 351  
Andrei Bogolyubsky → Bogolyubsky  
Andrei  
Andrew of Vladimir 106  
Andrew son of Algirdas 126  
Andrew son of Paleologue 180  
Andrew St. 34, 415  
Andrew the Elder 209  
Andrew the Younger 221  
Andrusovo 310, 315  
Anglo-Saxon 424  
Angora 120, 121  
Ankara 121  
Anna 22, 23, 32  
Anna Ivanovna 333  
Anthony 197  
Anti-Christ 313  
Antonio Pietro 206  
Apraksin 407

Arab 367–369, 371, 375, 378, 396,  
398, 404, 429, 430, 436–439,  
445  
Arabia 371  
Arabs 138, 371, 378, 425, 445  
Arakcheyev 359  
Argana 96  
Arghun 95, 412  
Arianism 299, 301  
Ariq Böke 93  
Aristotle 206, 445  
Arkhangelsk 196  
Arlads 68  
Armenia 36, 120  
Armenians 9, 65, 75, 95, 131, 411  
Arpads 23  
Arsenius 311  
Aryan 64, 65  
Asia 9, 13, 17, 34, 64–66, 68, 69,  
72, 73, 75, 80, 87, 88, 93, 95,  
97, 98, 120, 121, 131, 137, 138,  
167, 173, 182, 197, 206, 216,  
219, 263, 275, 278, 282, 284,  
292, 305, 329, 330, 334, 337,  
348, 350, 351, 361, 362, 364,  
380, 383, 388, 393, 397,  
402–406, 411, 412, 415, 421,  
422, 426, 427, 429, 430, 436,  
446, 447  
Asia Minor 9, 34, 66, 87, 120, 121,  
131, 380, 427  
Askold 19  
Assam 403  
Astrakhan 65, 226, 252  
Asyka 195  
Athos Mt. 29, 173, 202, 279  
Atil 11, 13, 172, 398  
Atil river 81  
Attlee 424  
Augustinians 207  
Austria 152, 217, 342, 343, 355,  
358  
Austrian 407  
Avars 172, 398, 399, 407  
Azeri 65  
Azov 225, 226  
Azov sea 77, 263, 382, 397  
Baghatur 68  
Baghdad 10, 11, 86, 131, 398, 445  
Baibars Bunduqdar 87  
Baikal 68, 427  
Baku 327  
Balkan 26, 65, 121, 192, 247, 351,  
364, 434  
Balkans 26, 32, 121, 151, 180, 192,  
304, 351, 388, 392, 413, 435  
Baltic sea 17, 200, 329  
Bamhet 97  
Bari 34  
Basilians 347  
Bastyi 382  
Batory Stephan 391  
Batu 80, 86, 87, 99, 104, 383, 413  
Bautzen 24  
Bavaria 271  
Bayan 118  
Bayezid I 121, 237  
Bedsnlet 404  
Beg Yakoob → Bedsnlet  
Belarus 279, 291, 302, 320  
Belgium 417  
Beloozero 102, 133  
Benedict XIII 153  
Berber 424, 445  
Berdyaev 422  
Berek 87, 413  
Berendei 62, 73  
Berestechko 306  
Berke 98, 99, 420  
Berlin 329

Bessarabia 348  
Białystok 348  
Bielsky Feodor 233  
Bila Vezha 10  
Bismarck 355  
Black Klobuks (Karakalpaks) 62,  
73  
Black Ruthenia 55  
Black sea 13, 14, 17, 21, 98, 120,  
303  
Blue Mongols 68, 73, 94, 382  
Boeotia 396  
Bogolyubovo 48  
Bogolyubsky Andrei 46-51, 60, 85  
Bogomilism 191-193, 229, 278,  
279  
Bogomils 194  
Bohemia 198  
Boh river 262  
Bolesław the Bold 25  
Bolesław the Great 23, 24  
Bolharynovich 205  
Bologna 178  
Bolshevik 377, 392  
Bolshevism 393, 433, 434  
Boris 157, 208, 233, 234  
Boris Alexandrovich → Boris of Tver  
Boris of Tver 157  
Boris of Volotsk 208  
Borovsk 133, 203  
Bosporus 17, 21, 237  
Bourbons 342  
Brahman 367, 368, 422, 429, 430  
Brandenburg 271  
Bratslav 300, 308, 392  
Brest 152, 301, 302, 306, 316  
British 430  
Brothers of the Sword 53  
Brunswick 442  
Brussa 120  
Bryansk 255  
Brzeg 431  
Buda 198, 271  
Buddha 411  
Buddhism 69, 80, 86, 94, 96, 173,  
411, 420, 446  
Buddhist 69, 80, 95, 411  
Buga 97  
Bug river 24  
Bukhara 80, 96  
Bulgaria 22, 28, 91, 151  
Bulgarian 13, 28, 29, 132, 148,  
152, 383, 416  
Bulgars 13, 22, 28, 29, 42, 48, 76,  
79, 91, 132, 148, 151, 152, 289,  
383, 416  
Burma 94  
Burunday 87, 88  
Burtas 9, 398  
Burte Chene 71  
Buryats 418  
Byzantine 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20,  
22-24, 28-30, 32-35, 47, 66,  
108, 121, 143, 144, 149, 151,  
153, 161, 167, 169, 178-180,  
191, 193, 198, 202, 203, 206,  
207, 211, 213, 231, 235, 237,  
243, 247-249, 268-270, 315,  
367, 375, 377-381, 383,  
385-393, 396, 398, 401, 415,  
416, 421, 432, 434-439, 441  
Byzantinism 32, 38, 144, 179, 191,  
203, 243, 247, 270, 273, 315,  
357, 392, 393, 416, 432, 435,  
442  
Byzantium 10, 19, 21, 23, 26,  
28-30, 32, 33, 35, 108, 151,  
169, 180, 203, 230, 249, 280,  
377, 387, 435  
Cēsis 200  
Caesar 71

- Cahun Leon 65  
 Cairo 369, 404  
 Calvinism 291, 299, 301  
 Cape of Good Hope 356  
 Carlsbad 342  
 Carpathian Mts. 106  
 Caspian sea 17, 21, 98, 315  
 Catherine II 329, 331-335, 339  
 Catholic 21, 22, 26, 32, 41, 61, 86, 87, 130, 135, 136, 146, 152, 168, 205, 237, 245, 247, 268, 270, 291, 301, 309, 319, 320, 335, 367, 428, 435, 441, 446  
 Catholicism 33, 39, 40, 61, 87, 89, 134-136, 153, 164, 165, 205, 291, 301, 320, 326, 428  
 Caucasian 351, 414  
 Caucasus 72, 74, 289, 397  
 Central Asia 64, 93, 350, 361, 404, 405, 421, 427, 447  
 Certelja E. 231  
 Chagatai 94, 95  
 Charles XII 322  
 Chełmno 88  
 Cheremis 42  
 Cherkases 75  
 Cherkasy 226  
 Chernigov 33, 38, 63, 77, 78, 88, 110, 308, 392  
 Cherven Towns 54, 56, 106  
 Cheta 272  
 China 66-68, 73, 74, 79-81, 84, 86, 87, 93, 94, 96, 99, 105, 118, 121, 185, 364, 373, 377, 381, 393, 404, 412, 413, 440, 445, 446  
 Chinese 64, 65, 68-70, 75, 80-83, 86, 92, 94, 97, 99, 111, 150, 185, 226, 324, 367, 368, 377, 380, 381, 384, 385, 396, 413, 419, 420, 422, 425, 429, 430, 440, 441, 446, 449  
 Chreptowicz 231  
 Christ 42, 62, 173, 192, 280, 306, 313, 402  
 Christianity 11, 18, 21, 23, 30, 31, 44, 67, 69, 96, 97, 272, 300, 357, 369, 415, 428, 434, 435, 446  
 Christians 11, 18-21, 23, 42, 55, 62, 69, 80, 86, 87, 95, 97, 121, 143, 157, 174, 192, 234, 237, 247, 280, 283, 289, 412, 414, 415, 420, 427, 436, 446  
 Chudes 13  
 Chudes lake (Peipus) 14, 16  
 Chudov 221  
 Chukhna 370  
 Chun-Ti 118  
 Church the 26, 28-32, 34, 39, 41-44, 47, 49, 56, 60, 85, 89-92, 107-109, 122, 123, 125, 133, 135-137, 143, 144, 146, 147, 151-154, 158, 159, 166, 168, 169, 185, 187, 193, 202, 203, 205, 213, 219, 232, 247-249, 278-280, 290, 291, 293, 296, 297, 299-301, 309, 311, 312, 320-322, 325, 326, 336, 347, 358, 359, 414-416, 421, 427, 434, 435, 441, 442  
 Clemens St. 22  
 Congress Kingdom 343, 344, 362  
 Constantine Monomachos 32  
 Constantine of Thessalonica → Cyril  
 Constantine Porphyrogenitus 20  
 Constantine the Great 95, 412  
 Constantinople 11, 13, 17, 20, 22, 26, 31, 43, 44, 49, 66, 129, 135, 143, 144, 158, 159, 180, 202, 246, 280, 302, 304, 326, 375, 436, 441  
 Contarini 223, 231  
 Corsican 71  
 Cossackdom 263, 264, 315

Cossacks 74, 138, 171, 210, 220, 222, 262-264, 295-298, 303-310, 315, 316, 322, 333-335, 338, 382, 385, 389-393, 401, 422, 424, 426, 431, 432, 435, 441

Counterreformation 291

Crimea 65, 67, 75, 84, 86, 132, 198, 217, 220, 225, 226, 238, 243, 254, 261, 276, 277, 385, 397, 431

Crimean 217, 220, 221, 224-226, 251, 261, 276, 277, 296, 303, 351, 414, 441

Croatia 198

Cross Samuel Hazzard 40

Crown 168, 257, 259, 299, 306

Cumans 33, 34, 37, 38, 42, 61-63, 73, 75-79, 138, 378, 379, 382, 383, 388, 415, 416, 436

Cyprian 143, 144, 148, 153, 169, 202, 203, 248, 268

Cyril chancellor 90

Cyril from Preslav 28

Cyril I 31

Cyril St. (Constantine of Thessalonica) 10, 11, 28

Czech 23, 36

Dalmatia 11, 415

Damascus 131

Daniar 197

Daniazy 210

Daniel 62, 87, 88, 90, 105, 106

Daniel of Halych 90, 383

Daniel Romanovich 77, 78

Danilevsky Nikolay 356

Danube river 81

David 35

Delator 217, 231

Delhi 131

Denmark 271

Derbent 327

Derzhavin 331

Deschamps 344

Diogenes 32

Dmitri Ivanovich Zhyłka 255

Dmitri Vasilevich Gimp 207

Dmitrov 133, 255

Dmitry Ivanovich Donskoy 123, 126, 127, 130, 133, 170

Dnieper river 10-16, 19, 21, 24, 75, 77-79, 81, 82, 138, 226, 296, 297, 299, 303, 310, 315, 320, 322, 355, 381-383, 390, 391, 397, 398, 440

Dobosz 402

Dobrolubov 352

Dominicans 153

Don horde 130, 132

Don river 10, 72, 73, 75, 81, 123, 126, 127, 130, 132, 133, 137, 170, 211, 260, 262, 296, 297, 303, 316, 322, 382, 390, 398

Doquz Khatun 86, 95

Dorpat 135

Dostoevsky 422

Dovmont St. → Timofey St.

Drava river 407

Drevlians 11, 12, 15, 20, 24

Druckis 161

Dubrovica 78

Dvina river 11, 13, 52, 53, 216, 218

Dzhanibeg 120

Dzungaria 67, 334, 445

East Asia 364

East Europe 145

Edigu 144

Egypt 84, 87, 95, 98, 369, 385, 404, 412, 420

Elbeland 24  
Elbe river 24  
Elias from Wąwelnica 153  
Elias St. 18  
Elisabeth 329, 333, 334  
England 32, 95, 361, 412, 417, 424  
English 265, 361  
Ephraim 34  
Ertuğrul 120  
Europe 12, 13, 34–36, 38, 45, 51,  
54, 64–67, 81, 84, 121, 123, 135,  
146, 152, 171, 178, 186, 197,  
198, 206, 216, 219, 225, 229,  
267, 300, 301, 308, 318–321,  
324, 327–329, 340–343, 348,  
349, 351, 357, 362, 393, 397,  
405, 423, 432, 433, 441, 442  
  
False Dimitri 391  
Feodor Alexeyevich 330  
Feodor Black of Mozhaïsk 102  
Feodor Borisevich of Volotsk 208  
Feodor (Theodor) 49  
Feodor Vasilyevich 209, 212  
Ferrara 231  
Fichte J.G. 432, 433  
Fiji Islands 371  
Finland 11, 72, 343, 348, 360, 361,  
370  
Finnish 42, 47, 375, 383  
Finno-Ugrian 64  
Finns 289, 370, 383  
Fino-Ural 378  
Fioravanti Andrew 178  
Fioravanti degli Alberti Rudolf 178,  
197  
Florence 205, 301  
France 74, 95, 271, 412, 417  
Franciscan 153  
Frederic III Habsburg 198  
Frederic the Great 329  
French 64, 86, 257, 328, 329, 337,  
344, 365, 403, 432  
  
Galich 125, 137  
Galicia 65, 358  
Gallipolis 120  
Gao 403  
Garmanovich 247  
Gashtolds 160, 164, 165  
Gaykhatu 95  
Gediminas 119, 124, 130, 277,  
434, 435  
Genghis Khan 67, 68, 70, 71,  
73–76, 79–81, 84–87, 93–99,  
118, 171, 185, 221, 380–382,  
384, 390, 401, 406, 411–415,  
420, 423, 426, 437, 446, 447  
Gennady 194, 214  
Genoese 75  
George 62, 78, 102, 106, 157, 180,  
207  
George Alexandrovich 157  
George of Moscow 102  
George of Nieświerz 78  
George St. 180  
George Vasilevich 106, 207  
Georgi 41  
German Quarter 320  
Germans 52, 53, 61, 64, 114,  
134–136, 180, 197, 199, 200,  
206, 207, 216, 217, 269, 320,  
321, 324–326, 328, 329,  
335–337, 360, 404, 432, 433,  
442  
Germany 36, 197, 199, 200, 321,  
323, 325, 330, 417, 432  
Ghazan 95, 412  
Giray (Mengli) → Mengli  
Gleb of Beloozero 102  
Glinskis 282, 283

Glinsky Yuri 283  
Gnosticism 421  
Gobi desert 68  
Godunov 262, 293  
Gogol 345  
Golden gate 24  
Golden Horde 98, 130, 225, 243,  
252, 254, 263, 272, 277, 387,  
398, 414  
Goliath 87  
Golicyns 260  
Goślewiec 105  
Gothlanders 53  
Goths 53, 112  
Goth shore 53  
Gotland 54  
Grąbczewski 396, 404, 447  
Greece 31, 34, 108, 311, 396  
Greek 10, 19, 21-23, 28, 31-33, 44,  
65, 90, 91, 137, 148, 169, 180,  
205, 233, 271, 279, 311, 312,  
318, 327, 343, 414, 421, 442  
Greeks 17, 18, 26, 89, 120, 180,  
368  
Gregory 20  
Gregory XII 153  
Grunwald 419  
Gusiev Vladymyr 235  
Güyük 85, 95  
  
Habsburg 198, 232  
Hakim 404  
Halych 52, 54, 56-58, 61, 63, 77,  
78, 88, 90, 105-107, 109, 147,  
379, 382, 383  
Hamites 424  
Hanseatic League 104  
Harold 32  
Harvard 40  
Hastings 32  
Helen 21, 180, 204, 239, 271, 272,  
412  
Helen daughter of Algirdas 126  
Helen Ivanovna 231, 239  
Helen of Moldova (Moldavia) 193,  
194, 207, 229, 240  
Helen St. 95  
Helga (Olga) 19, 20  
Hellenic 411  
Hellenistic 375, 436  
Hilarion 29-31  
Hindu 150, 173, 429, 445  
Holy Alliance 342, 343, 348  
Holy Land 86, 369, 446  
Holy See 86  
Holy Spirit 173  
Homer 179  
Horodło 165, 166  
Hungarian 23, 199, 238, 296  
Hungary 23, 36, 56, 67, 75, 79, 87,  
88, 105, 106, 197-199, 271,  
373, 383, 384, 412, 423  
Huns 64, 172, 397-399, 405, 407  
Hussein 97  
  
Iconium 120  
Igor 18-20  
Ilmen lake 13, 14, 16, 17  
India 64, 131, 364, 430  
Indochina 64, 403  
Ingigerda 32  
Inner Mongolia 393  
Iranian 96, 375, 378, 412, 436  
Irtys river 68, 196  
Isaac Komnen 108  
Isidore 158, 205  
Islam 17, 66, 69, 80, 87, 89, 95-98,  
120, 121, 131, 138, 192, 221,  
247, 261, 306, 369, 378, 395,  
396, 401, 411-414, 420, 422,  
428, 435, 445, 446, 448

Istanbul 198, 237, 238, 303, 378, 413  
Istria 11  
Italians 178, 179, 198, 199, 206, 207, 231  
Italy 34, 67, 178-180, 197, 198, 206, 264, 279  
Ivak 263  
Ivan Andreevich of Mozhaisk 164  
Ivan brother of Dmitry Donskoy 123  
Ivan Fedorovich of Ryazan 156  
Ivan III Vasilyevich the Stern 169, 170, 176, 178-183, 186, 187, 189, 192-201, 203, 205, 207, 209-213, 215-219, 221, 222, 224-227, 231-235, 237, 240-242, 244, 246, 248-259, 261, 263, 264, 268-273, 320, 386-388, 431, 447  
Ivan Ivanovich 122, 123, 210-212  
Ivan Ivanovich of Ryazan 210  
Ivan Kalita → Kalita Ivan  
Ivan Michailovich of Tver 157  
Ivan of Mozhaisk 159  
Ivan of Veliaminov 129  
Ivanoviches 119  
Ivan the Terrible 180, 249, 260, 282, 284, 285, 287, 296, 307, 390, 421  
Ivan the Younger 192, 207  
Ivan Vasilyevich 209  
Iziaslav I 40  
Iziaslav Ingvarovich 78  
  
Jacob 38  
Jagatai 96  
Jagiellon dynasty 198  
Jagiello Władysław → Władysław Jagiełło  
Jakob 233  
Jakóbowicz 231  
Jalal ad-Din 80  
Jan from Ludziska 168  
Jan Olbracht 224  
Janosik 402  
Janus 42  
Japan 94, 361  
Japanese 64, 364  
Japheth 71, 81  
Jaunutis 119  
Java 94  
Jerusalem 87  
Jesuits 322  
Jewish 9, 36, 37, 65, 194, 367, 393, 395-399, 432, 434, 441  
Jews 36, 37, 192, 194, 264, 278, 279, 368, 396-398, 445  
Jochi 74, 79, 80, 94  
John Casimir 306  
John of Plano Carpini 85  
Jonah 158, 159  
Josephinians 202-204, 249, 268  
Joseph of Nicaea 90  
Joseph Sanin → Sanin Joseph  
Josiphlanes (Josephites) 278  
Josiphlanism 279  
Judaic 395  
Judaism 396, 398  
Judaizers 193, 248, 278, 279  
Juliana of Tver 120  
  
Kabardian 72  
Kabyle 371  
Kaffa 226, 237, 238, 245  
Kaffir 403  
Kaidu 95  
Kaissar i Rum 121  
Kalita Ivan 119, 133, 170, 260  
Kalka river 77, 78, 81, 132, 382, 383, 416

Kalmyks 65, 334, 335  
Kaluga 161  
Kama river 79, 215  
Kandzhut 404, 447  
Kaniv 89  
Kara Hulagu 86, 94–96, 98, 99,  
411, 412, 420  
Karaites 65  
Karakalpaks 62, 73  
Karakorum 68, 184  
Kara-Kuchya 197  
Kar Alibek 440  
Karamzin 176, 331, 344, 345, 359,  
421  
Kashgaria 395, 404  
Kashin 119, 126–128  
Katkov 353, 357  
Kazaks 73, 74, 79, 84, 95, 171  
Kazan 132, 195, 196, 215, 217,  
219–221, 249–251, 253, 259,  
261, 262, 270, 272, 273, 277,  
288, 289, 294, 320, 336, 387,  
388, 415, 436  
Kazimir Jagiellon 159, 160, 164,  
165, 168, 198, 201, 224  
Keraites 67, 69  
Kerki 361  
Kęstutis 119, 126  
Kharkov 336  
Khazaria 36, 378, 397  
Khazarian 13  
Khazars 9–12, 14–17, 36, 67, 172,  
397–399  
Kherson 13, 22, 32  
Khiva 67, 350  
Khlepen 160, 255  
Khmelytsky 304–307, 316, 322,  
392  
Kholm 119  
Khomontov 221  
Khomynakov 349  
Khorasan 120, 131  
Khovansky Feodor 260  
Khozyasha 224  
Khwarezm 67  
Kiev 10, 13, 14, 18, 20–26, 29–31,  
33, 34, 36–38, 46–49, 60, 62, 75,  
77–79, 88–90, 108–110, 129,  
138, 146, 205, 221, 222, 243,  
247, 258, 291, 297, 300, 306,  
308, 310–312, 315, 321, 331,  
379, 382, 383, 391, 392, 421  
Kievans 311  
Kipchak 73–75, 79–81, 84, 87, 95,  
97–100, 104, 105, 111, 112,  
118, 132, 137, 138, 163, 169,  
180, 221, 226, 268, 381–387,  
401, 413–415, 420, 421, 436,  
445–447  
Kireyevsky 349  
Kirghiz SSR 118  
Kirghyzia 118  
Kirgiz 73, 74  
Kitbuqa Noyan 86  
Klyazma river 45, 125  
Klyuchevsky 256, 257  
Kochubey 346  
Kohistan 69, 72, 381, 382  
Koktchu 70  
Kolomna 133  
Kołodzyński 322  
Korea 68, 72, 81, 361, 364, 380,  
406  
Korvin Matthias 198  
Kosovo Field 121  
Kossak-Szczucka Zofia 393, 394  
Kostroma 133, 137, 193  
Kotyan 61, 75, 382  
Kozelsk 126, 145, 160, 255, 383  
Kraków 55, 57, 106, 135, 136, 145,  
153, 164, 165, 168, 178, 198,  
244, 435, 440

Kremlin 130, 133, 178  
Krzemieniec 88  
Kubensky 226  
Kublai 69, 80, 86, 94, 97, 411  
Kuchko 45, 46, 48  
Kuchkovo 46, 48  
Kulia 68  
Kulikovo 130, 131  
Kurakins 260  
Kuricyн Fedor 194  
Kursk 78, 102  
Kutush 250  
Kutuzov Andrey 237, 238  
Kutuzov Boris 233, 234  
Kyrgyz 65, 118, 350, 418  
Kyrgyzstan 118, 418, 424  
Kyrgyz steppe 350  
Kyrkora 238

Lachs 23, 25, 57, 245  
Ladoga lake 11, 14, 16  
Laos 403  
Lapland 72  
Latin 23, 26, 32, 38, 40, 61, 65, 74,  
90, 136, 137, 146, 149, 152,  
165, 166, 170, 174, 189, 190,  
205, 207, 237, 245, 268, 271,  
291, 301, 309, 311, 314, 318,  
327, 329-332, 347, 353, 367,  
370, 371, 378, 380, 388, 393,  
396, 401, 403, 405, 407-409,  
411, 413, 415, 422, 424, 427,  
431, 432, 434-443

Latkowski Juliusz 55  
Lawrence 371  
Lazar II of Serbia 180  
Lübeck 200, 207  
Legnica 373, 384, 415, 423, 446  
Leo II of Halych 106  
Leo I of Halych 106

Leon 32, 65, 357, 359  
Leontyev Konstantin 357, 359  
Lesser Poland 88  
Leszczyński Stanisław 322  
Leszek the Black 105  
Lezgins 75  
Lithuania 54, 55, 60, 65, 105, 119,  
120, 123, 126-130, 135, 136,  
138, 143, 145, 152, 153, 155,  
157, 159-161, 163-168, 170,  
177, 178, 188-190, 201, 202,  
205, 222, 224, 231, 233, 237,  
239, 240, 243, 244, 246, 247,  
252, 258, 267, 268, 276-279,  
283, 285, 287, 291, 299,  
304-308, 310, 322, 340, 344,  
428, 432, 434, 435, 440

Lithuanians 54, 55, 87-89, 104,  
105, 120, 123, 124, 126,  
128-130, 135, 136, 143, 145,  
146, 152, 153, 155, 159-161,  
163-168, 188-190, 192,  
199-201, 205, 224, 233, 234,  
237, 240, 243-246, 258, 265,  
266, 268, 269, 284-287, 291,  
292, 296, 298-300, 304, 340,  
413, 427, 428, 431, 435, 440,  
441

Livonia 52, 53, 61, 136, 172, 200,  
218, 310, 320, 360, 361

Ljubljana 342  
Lomonosov 331  
London 424  
Louis St. 74, 86, 87  
Louis XI 257  
Louis XVIII 343  
Lublin 105, 168, 298, 411  
Lucaris Cyril 302  
Luck 54, 78, 88  
Luke Chrysoberges 49  
Luminous Doe → Alangoy  
(Luminous Doe)

Lviv 88, 105  
Lycia 34  
Lyubutsk 127, 145

Macedonia 121  
Macedonian 152  
Magi 194  
Magyars 64, 75, 79, 383, 384  
Mahmed-Shikhzoda 245  
Mahomet II 264  
Makham 120  
Mamai 132  
Mameluks 84, 87, 98, 420  
Mamuk 217  
Manchurians 64, 65, 68, 71, 79,  
185, 375, 377, 390, 397, 405,  
407, 419  
Mansi 196, 216, 218  
Mari 42, 110, 121  
Maritsa river 121  
Marmara sea 120  
Marx 206, 432, 440  
Matthias Korvin 198  
Maximilian I 217  
Maxim the Greek 279  
Mazepa 322, 333  
Mazovia 25, 58  
Mediterranean sea 402  
Medyn 159  
Mendog 54, 55, 87  
Mengli-Giray 217, 224-226, 238,  
243, 245, 249, 250, 254, 276,  
277  
Merv 361  
Meshchera 263  
Mestchersk 97  
Methodius St 10, 11  
Michael Archangel 178  
Michael VII 32  
Michael Vsevolodovich 77

Mieszko II 25  
Mikhail Aleksandrovich of Tver  
127, 128  
Milan 178, 206, 207  
Miller 337  
Mindaugas 153, 434  
Mitrophan 90  
Münnich 329  
Mogila 311, 331  
Mohi heath 384  
Moklakov Nikita Guba 271  
Moldavia 193, 194, 207, 224, 225,  
229, 240, 277, 306, 431  
Moldavian 203, 204  
Moldova 203, 434  
Molière 331  
Mongolian 37, 61, 62, 64-67, 71,  
72, 75, 79, 81, 84, 86, 87, 91,  
94, 96-98, 111, 118, 120, 150,  
185, 220, 221, 264, 324, 375,  
380, 381, 383, 384, 390, 412,  
413, 415, 418, 420, 426, 429,  
446, 447  
Mongols 60, 61, 64, 65, 67-69,  
71-76, 79-88, 90, 92-94, 96,  
106, 107, 138, 149, 172, 182,  
185, 221, 226, 334, 382, 390,  
397, 398, 401, 405, 408, 411,  
412, 415-418, 420, 421, 423,  
429, 436, 446  
Monomakh (Vladimir) 32, 33,  
35-37  
Moorish 402  
Moravia 24  
Mordvin 42, 110  
Moroccan 403  
Morozov 305  
Mosaic 9, 11  
Moscow 46, 48, 102, 109-111, 115,  
116, 118-131, 133, 135, 140,  
141, 143, 145, 155, 157-161,  
163-166, 168-172, 174-186,

188-204, 207, 209-223, 225,  
227-229, 231, 233-235,  
237-240, 243-250, 253, 255,  
257-261, 263-265, 267-270,  
272, 273, 275-280, 282-289,  
295-297, 299, 300, 302-307,  
309-316, 319-321, 326, 329,  
330, 336, 338, 344, 355, 358,  
365, 385-388, 390, 391, 398,  
421, 422, 424, 431, 442

Moscow river 45

Mozabites 445

Mozhaisk 102, 133, 159, 164

Möngke 93

Mstislav Danielevich 106

Mstislav Romanovich of Kiev 77

Mstislav Svyatoslavich of  
Chernigov 77

Mstislav the Bold 379, 382

Mstislav the Brave 50

Mstislav the Dumb of Luck 78

Mstislav the Successful 59, 61, 63,  
75-79

Mubarek Shah 96

Munglik 70

Murad I 121

Murom 192

Muromian 42

Murtoza 238

Muscovite 131, 133, 158, 167, 170,  
179, 181, 182, 184, 186-188,  
190-192, 194-196, 201, 202,  
205, 212, 219-221, 225, 226,  
230, 231, 237, 240, 246, 249,  
257, 267, 275, 284, 285, 292,  
298, 300, 308, 310, 311, 313,  
315, 322, 324, 325, 391, 415,  
423, 426

Muscovy 123, 126, 128, 131, 135,  
160, 164, 166, 167, 186, 197,  
200-202, 206, 218, 220, 226,  
233-235, 237, 246, 247, 249,  
252, 259, 262, 265, 267, 269,  
272, 276, 285, 286, 288, 291,  
294, 299, 300, 305, 307,  
314-316, 325, 339, 342, 372,  
387-389, 391, 401, 414-416,  
421, 422, 428, 431, 433, 434,  
436, 441, 447

Muslim 14, 69, 80, 86, 87, 95, 96,  
131, 138, 143, 273, 369, 387,  
389, 395, 396, 427, 428

Myra 34

Nachman 395

Naples 343

Napoleon 71, 341-343, 348

Nashchokin 315

Naumov Vasily 234

Negro 403

Nekomat 127

Nestor 14, 15, 18, 34, 38-41, 147,  
331

Nestorians 69, 71, 80, 86, 87,  
95-98, 173, 411-415, 420, 421,  
446

Nestorovych Rodion 110

Neva river 11, 13, 17

New Ruthenia 47, 383

Nezhatina Niva 33

Nicaea 90

Nicholas 34, 62, 311, 345-352,  
415, 423, 448

Nicholas I 345-352, 423, 448

Nicholas II 448

Nicholas Romanov 311

Nicholas St. 34, 62, 415

Niemen river 55

Nieświerz 78

Nigudar 412, 415

Nikon 311-313

Nikonov 47

Nil Sorsky 203

Nilus 135

Nizhny Novgorod 48, 130, 131,  
157, 178, 192, 253  
Noah 71, 81, 411  
Nogai 98, 104-106, 196, 407, 414,  
420, 425  
Nogais 98, 252, 376  
Nordic 21  
Norman 45, 402  
North 11, 16, 32, 41, 54, 60, 61,  
70, 79, 107, 110, 138, 141, 145,  
200, 322, 337, 398  
Novgorod 10, 32, 48, 51-54,  
59-61, 77, 88, 104, 108, 109,  
120, 125, 127, 128, 130, 131,  
133, 134, 136, 157, 160, 171,  
172, 174, 178, 181, 189, 190,  
192-195, 200, 202, 208, 212,  
213, 235, 236, 240, 242, 253,  
256, 258, 263-265, 305, 307,  
321, 379, 385, 386, 417  
Novgorodians 136  
Novosilcov 344  
  
Obolenskys 161  
Ob river 196, 218  
Oceania 417  
Odenpe 52  
Odoyev 137  
Odoyevo 137  
Oghuz 73, 120  
Oka river 41, 42, 48, 161, 215,  
296, 390, 397  
Oldřich 23  
Old Believers 322, 335  
Old Faith 361  
Old Ruthenia 112  
Old Ryazan 211  
Oleg 17, 30  
Oleg of Chernigov 38  
Oleg of Kursk 78  
Oleg of Ryazan 126, 127  
  
Oleg Sviatoslavic 36  
Olga (Helga) → Helga (Olga)  
Oljeitu 96  
Ondrzajnik 402  
Onton 197  
Opava 342  
Opoka 255  
Orhan 120, 121  
Orient 190, 282, 320, 324, 371,  
404, 433, 435  
Orlovs 336  
Orsha 11  
Orthodox 39, 43, 44, 47, 49, 56,  
60, 90, 97, 135, 136, 152, 158,  
167, 168, 173, 193, 200, 201,  
203, 205, 207, 219, 232, 243,  
245, 246, 248, 267-270,  
278-280, 290, 291, 293, 296,  
297, 299-302, 305, 307, 308,  
311, 313, 315, 324-326, 341,  
351, 358, 359, 392, 414-416,  
421, 442  
Orthodoxy 89, 97, 130, 135, 136,  
158, 159, 169, 247, 297, 301,  
302, 304, 308-310, 319, 326,  
335, 347, 349, 370, 414, 415,  
421, 431  
Osman 65, 120  
Osmanli 65, 120  
Ostrogski Konstanty 299, 300, 302,  
331  
Ostróg 299, 302, 311, 331  
Otto I 21, 22  
Otto II 22  
Ottoman 65, 120, 273, 385, 389,  
392, 401, 407, 426, 437, 439  
Outer Mongolia 393  
Ovruch 54  
  
Ögedei 80, 94, 95  
Öz Beg 118

Pachomij 202  
Pacific ocean 94, 381, 412  
Pafnutij 203  
Palaeologues 144  
Palestine 86, 367  
Pamir 361  
pan-Asians 206  
pan-Slavs 24  
Paris 17, 65, 306, 342  
Patagonia 424  
Patrikyevyches 228  
Patrikyevich Yuri → Yuri  
Patrikyevich  
Paul St. 97  
Pechenegs 388, 436  
Pechersk Lavra, 30  
Pechora river 216, 218  
Peipus lake (Chudes) → Chudes  
lake (Peipus)  
Peking 68, 69, 96, 118  
Pelym 196  
Penza 9, 398  
Peremyshl on the Oka 161  
Perevick 211, 212, 247, 253  
Pereyaslav 34, 62, 63, 92, 126,  
133, 192, 307  
Perkantotes 180  
Perm 195, 196, 215, 216  
Permians 195, 215  
Perovsky 350  
Persia 9, 36, 74, 80, 95-97, 327,  
361, 377, 412  
Persians 65, 66, 73, 96, 131, 138,  
375, 381, 445  
Perun 18  
Pestryi Fedor 195  
Peter 44, 51, 97, 178, 214, 233,  
319-327, 329, 330, 333, 336,  
338-340, 432, 442  
Peter III 329  
Peter son of Dmitry 233  
Peter St. 97  
Peter the Great 51, 327, 329, 330,  
333, 336, 338-340, 432, 442  
Peter "the miracle maker" 214  
Phanar 247, 268, 303  
Philotheus of Pskov 342, 423  
Photius 21, 158  
Piasts 23, 25, 26, 34, 56, 58, 105  
Pierling 244  
Pietrashkovich 234  
Pietraszowicz 231  
Piłsudski 427  
Pinsk 54, 78  
Pisa 152, 153  
Pisarev 352, 353  
Plato 179  
Pleshchayev 110, 237, 238  
Pobedonostsev 359  
Podlasie 302, 358  
Podolie 300  
Poland 23, 56, 60, 63, 67, 88, 104,  
106, 130, 135, 152, 153, 159,  
164-166, 168, 169, 201, 218,  
224, 246, 247, 257, 258, 269,  
291, 298, 302-309, 320, 322,  
333, 339-341, 343, 344, 352,  
353, 355, 362, 373, 383, 384,  
390, 391, 401, 412, 419, 423,  
427, 431, 433, 441, 446  
Polans 11, 12, 14-16, 24  
Poles 23, 57, 245, 296, 297, 299,  
300, 309, 344, 347, 358, 361,  
379, 380, 390  
Polish 23, 24, 56-58, 61, 63, 73, 88,  
105, 107, 135, 145, 147, 153,  
164, 165, 167, 168, 189, 198,  
224, 238, 240, 246, 258, 259,  
266, 284, 287, 291, 296-300,  
302-305, 307, 309-312,  
314-316, 322, 332, 340, 341,  
343, 348, 355, 359, 360, 369,

- 379, 384, 390, 391, 413, 422,  
 428, 431, 432, 435, 440, 441  
 Polotsk 52-54, 108, 307, 310, 312,  
 322  
 Polovtsy → Cumans  
 Pomerania 24  
 Pompey 402  
 Pope 33, 34, 90, 95, 118, 153, 205,  
 271, 320, 412  
 Popielov 231  
 Port Arthur 364  
 Porte 303, 304  
 Portsmouth 363, 364  
 Possevino 299  
 Potanin N. 418  
 Potemkin 338  
 Poznań 57  
 Prague 36  
 Premysl of Zalesye 145  
 Pripjat river 55  
 Prophet the 98  
 Protestantism 291, 300, 301, 320,  
 326  
 Protestants 291, 299-301, 320,  
 321, 326, 336, 347, 370, 442  
 Prussia 152, 323, 329, 342, 343,  
 355  
 Przeworsk 105  
 Pskov 19, 54, 120, 127, 133, 135,  
 160, 189, 190, 194, 200, 208,  
 213, 221, 265, 305, 315, 342,  
 423, 435  
 Pugachev 335, 336, 338, 339  
 Punjab 361  
 Pushkin 346  
 Putyvl 277  
 Pypin Alexander → Alexander Pypin  
  
 Radziwiłł "Panie Kochanku" 432  
 Radziwiłł 299  
 Rambaud Alfred 17  
 Razin Stepan 316  
 Red Ruthenia 152  
 Reformation 291, 299  
 Rhalelov 180  
 Rhalev 264  
 Riga 53, 135, 200  
 Robin Hood 402  
 Rock 221  
 Rogachev 160  
 Romanovs 283  
 Romans 23, 368  
 Rome 21-23, 32-34, 38-40, 87, 90,  
 98, 108, 143, 178, 205, 207,  
 231, 232, 280, 284, 306, 448  
 Roosevelt 363  
 Roscislavs 58  
 Rostov 49-52, 92, 97, 101, 107,  
 108, 110, 133, 174, 192, 193,  
 265, 310, 321  
 Rufo Marco 206  
 Rurik 19, 23, 382-384  
 Rurikids 23, 25-27, 31, 35, 41, 45,  
 47, 50, 56, 58-60, 63, 76, 77,  
 79, 81, 82, 85, 89, 92, 102-104,  
 107, 115, 121, 124, 128, 132,  
 138-141, 156, 161, 165, 171,  
 242, 247, 277  
 Ruriks 379, 380, 382-384  
 Rus 11-14, 16-18, 20, 21, 26, 49,  
 81, 109, 166, 184, 246  
 Russak 245  
 Russia 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23,  
 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39,  
 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55,  
 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71,  
 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87,  
 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103,  
 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115,  
 117-119, 121, 123, 125, 127,  
 129, 131, 133, 135, 137, 139,  
 141, 143, 145, 147, 149-153,

155, 157, 159, 161, 163, 165,  
167, 169-171, 173, 175, 177,  
179, 181, 183, 185, 187, 189,  
191, 193, 195, 197, 199, 201,  
203, 205-207, 209, 211, 213,  
215, 217-221, 223, 225, 227,  
229, 231, 233, 235, 237, 239,  
241, 243, 245-247, 249, 251,  
253, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263,  
265, 267, 269, 271, 273, 275,  
277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 287,  
289, 291, 293, 295, 297, 299,  
301, 303, 305, 307, 309, 311,  
313, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323,  
325, 327-333, 335-337,  
339-345, 347-351, 353, 355,  
357, 359-365, 392, 393, 397,  
401, 408, 416, 417, 423,  
432-434, 439, 442, 448

Russian 34, 42, 43, 123, 147, 150,  
205, 219, 229, 237, 257, 265,  
289, 294, 324, 326-328, 331,  
332, 336, 337, 339-353, 355,  
358-362, 365, 366, 370, 388,  
393, 401, 415, 419, 432-434,  
443

Ruthenia 21-26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 37,  
39, 47, 49, 53-56, 58-64, 67, 71,  
75-77, 79, 81, 82, 85, 87-93, 97,  
99, 100, 102, 104-107,  
109-119, 123, 129, 130, 132,  
135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 143,  
146, 149, 151-156, 159-161,  
163-168, 170, 171, 173, 175,  
176, 184, 188, 192, 199-203,  
205, 210, 237, 243-245, 253,  
257, 258, 261, 264-269, 271,  
275, 277-279, 281, 283,  
285-287, 289, 291, 293,  
295-303, 305, 307, 309-311,  
313-315, 317, 319-323, 325,  
327, 329, 331-333, 335, 337,  
339-341, 343-345, 347, 349,  
351-353, 355, 357, 359, 361,  
363, 365, 378-380, 382-385,  
388, 401, 412-416, 421, 422,  
426, 434-436, 440, 447

Ruthenian 18, 24, 31, 34, 38, 49,  
54, 56, 57, 63, 74-78, 88-90,  
102, 107, 111, 115, 116, 118,  
122-124, 127, 132, 136,  
138-140, 147, 152, 153, 158,  
164, 165, 168, 200, 205, 229,  
244-246, 277, 284, 291,  
296-298, 300, 301, 308-312,  
315, 332, 340, 341, 358, 359,  
379, 385, 390, 392, 414-417,  
421, 427, 434, 435

Ruthenus 246

Ruza 133, 208, 255

Ryazan 97, 119, 126-128, 133,  
137, 156, 158, 160, 171, 194,  
209-212, 247, 253, 263, 295,  
390, 431

Ryazansk 115

Rzhev 159, 208, 255

Saburov Andrei Vasilevich 272

Saburov Feodor 260

Saburov-Pieshkov Dmitri  
Semenovich 272

Saburovs 260, 272

Safder-Ali 404, 447

Sahara 445

Sajó river 373

Sakhalin Island 364

Salmonida (Solomoniya) Saburov  
273, 387

Salvator 207

Samarkand 69

Samogitia 54, 245

Sandomierz 58, 105, 106

Sanin Joseph 202-204, 278

San river 427

Sarai 79, 82, 85, 92, 97, 100, 108,  
109, 115, 118, 130, 132, 143,

144, 155, 169, 172, 184, 276,  
 398, 414  
 Sarkel 10, 13, 398  
 Sarmatians 401  
 Sarmatic lowlands 216  
 Sarmatism 401, 427, 432  
 Sartaq 87, 413  
 Sassanids 66  
 Satyl-Khan 210  
 Sava river 407  
 Sava St. 91  
 Sącz 106  
 Scandinavia 11, 17, 45  
 Scandinavians 12  
 Schlözer 337  
 Seljuqs 120, 121, 182, 376, 380  
 Semen Ivanovich 255  
 Semites 65  
 Semitic 64, 66  
 Serbia 91, 121, 180, 271  
 Serbs 121  
 Serensk 160  
 Serpukhov 122-124, 127, 128, 133  
 Sevastopol 351  
 Severians 16  
 Seversk 322  
 Sevier 256, 265  
 Shaka 403  
 Shawar 404  
 Shchedrin 345, 356  
 Shcherbatov 337  
 Sheikh-Ahmat 252  
 Shemiachich of Sevier 256  
 Shemyaka 159  
 Sherbowitz-Wetzor Olgerd P. 40  
 Shestakov 205  
 Shiban horde 196  
 Shiite 96, 412, 445  
 Shuiskys 161  
 Shumsk 78  
 Shuvalov 330  
 Shuysky Andrei 282  
 Siam 94  
 Siamese 403  
 Siberia 65, 80, 196, 216-218, 263,  
 289, 351, 417, 424, 427  
 Sich 297, 333, 338  
 Siemashko 347  
 Sieradz 106  
 Sieroszewski 419  
 Sievers 12  
 Sigismund III Vasa 300  
 Sigismund the Old 296, 391  
 Silesia 431  
 Simeon 28  
 Simeon the Proud 118-120, 122  
 Simon 213, 272  
 Skharyia 193  
 Skwirsk 138  
 Slav lands 10-12, 16, 19, 21, 25,  
 27, 34, 38, 43, 44, 50, 57, 60,  
 63, 83, 88-90, 92, 107, 130,  
 146, 147, 149, 151, 153, 154,  
 166, 168, 171, 248, 267, 269,  
 299, 310, 331, 332  
 Slavonic 10, 299, 442  
 Slavophiles 206, 353, 356  
 Slavs 9-11, 13, 14, 16-18, 24, 27,  
 35, 218, 219, 260, 262, 290,  
 296, 298, 380, 383, 385, 389,  
 407, 421  
 Slavyneckij Jepifanij 311  
 Smolensk 50, 52, 88, 112, 115,  
 127, 128, 200, 304, 307, 310  
 Snups Michael 217, 218  
 Solari i Aviso Antonio 178  
 Solomoniya (Salmonida) Saburov →  
 Salmonida (Solomoniya)  
 Saburov  
 Solovetsky monastery 314

Songhai 403  
Sophia St. 133  
Sophia Zoe → Zoe (Sophia)  
Palaiologina  
Sorghaghtani Beki 80, 86, 95  
Sorsky Nil → Nil Sorsky  
South Africa 403  
Southern Ruthenia 33, 37, 56,  
61–63, 77, 81, 82, 89, 106, 109,  
110, 153, 261, 298–300, 302,  
310, 311, 314, 315, 322, 352,  
384, 416, 426  
Spain 343  
Spanish 403  
Speransky 343, 344  
Stalin 424  
Stanisław Leszczyński →  
Leszczyński Stanisław  
Starodub 84, 125  
Stefan Dušan 121  
Stephen 23  
Stephen Bathory 296, 303  
Steven of Serbia 271  
Steven the Great of Moldavia 225,  
431  
St. Petersburg 331, 334, 336, 356,  
362, 370  
Strigolniki 135, 136  
Stroganov 216  
Subutai 74, 75, 77–79, 382, 383  
Sudak 75  
Suleyman Shah 120  
Sultan-i Rum → Kaissar i Rum  
Sumarokov 331  
Sunnites 131  
Sutu Bogdo 70, 71, 411  
Suvorin 353  
Suzdal 46, 47, 50, 52, 60, 110, 132,  
176, 192, 265, 310, 379  
Sviatopolk 24, 33–36  
Sviatopolk II 33–36  
Sviatoslav 19–22, 28, 78, 127, 128  
Sviatoslav from Shumsk 78  
Sviatoslav Ivanovich of Smolensk  
128  
Sviatoslav “Yanevsky” 78  
Sweden 19, 320, 322, 370  
Swedes 13, 213  
Swedish 322  
Sylvester 288  
Symeon of Polotsk 312  
Syr Darya river 350  
Syria 86, 422  
Syrian 375, 436, 448  
Szczecin 271  
Švitrigaila 145  
Tabor Mt. 173  
Tajjins 68  
Talabuga 106  
Talleyrand 343  
Tambov 9, 398  
Tamerlane 121, 131, 132, 137,  
138, 144, 167, 176, 182, 425  
Tartu 200  
Tatar 63, 65, 68, 71, 74, 76–79,  
81–86, 88–93, 97–106, 109, 111,  
112, 114, 115, 120, 128–130,  
132, 137–141, 143, 144, 146,  
155, 163, 167, 169–172, 175,  
176, 178, 179, 181, 182, 184,  
185, 191, 197, 198, 202, 215,  
220, 221, 224–226, 228, 229,  
237, 243, 249, 251–254,  
259–264, 268–273, 276, 281,  
282, 288–290, 294–297, 303,  
305, 306, 311, 324, 333, 381,  
383, 384, 387, 388, 390, 391,  
398, 401, 408, 413–415, 417,  
420, 421, 426–428, 434–436,  
441, 446, 447

Tatardom 261, 262, 415  
Tavda river 196  
Tbilisi 74  
Tegrul 69  
Tekunder 95  
Temüjin 68-72, 74-76, 79, 80, 84,  
93-95, 99, 105, 111  
Terek 75  
Terek river 75  
Teutonic Knights 120, 126, 127,  
419, 434  
Theophanes 306  
Theophanu 22  
Timofey St. [Dovmont] 128  
Timur 121  
Tit of Kozelsk 126  
Tiumen 263  
Tokhtamysh 132, 133  
Toktai horde 104  
Tolui 80, 93, 94  
Torjek 383  
Torkil 62, 73  
Torus 253  
Trakhaniotes 180, 194  
Transoxiana 66, 73, 80, 95, 96, 412  
Trebizond 436  
Trubeckis 161  
Trubetskoy S. 365  
Tsamblak 153  
Tsushima 448  
Tuaregs 371  
Tu-Kiu 64  
Tuna river 81  
Tunguzians 65  
Turan 415  
Turanian 120, 167, 168, 172, 176,  
177, 190, 191, 206, 215,  
218-221, 224-226, 241, 243,  
263-265, 270, 367-373,  
375-382, 384-393, 395-399,  
401, 404, 405, 407-409, 415,  
417, 419-426, 428-442,  
445-449  
Turkestan 66-68, 72, 96, 97, 118,  
131, 406, 412  
Turkey 120, 121, 182, 218, 270,  
303, 309, 339, 373, 396, 414,  
416, 423, 440, 441  
Turkic 67-76, 79, 80, 96  
Turkish 64-67, 74, 121, 137, 144,  
178, 182, 203, 225, 238, 247,  
263, 264, 268, 303, 304, 371,  
375, 377, 380, 397, 405, 406,  
412, 429, 431, 434, 440  
Turkmen 361  
Turkmenistan 380, 440  
Turks 64, 71, 226, 239  
Tver 102, 115, 116, 119, 120,  
125-129, 134, 157, 212, 253,  
258  
Tyumen 196  
Uganda 403  
Uglich 255  
Ugra river 145  
Ugric 67, 72, 73, 79  
Ugro-Altai 221  
Ugro-Finnish 375, 383  
Ukhta 221  
Ukraine 277, 296, 297, 300,  
305-307, 309, 310, 315, 320,  
322, 358, 412  
Uljaitu 412  
Uniate 34, 152, 158, 301, 309, 347,  
358  
Union 135, 152, 165, 166, 168,  
205, 298, 301, 302, 306, 316,  
347, 358, 441  
Urak 217  
Ural Mts. 72, 80, 215-219, 263,  
333, 427  
Ural river 81

Urban II 34  
USA 40, 355  
USSR 118  
Ustyug 97, 196, 216, 218, 255  
Uyghur 65, 73, 74, 76, 83, 92, 97,  
99, 381, 384, 401, 412-415,  
420, 426, 446, 447  
Uzbek 118  
Uzbekistan 118  
Uzbek SSR 118  
  
Valdai Hills 17  
Valuyev 353  
Varangians 16-19, 21, 23, 26, 27,  
35, 43, 53, 127  
Varna 164  
Vasil 35  
Vasili Ivanovich III 249  
Vasili Vasilovich 156  
Vasily Dmitriyevich 143-145, 169  
Vasily Ivanovich 260, 342  
Vasily the Blind 158-161, 164,  
174-176, 185, 186, 256, 272,  
275  
Vasily Vasilyevich Veljaminov 127  
Velikiye Luki 54  
Venetians 67, 75, 84, 385  
Venice 207, 233, 320  
Veps 13  
Verona 342  
Vienna 198, 306, 320  
Viereya 255  
Vikings 16, 402  
Vilnius 135, 145, 157, 159, 160,  
163, 164, 198, 222, 233, 245,  
270-272, 307  
Visby 53  
Vistula river 105, 216  
Vitebsk 120, 310, 322  
Vladimir Andreyevich 123  
Vladimir (Monomakh) 35, 37  
Vladimir of Pron 126  
Vladimir of Serpukhov 123, 124,  
127  
Vladimir of Volhynia 77  
Vladimir on Klyazma 49, 90, 108,  
133  
Vladimir son of Yaroslav 26  
Vladimir-Suzdal region 379  
Vladislav Jagiellon 198  
Voguls 195, 196  
Volga river 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 41,  
42, 48, 73, 79, 81, 97, 98, 132,  
141, 203, 215, 216, 220, 221,  
225, 260, 262, 275, 277, 289,  
315, 334, 383, 388, 391, 397,  
398, 414, 427  
Volhynia 54, 77, 78, 147, 309, 322  
Volodar 52  
Volokolamsk 202-204  
Volotsk 208  
Vorskla river 140, 146, 163, 164  
Vsevolod 32, 33, 84  
Vsevolod Mstislavich 77  
Vyatichs 16, 88  
Vyatka 194, 215, 216  
Vyatka river 102  
Vychevga 216  
Vytautas 143-145, 153-157, 160,  
163, 164  
  
Wallachia 191, 203, 220, 229, 315,  
434  
Wallachians 296, 390  
Warsaw 304, 320, 344  
West 10, 13, 14, 21-23, 27, 34, 36,  
40, 68, 70, 71, 74, 81, 94, 106,  
110, 146, 165, 179, 194, 198,  
199, 201, 206, 248, 258, 259,  
299, 318, 319, 332, 341, 342,  
344, 349, 350, 364, 371, 381,  
404, 413, 426, 432, 433

Western 10, 23, 32, 35, 38, 52, 56,  
57, 60, 61, 65, 74, 79, 80, 108,  
149, 152, 164, 171, 186, 190,  
206, 229, 248, 257, 265, 267,  
300, 314, 320, 342, 351, 357

Western Europe 61, 177, 266, 267,  
352, 362

White lake 14, 16

White Ruthenia 302, 320

White sea 17, 289, 313

Wierejski Vasily Michajlovich 233

Władysław IV 304

Władysław Jagiełło 135, 136, 145,  
153, 165, 168, 435

Władysław Łokietek 257

Władysław of Varna 164

Wyhowski 392

Wysza Piotr 153

Xiongnu 64

Yaik river 81

Yakut 65, 419

Yaropolk 30, 33

Yaroslav 26, 28, 30, 31, 67, 84, 92,  
102, 103, 267

Yaroslaviches 117

Yaroslavl 138, 253

Yaroslav Yaroslavich 102

yasak 87, 95-98

Yassack 412-414, 446

Yekaterinburg 216

Yelets 137

Yesugei 68, 69

Young Turks 396

Yugra 72, 76, 167, 195, 196, 198,  
216, 218-221, 264, 289, 333,  
388, 426, 436

Yuri Glinisky → Glinisky Yuri

Yuri Ivanovich 241, 255

Yuri Konstantinovich Saburov 272

Yuri Patrykyevich 260

Yuri the Long Armed 38, 45, 46,  
110

Yury Dimitrievich 159

Yuryev 89, 192

Yuryev-Polsky 133

Zabrzeziński 240

Zakhar 240

Zakhariynych 240

Zalesye 47-49, 81, 84, 88, 103,  
109, 112, 119, 124, 128-133,  
138, 139, 141, 142, 144-146,  
151, 155, 157-161, 166, 167,  
169, 170, 173, 175, 176, 183,  
191-195, 203, 206, 209, 210,  
219, 220, 222, 226, 258-260,  
264, 265, 276, 279, 280, 296,  
331, 372, 379

Zaporozhye 297, 303, 304, 316

Zbruch river 63

Zoe (Sophia) Palaiologina 178-181,  
200, 203, 207, 230, 231, 275,  
278

Zubtsov 255

Zulu Attila 403

Zulus 403

Zvenigorod 133, 255

Żyrosław 61