



Moscow, the Golden Horde, and the Kazan Khanate from a Polycultural Point of View

Author(s): Omeljan Pritsak

Source: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Dec., 1967), pp. 577-583

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2492610>

Accessed: 17/06/2014 02:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Slavic Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

OMELJAN PRITSAK

*Moscow, the Golden Horde,
and the Kazan Khanate from
a Polycultural Point of View*

THE seventeenth-century chronicles record an interesting event under the year 1574:

At that time Tsar Ivan Vasil'evich enthroned Simeon Bekbulatovich as tsar in Moscow and crowned him with the crown of the tsars, and called himself [simply] Ivan of Moscow; he left the city and lived in Petrovka. All the offices of tsardom he passed to Simeon, and himself rode simply, like a boyar with shafts, and whenever he comes to Tsar Simeon, he sits at a distance from the Tsar's place, together with the boyars.¹

That such an event did in fact take place, we have the testimony of contemporary witnesses, the English envoy Danyell Silvester² and the imperial envoy Daniel Printz a Bucchau,³ as well as official documents which have been preserved from the time of Simeon's reign as tsar.⁴

Among the "epistles" of Ivan the Terrible there is also one addressed to Simeon. It begins thus: "To the lord and great prince Simeon Bekbulatovich of all Rusiia, Ivanets Vasil'ev with his children Ivanets and Fedorets incline their heads [bow very humbly]." ⁵

Printz, member of a mission from Emperor Maximilian II, who arrived in Moscow in November 1575, learned from the local boyars that in August of that year the metropolitan of Moscow had officially crowned Simeon.⁶

Modern historians have as yet been unable to explain the reason for this—according to their thinking—masquerade.⁷

¹ "Sokrashchennyi Vremennik do 1691g.," *Dokumenty po istorii XV-XVII vv.* (Moscow, 1955), p. 148 ("Materialy po istorii SSSR," Vol. II).

² N. C. de Bogoushevsky, "The English in Muscovy during the sixteenth century," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, VII (London, 1878), 106-8.

³ Printz, *Moscoviae ortus et progressus* (first published in 1668); Russian translation by I. A. Tikhomirov in *Chteniia v obschestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (Moscow), No. 3-4, 1876, p. 29 (subsequent citations of Printz refer to the Russian translation).

⁴ On these documents see P. A. Sadikov, *Ocherki po istorii oprichniny* (Moscow, 1950), pp. 117; 129; 145 and n. 1; 164; 376, n. 3; 380, n. 1.

⁵ *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo*, ed. D. S. Likhachev and Ia. S. Lur'e (Moscow and Leningrad, 1951), p. 195.

⁶ Printz, p. 29.

⁷ Sadikov presents all hitherto existing views concerning the episode on pp. 41-45 and 71-72 of his monograph cited in note 4 above.

In 1565 Ivan embarked on his famous reforms,⁸ dividing his state into the *oprichnina* (or, from 1572, the court) and the *zemshchina*. These reforms were aimed at creating a basis of unity for the newly independent Muscovite state, which could not subsist while retaining remnants of the appanage system. The so-called treachery of the boyars which began in 1567, as well as the setbacks on the Livonian front, forced Ivan to turn to the terroristic methods of physical liquidation of his opponents, beginning in 1569 and culminating with the executions of 1574.

Only thereafter could Ivan commence with his "sorting out of lands and peoples"⁹ and further reorganizations.

Facing strong resistance, he—the first tsar of his family (who several times already had fallen into despair in difficult situations and thought of abdication)¹⁰—needed the support of a generally accepted traditional authority.

The connection between the executions of 1574 and the transfer of power to Simeon was pointed out by Ivan himself in a conversation with the English ambassador Silvester.¹¹

In the system to which for three hundred years the great principality of Moscow (Vladimir) belonged, the *only* possessor of the charisma for rulership was the dynasty of Chinggis Khan. No matter how strong Temür the Lame (Tamerlane) was in the second half of the fourteenth century, nevertheless, not being a member of Chinggis' dynasty and not having the right to the title of *khaghan*, he had to keep puppet Chinggisids as sources of the charisma for his own power.

Ivan the Terrible—in the male line a direct descendant of Dmitrii Donskoi, and in the female line of Mamai, Donskoi's antagonist (his mother, Elena Glinskaia, was a great-great-great-granddaughter of Mansur Kiyat, Mamai's son)¹²—was the most powerful of all the successor rulers to the former Golden Horde. But he was not a Chinggisid. In the terminology of the steppe his title was given not as *khaghan*, but only as khan: *aq/čayan khan*, "white (western) prince."¹³

Who was this Simeon Bekbulatovich? He was a genuine Chinggisid, a descendant of Orda, the eldest son of Jöchi, who was the eldest son of Chinggis Khan. He was also a great-grandson of Ahmed, the last khan of

⁸ See two recent monographs by A. A. Zimin: *Reformy Ivana Groznogo* (Moscow, 1960) and *Oprichnina Ivana Groznogo (until 1572)* (Moscow, 1964).

⁹ *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo*, p. 195.

¹⁰ Sadikov, p. 32.

¹¹ Bogoushevsky, p. 106; Printz, p. 29.

¹² On Elena Glinskaia's genealogy see Józef Wolff, *Kniazowie Litewsko-ruscy od końca czternastego wieku* (Warsaw, 1895), pp. 77–86.

¹³ See, for example, Siegmund zu Herberstein, *Reise zu den Moskowitern 1526*, ed. Traudl Seifert (Munich, 1966), pp. 81–82. For discussion of this interesting problem see W. Barthold, *Istoriia izucheniiia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* (2d ed.; Leningrad, 1925), p. 172; and G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia* (New Haven, 1953), p. 388. In this connection one piece of information given by Printz deserves our special attention. He writes that the rebelling Muscovites planned to dethrone Ivan the Terrible and invite as their ruler the Crimean khan (Printz, p. 22).

the Great Horde,¹⁴ who was Ivan III's antagonist at the Vigil on the Ugra in 1480. Until 1573, when he was baptized (his former name was Sayin Bulat; *Sayin* was a well-known epithet of the first conqueror of Rus', Batu), he was khan of Kasimov.¹⁵

An erroneous notion still prevails in the world of scholarship concerning the Kasimov khanate with its center in the town of Meshchersk (*Xan kermän*). It is generally accepted that this was a Muscovite creation to keep the khans of Kazan in check. But recently M. G. Safargaliev (1960) has proved that the situation was quite different.¹⁶

In his paper Mr. Keenan mentioned the capture of Prince Vasilii II of Moscow by Ulu Muhammad of Kazan. Some important decisions were to be taken at that time in Kazan. As is generally known, when the Golden Horde disintegrated, in place of one center there arose four new centers: Kazan, the Crimea, Astrakhan, and the so-called Great Horde. It was now decided that the great prince of Moscow would pay to the successors of the Golden Horde the tribute (*vykhod*, "tax on landed property") previously paid to the Horde. In addition he also now surrendered "the Meshcherian towns" as a *iurt* (appanage) to the son of Ulu Muhammad, Kasim, who in this way became the link between Moscow and Kazan.

Ulu Muhammad belonged to the line of Jöchi's thirteenth son, Tuqa Temür.¹⁷ Another branch of his dynasty ruled in the Crimea.

From the charter of the contract between Ivan III and Prince Iurii Ivanovich dated June 16, 1504, it appears that even at that time the principality of Moscow was sending the *vykhod* for the Horde to four places: the Crimea, Astrakhan, Kazan, and Kasimov.¹⁸

The turning point in the relations between Moscow and Kazan occurred not in 1487 (as Pelenski states, following Nolde) but in the year 1512. It was probably in commemoration of the events of that year that the Rus' Chronograph was compiled.¹⁹ There took place at that time, in Moscow, very important conferences between Vasilii III and the Chinggisid Queen Dowager Nur Sultan, who represented the Kazan and Crimean lines of Ulu Muhammad's dynasty.

It is impossible to delve here into the details of the conference of 1512.

¹⁴ On Simeon's genealogy see V. V. Vel'iaminov-Zernov, *Izslედovaniia o kasimovskikh tsariakh i tsarevichakh*, II (St. Petersburg, 1864), 9-11.

¹⁵ On Simeon's activity see N. V. Lileev, *Simeon Bekbulatovich khan Kasimovskii, velikii kniaz' vseia Rusi, vposledstvii velikii kniaz' Tverskoi, 1567-1616 gg.: Istoricheskii ocherk* (Tver, 1891), pp. 1-123; and Vel'iaminov-Zernov, pp. 1-26.

¹⁶ Safargaliev, "Razpad Zolotoi Ordy," in Mordovskii Gosudarstvennyi universitet, *Uchenye zapiski*, II (Saransk, 1960), 255-57.

¹⁷ On genealogical problems of this line see W. de Tiesenhhausen, ed. and trans., *Sbornik materialov otnosiaschikh k istorii Zolotoi Ordy*, II (Moscow and Leningrad, 1941), pp. 59-63.

¹⁸ *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV-XV vv.*, ed. S. V. Bakhrushin and L. V. Cherepnin (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), p. 365.

¹⁹ On the special position of the Chronograph of 1512 in Muscovite historiography see Hildegard Schaefer, *Moskow das dritte Rom* (2d ed.; Darmstadt, 1963), pp. 65-81.

I only want to stress that now the Kazan-Crimean dynasty relinquished Kasimov. The *iurt* in the Meshcherian land was now passed over to the members of the dynasty of the former khan of the Golden Horde, Ahmed, set up by Moscow. Only now did the Kasimov Chinggisids become puppets in the hands of the Muscovite dynasty, imparting to the latter the charisma of the state dynasty which was indispensable for the formation of a new state organism.

My remarks, as supplements to Mr. Keenan's paper, aim—as his paper does—to demonstrate that a historian of the Muscovite state must be acquainted with the sources and the problems of the “other side” in order to understand and properly evaluate events and situations.

This refers in the first instance to the paper presented by Mr. Pelenski, who has taken great pains to gather all the historical sources available to him on the Muscovite claims to the Kazan khanate. But he has followed in the footsteps of earlier historians in examining the problems from a monocultural point of view.

It would be appropriate to present now a first attempt at clarifying the topic under discussion from a polycultural viewpoint.

From the period of the Rus' principalities the lands of the future Muscovite state inherited a dual system of organization:

(1) The feudal principalities and republics, of which the most important politically was the great principality of Vladimir, and the most important economically Lord Novgorod the Great.

But because of the primitive system of dividing appanages within the great principality of Vladimir, there arose a whole series of great principalities, which tried to outbid each other with the Mongol administration to receive a *iarlyk* (khan's charter) for the great principality of Vladimir. Of all these the one principality which succeeded in the fourteenth century in achieving a superior position for itself was the principality of Moscow. Through its unconditional allegiance and its subservience the Muscovite dynasty won the trust of its Mongol sovereigns, who in addition conferred on it a protectorate over Novgorod. The alliance between Ivan Kalita (Moneybags) and the Kievan “Metropolitan of All Rus'” led to the transfer of the metropolitan's residence to Moscow, and the Muscovite prince added to his titlature the title “of all Rus',” which heretofore had been limited to the metropolitan only.²⁰

(2) The Kievan (later the Vladimir) Metropolitanate of All Rus', which was the only institution which encompassed all the lands of Rus' but which, by the same token, was an institution of the Byzantine church and empire.²¹ As mentioned above, after their transfer to Moscow in the fourteenth century the metropolitans cooperated closely with the princes of

²⁰ See M. D'iakonov, *Ocherki obshchestvennogo i gosudarstvennogo stroia drevnei Rusi* (4th ed.; St. Petersburg, 1912), p. 388.

²¹ It should be remembered that since 1267 the metropolitans of Kiev had concurrently acknowledged two sovereigns: the Byzantine emperor and the *khaghan* of the Golden Horde.

Moscow (Peter 1308–26, Theognost 1328–53, Alexius 1354–78). This evoked a justifiable opposition on the part of the rivals of Moscow (for example, Tver) in northern Rus', as well as on the part of the Orthodox under Poland and Lithuania. For this reason the metropolitans of the first half of the fifteenth century tried to maintain an objective attitude to all their faithful. This may be studied from the example of chronicle writing. In addition to the collections of the great princes there now appeared at the metropolitan's chancery all-Rus' collections: those of Cyprian (1408) and Photius (1418), in which the redactors attempted to give all the lands an opportunity of expression.²²

In the first half of the fifteenth century Moscow was the center of two mutually independent establishments:

(1) The great principality of Vladimir which now, after two hundred years of experience in the state system of the Golden Horde, rose to the leading position among the heirs to that empire; and

(2) The Kievan Metropolitanate of All Rus', which until recently had occupied a quite insignificant place in the system of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but now, due to the downfall of the Byzantine state, ascended to the dominant place in the Orthodox world.

The union of the Byzantine Church with Rome achieved at Florence (1439) created a new situation. The Muscovite government did not recognize Cardinal Isidore as Kievan metropolitan. After some contention a council of bishops, without the Patriarch's approval, elected and consecrated, in 1448 in Moscow, a new metropolitan, Iona, whose title was now restyled to conform to that of the Great Prince: "Metropolitan of Vladimir, Moscow, and All Rus'." The new metropolitanate became practically autocephalous. The Orthodox of Poland and Lithuania remained under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Until 1490 the metropolitans of Moscow were not named by the great princes; it had become the custom that the metropolitan chose his successor.²³

But events moved on. In 1453 the Ottoman Turks had occupied Constantinople, the "second Rome." This extraordinary event was of double significance for the future Muscovite state.

First, after the fall of the Orthodox Balkan states and now of the Byzantine Empire itself, the only guardian of the Orthodox faith remaining was northern Rus'. The South Slavic conceptions of the "third Rome" were now transmitted to the north (the era of the second South Slavic influence).²⁴ While the legend of the "white hat (*kolpak*)" before 1564 acknowl-

²² For more on this see M. D. Priselkov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI-XV vv.* (Leningrad, 1940), pp. 128–64.

²³ E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, Vol. II, Part 1 (Moscow, 1900), *passim*, esp. pp. 516, 532.

²⁴ On this see V. Moshin, "O periodizatsii russko-iuzhnoslavianskikh literaturnykh svyazei X–XV vv.," *Russkaia literatura XI–XVIII vekov sredi slavianskikh literatur* (Moscow, 1963), pp. 97–106; and Schaefer, pp. 1–51.

edged Great Novgorod as the "third Rome,"²⁵ Philotheos of Pskov decided in favor of Moscow (ca. 1510–11).²⁶

Second, the destruction of the Genoese trade colonies by the Turks shifted European trade with Persia and Central Asia to the Volga. Just as formerly at the time of the Golden Horde the "Pax Mongolica" in Eastern Europe was based on the trade route Novgorod-Volga-Crimea,²⁷ so now the route Novgorod-Volga became the chief artery. Merchants from all of Europe, including England—especially merchants from northern Italy (Milan), who now replaced the Genoese in Eastern Europe—now began to arrive. The occupation of Novgorod by Ivan III in 1478 was a kind of answer to the introduction of Ottoman garrisons in the Crimea and the expulsion of the Genoese from Kaffa in 1475.

The Chinggisid dynasty of Tuqa Temür took possession of Kazan, the Crimea, and, in 1502, Astrakhan. For various reasons, however, it was unable to ensure a new "Pax" in Eastern Europe. The Nogais and some other remnants of the Golden Horde now turned to Moscow as the only power capable of ensuring peace. In the mid-sixteenth century the Nogai prince Ismail wrote to his brother Yusuf: "Your men go to trade in Bukhara, and mine go to Moscow; but should I just start fighting with Moscow, then I myself would have to go naked, and there won't be anything from which to sew shrouds for the dead."²⁸

Thus, the next step which Muscovite policy faced was to gain possession of Kazan and Astrakhan, that is, the second part of the Volga route. The official policy of the great prince of Moscow in relation to the so-called Tatars was based, as Mr. Keenan has emphasized, on pragmatism, without any nationalist or religious sentiments, in contrast to the policy of the metropolitanate of Moscow, which was now becoming the center of international Orthodox propaganda, using the powers and prestige of the new emerging political power for its purposes.

The princes of Moscow needed Kazan and Astrakhan for yet another reason. When the great princes of Moscow first entered the arena of European politics in the second half of the fifteenth century, their status was unclear. Their pretensions to a connection with the first Rome (forged genealogy back to Augustus—ca. 1480)²⁹ and "second Rome" (the legend of the Monomakh hat—ca. 1523–52)³⁰ were not treated seriously by the diplomatic world.³¹ They needed the charisma of a state organism which everyone would know and respect. The two Chinggisid successor states, Kazan and Astrakhan, were just such organisms. For this reason Ivan the

²⁵ Schaeder, pp. 112–16.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 198–215.

²⁷ On the role of trade in the Golden Horde see Vernadsky, pp. 342–44.

²⁸ Quoted after Barthold, p. 176.

²⁹ Schaeder, pp. 93–103.

³⁰ One cannot deny a sense of humor to the Muscovites in calling the Uzbek hat (see Vernadsky, p. 386) the hat of Monomakh.

³¹ See opinion expressed by Herberstein, pp. 80–84, and Giles Fletcher (1591), *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 19 a.b. See also Schaeder, pp. 104–12.

Terrible accepted as the basis of his new titulature the formulas "Tsar of Kazan" and "Tsar of Astrakhan."³²

After his marriage with Zoe (Sophia) Paleologue, Ivan III began to usurp for himself the privileges of the Byzantine emperors. After the death of Metropolitan Gerontius (1473–89), who, to the discomfiture of the great prince, had succeeded in maintaining his independence, Ivan III began to appoint the metropolitans himself (first Zosima in 1490).³³ This resulted in a kind of nationalization of the metropolitanate. The metropolitan became a tool of the prince, although during a prince's illness or the minority of the heir, he reasserted spiritual and political leadership (for example, Macarius' act of crowning young Ivan the Terrible in 1547). Of course it is difficult now to find an exact demarcation line between the actions of the principality and of the metropolitanate. New situations demanding important decisions arose—for example, to what extent the metropolitans could pursue the foreign policy of the metropolitanate independently of the great princes (as in receiving envoys from Lithuania and other countries). Such questions were decided *ad hoc*, until the full development, after the Time of Troubles, of the diarchy of the patriarch and the tsar, which led to the well-known conflict between Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and ended in the abolition of the Patriarchate by Peter I.

³² The long official title of the first Muscovite tsar (Ivan the Terrible)—as represented on the tsar's great seal—carries the word "tsar" only with regard to Kazan and Astrakhan; see E. I. Kamentseva and N. V. Ustiugov, *Ruskaia sfragistika i geraldika* (Moscow, 1963), p. 115.

³³ Golubinskii, II, Part 2 (Moscow, 1911), 23.