

The Muslim Tatars of Muscovy and Lithuania: Some Introductory Remarks

Bulat R. Rakhimzyanov

From the middle of the 15th century two states with considerable Slavic populations—vast and powerful Lithuania¹ and young, but ambitious, Muscovy—competed for the leading role in territories that had formerly belonged to Kievan Rus'. From the middle of the 16th century it had become clear that Muscovy had emerged as the successor, not the challenger, of the disintegrated Golden Horde. Muscovy entered its new, imperial era as an expansion-oriented, despotic state. Lithuania, on the contrary, after the Union of Lublin in 1569, became part of the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth, a Europe-oriented state. Both Muscovy and Lithuania-Ruthenia had Muslim Tatars as their ethnic components. But treatment of these Muslims differed substantially in the two states. This article addresses the role of the Tatar component in the differing political fates of Muscovy and Lithuania during the 15th and 16th centuries.



Contacts between the Slavic world and the Steppe² have traditionally been treated in the context of a kind of peculiar religious and national “cold war,” which intermittently became hot.³ Such portrayals are accurate, but only to a

This article has been written with financial support from the Gerda Henkel Stiftung (grant AZ 09/SR/10).

¹ The terms “Lithuania,” “Lithuania-Ruthenia,” and “Grand Principality (Duchy) of Lithuania” are synonyms in this article.

² I interpret “Steppe” as Desht-i-Qipchaq—the Qipchaq Steppe, a part of the East European steppe bounded roughly by the Oskol and Tobol rivers, the steppe/forest line, and the Caspian and Aral Seas.

³ Edward L. Keenan, “Muscovy and Kazan: Some Introductory Remarks on the Patterns of Steppe Diplomacy,” *Slavic Review* 24 (1967): 549. See the most typical works: S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen*, 14 vols. in 7, ed. I. D. Koval'chenko and S. S. Dmitrieva (Moscow: Mysl', 1988–91); K. V. Bazilevich, *Vneshniaia politika russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva: Vtoraia polovina XV veka* (Moscow: Izd-vo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1952); V. V. Kargalov, *Konets ordynskogo iga* (Moscow: Nauka, 1980); V. D. Nazarov, *Sverzhenie ordynskogo iga na Rusi* (Moscow: Znanie, 1983); Iu. G.

certain extent. To portray Slavic⁴-Tatar relations of this period in the monotonous tones of conflict and retrenchment is to distort beyond recognition the true picture of things. This was clearly demonstrated first by Harvard scholars;⁵ then post-Soviet (Tatar and Russian) scholars continued working in this context.⁶ Relations between the Slavic world and Steppe khanates were very pragmatic and friendly by force; religious and national antagonism played no significant role in their diplomacy.⁷ The dynasties which emerged in the three most important centers after the collapse of Sarai (the capital of the Golden Horde⁸), i.e., Crimea, Lithuania, and Moscow, often cooperated during the stage of shifting alliances and changing fortunes.

In fact, Slavic-Tatar relations of this period were far from uniform. With the fracturing of the Golden Horde into successor polities in the mid-15th century, numerous Juchid⁹ dynasts dispersed far and wide across Central Eurasia. Slavic relations with certain Juchids and their followers did, to be

Alekseev, *Osvobozhdenie Rusi ot ordynskogo iga* (Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe ot-delenie, 1989).

⁴ The adjective *Slavic* is used here in an entirely geographical—and not ethnic—sense. It means here the lands of Orthodox belief of Lithuania-Ruthenia and Muscovy.

⁵ Edward L. Keenan, "Muscovy and Kazan', 1445–1552: A Study in Steppe Politics" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1965); Keenan, "Muscovy and Kazan," 548–58; Craig G. Kennedy, "Fathers, Sons, and Brothers: Ties of Metaphorical Kinship Between the Muscovite Grand Princes and the Tatar Elite," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19 (1995): 292–301; Kennedy, "The Juchids of Muscovy: A Study of Personal Ties between Emigré Tatar Dynasts and the Muscovite Grand Princes in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1994).

⁶ D. M. Iskhakov, *Ot srednevekovykh tatar k tataram Novogo vremeni: Etnologicheskii vzgliad na istoriiu volgo-ural'skikh tatar XV–XVII vv.* (Kazan: Svod pamiatnikov, Master Lain, 1998); V. V. Trepavlov, *Istoriia Nogaiskoi Ordy* (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura RAN, 2001); I. V. Zaitsev, *Astrakhanskoe khanstvo* (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura RAN, 2004, 2006); I. V. Zaitsev, *Mezhdū Moskvōi i Stambulom: Dzhuchidskie gosudarstva, Moskva i Osmanskaia imperiia (nach. XV–per. pol. XVI vv.). Ocherki* (Moscow: Rudomino, 2004); B. R. Rakhimzianov, *Kasimovskoe khanstvo (1445–1552): Ocherki istorii* (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izd-vo, 2009).

⁷ Keenan, "Muscovy and Kazan," 549.

⁸ I have used the term *Golden Horde* to refer to the Juchid polity centered at Sarai from the mid-13th century to the early 15th. While the term itself was never used by contemporaries, it is a well-established convention among modern historians, and thus I am using it here. The alternative term *the Ulus of Juchi* is the original name of this polity and can be used as synonymous.

⁹ Juchi—the elder son of Chingis-khan, first Mongol emperor. Juchi possessed vast lands and united the Middle and Lower Volga area, Northern Caucasus, Crimea, Urals, Khorezm and a part of Western Siberia, later known as the "Ulus [state] of Juchi." Part of this *ulus* was later called the "Golden Horde." Juchi's royal descendants were called "Juchids."

sure, grow increasingly strained.¹⁰ But as the 15th and 16th centuries unfolded, both Muscovite and Lithuanian grand princes also formed increasingly close ties with certain dynasts of the Juchid line.

Muscovy had been an integral part of the steppe world, both politically and economically, since its very origin. It refrained from actively resisting Mongol-Tatar domination and carefully avoided challenging the political supremacy of the Golden Horde throughout most of the 14th and a good part of the 15th centuries. Its geographical position and important economic ties with the East made it a full-fledged participant in the Tatar political world. It remained the same in both the 15th and 16th centuries.

The Lithuanian conquest of the Ruthenian territories terminated the Golden Horde's rule in these lands approximately a century prior to Muscovy's emancipation from the Golden Horde's supremacy. After the Battle of the Blue Waters in 1362, the Belorussian and Ukrainian Rus' territories became part of the "West," while Muscovy remained the "East."¹¹ Lithuania was able to expand into the Belorussian and Ukrainian lands, although in the course of this expansion its elite became Slavicized; in this respect, the conquerors were overcome by the conquered. Lithuania's resources were too limited to accomplish the conquest of the Steppe.

Both Muscovite and Lithuanian rulers enticed members of the Turkic highest nobility from their native states into Muscovy and Lithuania-Ruthenia. At the same time, treatment of these Muslim nobles differed substantially in the two states.

With the first immigration wave of Tatar Muslim dynasts into Muscovy in the 1440s, a steady influx of Tatars began that, by 1600, had led to the resettlement of over 60 male dynasts and many thousands of their military retainers and family members into the Muscovite heartland. In several dozen cases, Tatar khans, along with their retainers, resettled in the central lands of the grand prince, thereby establishing a special form of relationship with the Muscovite ruler and his realm. The Muscovite grand princes proved quite adept at offering relationships which would draw in and satisfy displaced Juchids. Without clear indications and assurances, a fugitive Juchid might well pass up Muscovy in favor of other more attractive offers from Istanbul, Lithuania-Ruthenia, or Bukhara.¹²

The Lithuanian case has been investigated to a lesser extent. It varied and was much more complicated than the Muscovite case. Tatars began to arrive in Lithuania at the end of the 14th century. The first Tatar emigrants in

¹⁰ Kennedy, "The Juchids of Muscovy," 4.

¹¹ Jaroslaw Pelenski, "The Contest between Lithuania and the Golden Horde in the Fourteenth Century for Supremacy over Eastern Europe (Specifically for All the Lands of Rus')," in *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus'* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs; New York: Distributed by Columbia University Press, 1998), 143.

¹² Kennedy, "The Juchids of Muscovy," 49.

Lithuania were representatives of the Mansur bek (princely) clan of the Ulus of Juchi—Mansur Kiiat Mamaevich (1380); also an individual called Leksa Mansur, who apparently was the ancestor of the Glinskii princes¹³ (famous both in Muscovite and Lithuanian history). After the defeat of Tokhtamysh khan on the Vorskla River in 1399 approximately half of his troops voluntarily stayed in Lithuania. Muslim Tatar settlements within the country were concentrated mainly in regions such as Volhynia and Podolia. All the emigrants from the Ulus of Juchi had been granted lands within the Lithuania; their status was comparable to that of “boyars” — they had to be ready to provide military service. Tatars continued to migrate to Lithuania-Ruthenia until the early 16th century, playing a significant military role within the Grand Duchy.

One of the most important consequences of this Tatar influx was the foundation of special polities within the territory of Muscovy. In contrast, the appearance of service Tatars in Lithuania did not lead to major political consequences.

Muscovite princes granted special lands (somewhat like independent principalities; in Turkic tradition—*iurts*) in the immediate territory of Muscovy to Tatar dynasts. There were many *iurts* of this kind within the territory of 15th- and 16th-century Muscovy: in the towns of Kasimov, Romanov, Kashira, Zvenigorod, Iur’ev-Polskii, Serpukhov, Khotun’, Surozhnik, the so-called “Andreev stone town,” etc. As contrasted to the Muscovite case, Chingissids did not find their niche within the aristocracy of Lithuania-Ruthenia, and finally this practice led to essential differences in the external and internal policies of Lithuania-Ruthenia and Muscovy, as well as to their different roles in the formation of the political structure of Eastern Europe.

I will try to compare the status of Muslim Tatars in Muscovy and Lithuania-Ruthenia according to the data of relevant primary sources, but first I would like to draw attention to my general observations on this matter.

In existing Russian translations from Tatar sources, the Juchids’ arrival in Muscovy is represented as the free act of independent political persons; their status while in Muscovy is unclear. Diplomatic records show well into the 1530s a studied avoidance of the terms *service* and *to serve* when characterizing relations between émigré Tatars and the Muscovite grand princes. These relations had been characterized through phrases expressing the grand prince’s actions towards the entering Juchid such as: *vziati k sebe* (to take into his presence), *dati opochiv v svoei zemli* (to grant asylum in his land), and *istomu podniati* (to lift [their] burden). Nowhere was there an invitation issued from the Muscovite grand prince to a Juchid Tatar to come “to serve.” Nowhere does a Juchid entreat the grand prince to take him in so that he might “serve” the grand prince. The terminology expressing the nature of the Juchid

¹³J. Tyszkiewicz, *Tatarzy na Litwie i w Polsce: Studia z dziejow XIII–XVIII w.* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1989), 147.

presence in Muscovy was politically neutral.¹⁴ If anything, it stressed the continued autonomy a Juchid might expect to enjoy while allied with the grand prince.

Indeed, the sojourn of high-ranking Crimeans in Muscovy should be conceived of as voluntary, according to documents of the 1470s–80s. Once in Muscovy, they were free to return to their home territory. Muscovite officials promised them, “you are free to enter Muscovy as well as to leave wherever you want” (*dobrovol’no priedesh, dobrovol’no kudy voskhochesh’ poiti—poidesh’, a nam tebia ne derzhati*). Many émigrés did return home. For instance, during the fall of 1489, an individual identified only as “Son of Idika” (*Idikin syn*) was given leave to go to Crimea.¹⁵ In documents to the Crimean sultans Izdemir and Devlesh this paragraph had been dropped.¹⁶ Apparently that was the reason for their preference of Lithuania-Ruthenia instead of Muscovy.¹⁷

According to the text of invitations to the influential Crimean prince (*mirza*) of the Shirin karachi clan, Dovletek,¹⁸ or to the former Crimean khan Mengli-Girey,¹⁹ they were free to continue their political careers whenever they wished. We observe the same case during the sojourn of the first Crimean khan, Khaji-Girey, in Lithuania-Ruthenia, where he “had unsaddled the sweaty warhorse” (*konia potnogo ... rozsedlal*²⁰), in the words of the grand prince of Lithuania Alexander Jagiellon (1492–1506).

By the mid-16th century, however, the Muscovite grand prince’s authority was becoming so great and his corresponding status so enhanced that the option of forming “service” relationships with émigré Juchids began to emerge.²¹ In the final decades of the century, this became even more pronounced.

High-ranking Horde émigrés usually received various land grants (*po-mest’ia*) or even whole towns (*goroda*) for their *kormlenie* (feeding). Originally Crimeans or subjects of the Great Horde received towns located along the southern border of Muscovy—Mescherskii Gorodok (Kasimov),²² and Ka-

¹⁴ Kennedy, “The Juchids of Muscovy,” 129.

¹⁵ *Sbornik Imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* (hereafter, *SIRIO*) (St. Petersburg, 1867–), 41: 58.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 41: 100.

¹⁷ A. L. Khoroshkevich, *Rus’ i Krym ot soiuza k protivostoianiiu: Konets XV v. – nachalo XVI v.* (Moscow: Éditorial URSS, 2001), 281.

¹⁸ *SIRIO*, 41: 28.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 22.

²⁰ *Litovskaia Metrika*, kniga zapisei 5, # 4, p. 56 (cited by Horoshkevich, *Rus’ i Krym*, 278 n. 31).

²¹ Kennedy, “The Juchids of Muscovy,” 131.

²² See Rakhimzianov, *Kasimovskoe khanstvo*.

shira. The need for defense of the southern border was a possible reason for this practice, since the Oka river was a defensive line for this area and all these towns were located along it. The towns of Kaluga, Tarusa, Serpukhov, Kashira, Kolomna, Kasimov, and Aleksin were the original defense centers for Oka River bank.²³ Refugees from the Horde who were considered “mistrustful” from the Muscovite point of view usually received towns in the center of the country. So, Crimean sultan and former Kazanian khan Abdyl-Latif received Iur’ev-Pol’skii in 1508.

The social status accorded to high-ranking Crimean and Great Horde émigrés in Lithuania was generally similar to the status accorded to the same groups in Muscovy.²⁴ They received towns near the capitol or some other big city. Huge land-ownerships were awarded to the son of former Crimean khan Nur-Daulet (name lost), who stayed in Lithuania after his father’s move to Muscovy (after the stay in Lithuania). This son of Nur-Daulet became a founder of the Punskaa princely dynasty. He owned lands in the Trotskii and Novogradskii districts.²⁵

There are obvious differences in the formal obligations of émigré Juchids in Muscovy and Lithuania-Ruthenia. For instance, all émigrés to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania lost their nobility status when leaving for the Grand Duchy, as opposed to the Muscovite practice.²⁶ In Muscovy émigré Juchids took positions according to their status in their home territory²⁷—all late Golden Horde states (the Great Horde, the Crimean khanate etc.). Their status within the system of the grand prince’s court was higher than the status of the former appanage princes.²⁸ High-ranking Crimean émigrés in Muscovy often became close satellites of the grand prince’s *dvor* (court). Thus, the situation was of two kinds. On the one hand, Muscovite grand princes became suzerains for the Crimean Khanate and Great Horde’s refugees. On the other hand, formally they still were their vassals according to the “legal” ideas of the Pax

²³ D. I. Beliaev, “O storozhevoi, stanichnoi i polevoi sluzhbe na pol’skoi ukrainie Moskovskogo gosudarstva do tsaria Alekseia Mikhailovicha,” *Chteniia v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* 4 (1846): 5–60; N. P. Pavlov-Sil’vanskii, *Gosudarevy sluzhilye liudi* (St. Petersburg, 1909).

²⁴ Khoroshkevich, *Rus’ i Krym*, 299.

²⁵ See for details M. Kosman, “Dokumenty wielkiego ksiaza Witolda,” *Studia źródłoznawcze. Commentationes* 16 (1971): 151. Cf. J. Sobczak, *Położenie prawne ludności tatarskiej w Wielkiem księstwie Litewskim* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1984), 25–26.

²⁶ They temporarily maintained them only in the middle of the 15th century.

²⁷ A. A. Zimin, “Ivan Groznyi i Simeon Bekbulatovich v 1575 g.,” in *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta*, vyp. 80: *Iz istorii Tatarii*, 4 (1970): 143–48.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

Mongolica (because they were not Chingissids by birth, as were Crimeans or Great Hordians).

Living in Muscovy, some Crimean and Great Horde émigrés remained Muslims, others (a minority) converted to Christianity. Those who converted to Christianity sometimes achieved high positions within the Muscovite political system. One impressive example of such “an extraordinary career”²⁹ is the social and political ascent of the tsarevich (sultan) Khudai-Kul—Petr Ibragimovich.

The formal act of legal registration of Crimean and Great Horde refugees’ rules in Muscovy was called *ustanovlenie* or *osazhdenie* (“establishment” or “landing”). For example, the former Crimean khan Nur-Daulet had been “landed” (*osazhden*),³⁰ i.e., had been provided with land grants—with a *po-mest’e* or *kormlenie*. It is clear that such actions of the Muscovite grand prince caused some damage to the Muscovite population. Muscovite diplomats did not forget to remind the Crimean khan of this. Diplomats invoked the example of the former Crimean khans Nur-Daulet and Aidar, that Muscovite grand prince Ivan III “vzial ikh k sobe i istomu ... svoei zemle uchinil” (took them to him and caused damage to his land).³¹

In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, all émigré Juchids were objects of law, not subjects (*byli ob’ektami prava, a ne sub’ektami*), as evidenced by the unilateral regulation of their status in all relevant documents of the period. In contrast, Muscovite rulers did not dare to change the Tatar émigré’s status from “subject” to “object” of law for a long time. Here we see the trace of the “Mongol yoke.”³²

Historians have only one surviving document relating the terms of “cooperation” between the Muscovite grand prince and an émigré Juchid Tatar. It is a treaty between Vasili III, grand prince of Muscovy (1505–33), and Abdyl-Latif, khan of Kazan’ (1497–1502). Abdyl-Latif lived in Muscovy from 1502 on. The treaty was signed in December 1508 in Muscovy.³³ A special arrangement took form between Vasili III and Abdyl-Latif, whereby the latter and his retinue resettled in Muscovy. I propose that with some restrictions we can extend the terms of this particular agreement to most of the treaties between the Muscovite grand princes-tsars and Tatar residents in Muscovite lands.

²⁹ Donald G. Ostrowski, “The Extraordinary Career of Tsarevich Kudai Kul/Peter in the Context of Relations between Muscovy and Kazan’,” in *States, Societies, Cultures: East and West: Essays in Honor of Jaroslaw Pelenski*, ed. Janusz Duzinkiewicz (New York: Ross Publishing, 2004), 697–719.

³⁰ *SIRIO*, 41: 31.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 25, 27, 34, 35, 26.

³² Khoroshkevich, *Rus’ i Krym*, 296.

³³ This document has been published in *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei* 5 (1863): 399–401; *SIRIO*, 95: 49–51.

The fact of formal registration of Tatar émigrés' legal status in Muscovy (in the form of bilateral commitments) sharply distinguishes Muscovy from Lithuania. Unfortunately, we do not possess any document concerning relations between the Lithuanian grand prince and an émigré Tatar. The status of the émigré Juchids in Lithuania-Ruthenia was regulated only by *privileis*³⁴ of the Lithuanian grand princes, beginning with the *privilei* of Vytautas the Great (Witold, Vitovt) (1392–1430). Thus, we can create our hypotheses only by employing analogies. I will compare the original agreement between the Tatar khan and his Muscovite suzerain with the agreement between the Lithuanian grand prince (simultaneously the Polish king from 1447) Casimir IV Jagiellon (1440–92) and his vassal Russian Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes (namely Ivan Iur'evich, and Vasilii and Fedor Mikhailovichi) (dated 1459).³⁵ Of course, these analogies are not perfect ones—in their political status Juchids (Abdyl-Latif was a real one) formally maintained much higher positions than the Muscovite dynasty of Riurikovichi-Danilovichi (Vasilii III) within the system of *Pax Mongolica*. But, in fact, namely Vasilii was a suzerain, and Abdyl-Latif was a kind of a special vassal of the Muscovite grand prince. Concerning relations between the Lithuanian grand prince and the Russian Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes, there was no such dilemma in their mutual status. The Lithuanian grand prince had, undoubtedly, a higher status than the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes.

The terms of Abdyl-Latif's agreement are dated to 1508, a rather late period in terms of the situation between the Muscovites and the Tatar political world. That is why they give us the opportunity to trace the outlines of the relationship between the Muscovite suzerain and the Tatar vassal.

In the deed written by Abdyl-Latif he is called a "tsar" (khan), not a sultan, because previously he had been a Kazanian khan. Use of this term stressed that according to the traditional political correlation in the Steppe³⁶ world, he, as a Chingissid, formally had a higher status than a Muscovite grand prince. In the deed by the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes, the Polish king and Lithuanian grand prince Casimir is called "korol'," "gospodar," "velikii kniaz'" (king, master, grand prince). In the deed by Abdyl-Latif the Muscovite grand prince Vasilii III is given the title "velikii kniaz'" (grand prince). For the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes, King Casimir was a "gospodar" (master, lord), while for Abdyl-Latif the Muscovite grand prince was just a "brat" (brother). Thus, King Casimir was indisputably recognized

³⁴ A *privilei* is an act regulating the state system and social estate privileges in Lithuania.

³⁵ This document has been published in *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV–XVI vv.* (hereafter, *DDG*), ed. L.V. Cherepnin (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), 192–93.

³⁶ I.e., Tatar, or Mongol.

as a suzerain, and the Muscovite grand prince was positioned as a political figure equal to a Juchid.

In the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii deed we read: "bili esmo cholom ... aby nas prinial v sluzhbu" (we asked you humbly... to get us into your service); in Abdyl-Latif's, "dal esmi rotu" (I have given you an oath). As for "*chelobit'e*" ("*bili esmo cholom...*"), the meaning of this term is rather clear—it signified a humble request during the Middle Ages. The term *rota* ("dal esmi *rotu*") meant an oath, no more than that. Thus, according to this terminology the status of the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes in their relations with Casimir was lower than the status of Abdyl-Latif in his relations with Vasilii.

The Odoevskii princes promised "sluzhiti verno vo vsem, bez vsyakoe khitrosti, i vo vsem poslushnym byti" (to serve faithfully in all matters, without any cunning, and obey in all things). Abdyl-Latif promised "byti poslushnu vo vsem" (to obey [Vasilii] in all things) as well as "hoteti mi [Abdyl-Latif—B.R.] dobra k Vasiliu i ego detem i ikh zemliam v pravdu bez hitrosti" (to wish well to Vasilii and his children and to their lands truly and without cunning.) The expression *hoteti dobra* (to wish well) was usually used in relations between rulers whose status was equal.³⁷ Moreover, the document by Abdyl-Latif shows avoidance of the terms "service" and "to serve." Service relations seem to have been taken on only when both parties recognized a clear disparity in their relative status. Recognition of such a disparity does not seem to have emerged in Muscovite grand princely-Juchid relations before the mid-1500s. In this situation a possible resolution was to establish a relationship of "obedience." In contrast to "service," this relationship did not involve any formal expressions of abject self-abasement, such as the use of the term *bound servant* or the act of kneeling in deference. One may suggest, according to this terminology, that a Juchid might expect some autonomy while within the Muscovite grand prince's realm.

King Casimir's obligation toward the Novosil'skie and Odoevskie princes was "vo chesti, i v zhalovan'i, i v dokonchan'i derzhati" (to keep with honor, and with material support, and in agreement). In the term *zhalovanie* we see clearly the essence of this paragraph. Only a suzerain could *zhalovat'* (grant, provide material support). We recall a later expression by Ivan IV the Terrible: "Russkie *obladateli* zhalovati i kazniti vol'ny byli *podolastnykh*" (the Russian *masters* were free to grant and punish their *dependent subjects*).³⁸ There is no such paragraph in Abdyl-Latif's deed, perhaps because he was not a bound servant of Vasilii and Vasilii was not his unreserved suzerain?

The next part of the deed by the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii princes concerns financial affairs between the master and his servants. The latter must pay "poletnoe ... po starine" (the annual tribute ... in accordance with past

³⁷ DDG, 123, 127, 160, 165, 187, 203, 208, 212.

³⁸ *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo*, ed. V. P. Adrianova-Peretts (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1951), 44.

practice). There is no such paragraph in Abdyl-Latif's deed. This may suggest that he did not pay such tributes to the Muscovite grand prince.

Abdyl-Latif was not to correspond with anyone, in written or oral form, without the permission of the grand prince. If his brother, Muhammad-Amin, or any other Tatar khan, or anyone sent him a messenger, he was to report to Vasilii on this matter immediately. In the event of the arrival of a Crimean envoy to Abdyl-Latif, he was to report to the Muscovite grand prince immediately. He was to live in the place provided for him. He was not to leave the place of his residence (the town of Iur'ev-Polskii) without permission. The ban on external political activity on the part of the Tatar khan was one of the most important issues in Abdyl-Latif's deed.

There is no paragraph about the Muscovite grand prince's obligation to defend Abdyl-Latif from enemies. In contrast, according to the terms of the Novosil'skii and Odoevskii deed, the Lithuanian grand prince had to "*boroniti*" (defend) his service princes from any enemy ("*ot vsiakogo, kak i svoego*"). Again, we see here signs of the former Kazanian khan's power (he did not need to be defended), as well as evidence of his equality in status with the Muscovite grand prince.

For all that, Abdyl-Latif could participate in military campaigns organized by the Muscovite grand prince—"poidu s toboiu na tvoe delo" (I will go with you on your business)—or could be sent on a military campaign alone—"kude odnogo menia poshlesh' na svoe delo" (where you will send me alone for your business). This chapter equated Abdyl-Latif with any other vassal of the Muscovite grand prince—their main duty was participation in military campaigns of their suzerain.³⁹

The deed by Abdyl-Latif stated the personal immunity and inviolability of the personal property of the Muscovite population: "hodia po vashim zemliam, ne imat' i ne grabit' svoeiu rukoiu nichego, ni nad hrest'ianinom, ni nad kakim ne uchinit' nikakovy sily" (passing through your lands, not to pillage at all, and not to violate on your people at all). A special paragraph dedicated to religious tolerance was also added: "A kto uchinit nad khrest'ianskim bogomol'stvom, nad Bozhieiu tserkovi'iu kakovo poruganie, ili nad khrest'ianstvom nad kem nibudi uchinit' kakovu silu, i mne za togo za likhago ne stoiati, po toi rote ego vydati, a kto ego nad tem nasil'stvom ub'et, v tom viny net, togo dlya mne roty ne slozhiti" (And who [Abdyl-Latif's Muslim retinue—B.R.] abuses Christian clergy and God's Church, or outrages Christianity in some way, and I [Abdyl-Latif] will not defend this evil man, and will deliver him up according to this treaty, and if he is killed during this abuse, there will be no guilt there, and this treaty will not be cancelled because of this [event]). Here we see some possible limitations for conflicts between different confessions. Limitations for Abdyl-Latif's military detach-

³⁹ Khoroshkevich, *Rus' i Krym*, 291.

ment, while in Muscovite territory, were among the most important issues of the deed by Abdyl-Latif.

Abdyl-Latif guaranteed personal immunity for envoys of the Muscovite grand prince traveling to the late Golden Horde states or elsewhere. If a Russian who escaped from a Tatar khanate was passing through the territory controlled by Abdyl-Latif, the latter had to guarantee personal immunity for this Russian: “nashim kazakam tekh ne imati, ni grabiti, otpushati dobrovol’no” (our kazaks should not rob these people and should let them go).

It is not clear who was to solve the problems within the *dvor* (retinue) of Abdyl-Latif. I suppose that it was an internal affair of Abdyl-Latif and his Muslim retinue. In contrast, we find such a paragraph in the Novosil’skii and Odoevskii deed. The final judge in such matters was the Polish king and Lithuanian grand prince Casimir.

The legal status of Abdyl-Latif’s land domain, the town of Iur’ev, is unclear. We cannot determine either the taxes to be collected by Abdyl-Latif from the local population, or the taxes to be paid by him to the Muscovite grand prince. Generally, Abdyl-Latif’s document absolutely lacks any clauses pertaining to legal proceedings. On the contrary, the deed by the Novosil’skie and Odoevskie princes treats these matters in detail. The superior judge in all cases was the Polish king. We can suggest, by analogy, that in the Muscovite case, too, the superior judge was the Muscovite grand prince. But this is only a suggestion. An unspecified *sudebnik*⁴⁰ (code of law) had been given to Abdyl-Latif. What was this *sudebnik*? Possibly, it was the universal Sudebnik of 1497 (the so-called “Sudebnik of Ivan III”). In this case, Abdyl-Latif functioned as governor for the entire population of Iur’ev-Polskii, including the Orthodox (!). If not, it is unclear why this *sudebnik* was issued to Abdyl-Latif, since he could judge his Muslim retinue only according to the norms of the Sharia.

Specific provisions for Abdyl-Latif’s “ulans, princes, and kazaks” (Muslim retinue) were made. Abdyl-Latif agreed to maintain friendly relations with Janai in Meshcherskii Gorodok (Kasimov) and with Shig-Avliar in Surozhik, and with any other Tatar khans or sultans who might come to Muscovy, and promised neither to accept in his service any ulans, princes, or kazaks from the retinues of such Tatar residents of Vasilii, nor to permit any of his own retinue to be accepted into their service. A similar restriction regulated Abdyl-Latif’s relations with Vasilii: neither of them could accept former vassals of the other into his own service, with the interesting exception that Vasilii retained the right to accept into his service members of the four ruling

⁴⁰ *Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossii XVI stoletii: Opyt rekonstruktsii*, ed. A. A. Zimin and L. V. Cherepnin, 3 vols. (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut istorii SSSR, 1978), 1: 61.

karachi clans of the late Golden Horde states.⁴¹ Thus, not only Abdyl-Latif himself was presented as a subject of law (*sub"ekt prava*), but his Muslim retinue also. In the Lithuanian case, only the Novosil'skie and Odoevskie princes themselves were such subjects, not their retinues.

The main idea of Abdyl-Latif's deed is the ban on external political activity by the Tatar khan and the imposition of certain limitations on Abdyl-Latif's military detachment while in Muscovite territory. Abdyl-Latif was positioned, at least formally, as a political figure equal to the Muscovite grand prince (*brat*). He was not a servant of Vasiliï and Vasiliï was not his unreserved suzerain. Though living in Muscovy, he continued to enjoy a degree of political and social autonomy. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, all émigré Juchids were objects of law, not subjects (*byli ob"ektami prava, a ne sub"ektami*), i.e., they were themselves subject to laws made by others. In contrast, for a long period of time, Muscovite rulers did not dare to change the status of Tatar émigrés from "subject" of law to "object."



Muscovy competed with Lithuania-Ruthenia for the succession to all of Rus'. Although Vytautas's designs proved to be a failure, similar expansionist schemes were more successfully carried out by Russian grand princes and tsars (namely, Vasiliï III and his son Ivan IV the Terrible) in their struggle against the east. The ethnic and religious composition of both the Muscovite and Lithuanian-Ruthenian states was more complex than Russian and Soviet historians would have preferred. Due possibly to close relations between the Muscovite grand princes and high-ranking Tatars, over the course of the 15th and 16th centuries, the status and roles of the Muscovite grand princes within the system of Pax Mongolica rose by degrees, culminating in the grand prince's assumption of the highest position within the Steppe political system, that of "great sovereign khan."⁴² The rapid rise of the grand prince reflected Muscovy's emergence during this period as the ascendant imperial power in Central Eurasia, and Lithuania's failure to act in this particular imperial expansionist role. From my point of view, there was greater secular tolerance and political respect for Muslim Tatar dynasts in Muscovy than in Lithuania. It is possible that this phenomenon influenced the future political development of two states.

⁴¹ "a vam ot menia liudei ne prinimati, oprich Shirinova rodu i Baarynova i Arginova i Kipchakova" (*SIRIO*, 95: 51).

⁴² Kennedy, "The Juchids of Muscovy," 1.