

ISSN 1226-4490

*International
Journal of
Central
Asian Studies*

Volume 1 1996

**Editor in Chief
Choi Han-Woo**

**The International Association of Central Asian Studies
Institute of Asian Culture and Development**

Documents of Russian

—Eastern Correspondence in Turkic languages

And Their Significance in the Science of Sources—

Prof. Dr. Mirkasym Usmanov

Illuminating the history of Russian–Eastern relations and observing the fate of the embassy to India of 1675–1677^{[1](#)} headed by Muhammad-Iysyf, academician V.V.Bartold wrote: “Kasimov was one of those figures of the Tatar origin who in the XYII and XYIII centuries had rendered Russia a great service in it's relations with Front-Asian and even Eastern-Asian countries. Thanks to Tatars who were in Russian service the Russian government possessed a skilled personnel for it's relations with governments of muslim countries. This is partly the reason why in Russia even in the XYIII c. Front-Asian languages have been studied less as compared to languages of Eastern Asia. For some period of time Tatar language was the language of diplomatic relations between Russia and Persia. Documents in Persian must have been translated into Russian by Tatars as well, they expounded the contents in the style of Russian official papers...”^{[2](#)}

Reflection the actual state of affairs, these conclusions of V.V.Bartold could be made more exact in some details and considerably enlarged in respect of time and space. They do to the same extent correspond to Russian–Eastern contacts in the XY–XYI centuries and up to the XIX c., and they are applicable not only to relations with Asian countries but also with those muslim outskirts of the Russia Empire official communications of with which had a character of interstate relations due to their self-government. But in order to have some idea about it, it is necessary to turn our attention, even if briefly, to the history of early relations of the Russian state with its neighbours in the South–East. Elucidating main stages of this complicated history, we could have not only confirmed the source base of the above thesis, but at the same time received the information about the origin, development, structure and informational diapason of those numerous documental sources in Turkic languages of XYI–XYIII centuries. These documents have been accumulated in state archives and antiquity depositories but no to the present day they did not become the object of special analysis and hence their information failed to find an application in the study of the century–old history of Russian–Eastern relations. At the same time it is impossible to illuminate all urgent problems in one article with limited volume. For this reason the material presented here is of preliminary character.

* * *

The earliest contacts of the Eastern Slavs with representatives of Altaic linguistic group (with the Turks and mondspeaking tribes) go back to the IY–YII centuries A.D., to the epoch when the Huns^{[3](#)} find the Avars^{[4](#)} appeared in the Eastern Europe. In the IX–X cc. long-term relations had been between ancient Russia and the

Khazar Kaganat¹⁾ among the population of which the Turkic component predominated.¹⁾ In the X-th century and the beginning of the XIII c. Kievan Russia had established closer and more complicated relations (peaceful and friendly as well as hostile) with its Turkic speaking neighbours in the East and South, namely with the Bulgars on the Volga,²⁾ and in the southern steppes³⁾ with Pechenegs, the Torks, the Berendeis, the Black klobuks, the Polovets (Cumans) and etc. Academician A. N. Kononov convincingly showed that in spite of the complexity and discrepancy of the events themselves (with certain one-sided illumination of them in the literature⁴⁾), these long-term relations strengthened mutual cultural influences which gave the opportunity to speak, with a certain extent of probability, about peculiar Russian-Turkic bilingualism in Russia.⁵⁾

We are paying attention to this thesis made by A.N. Kononov as the probability of bilingualism in Kiev which “had a Turkic name Mankirman”⁶⁾, gives us a right to speak about the possibility of analogous phenomena, though in some other forms and volumes, in the opposite camp as well. Not only Kievan princes but also Turkic chieftains were equally interested in maintenance of contacts in the times of alliance, and in getting information, intelligence data about their rivals, enemies at the periods of conflicts and wars. It goes without saying that such lengthy contacts necessarily had been accompanied both by oral negotiations and by written treaties, mutual commitments. Otherwise the facts of such relations could not have been fixed in some other written sources, in Russian chronicles, for example. Therefore we can assume that as functional and written language there could be used both their own language of contractors, for example Slavic, and “foreign” languages, e.g. Greek and Latin which were well known in Russia⁷⁾, and consequently were accessible to Russia's neighbours too. At the same time we can not exclude the possibility of the fixation of some statements in Turkic language. The point is that not only the Turkic language was known in Kiev and could be used for writing with the help of some other alphabets, but in such treaty records was also interested the Turkic side of contractor for its own needs. If the Bulgars had composed such conjectural Turkic documents in Arabic language⁸⁾, their Polovets-Kipchak analogues had been fixed not in runic, what would be more probably for us to suppose⁹⁾, but on the base of Roman alphabet or Slavic writing. This is favoured by the facts of expanding the Christianity among the Turks of Southern Steppes at the very beginning of the XIII c.¹⁰⁾, including the fact of compiling (writing) “Cuman collection” (“Codex Cumanicus”).¹¹⁾

Proceeding from all these one can suppose that the first “meeting” of Ancient Russian and Early medieval Turkic official diplomatic documents had taken place in pre-mongol era.

Naturally that speaking about the possibility of drawing up the Turkic diplomatic documents in pre-mongol Eastern Europe, it is necessary 1) to differentiate between various Turkic regions, for example, the Volga Bulgaria and Polovets Steppes; 2) not to put sign of equality between the Turks of Eastern Europe on the one hand and, say, the Uigurs – on the other hand.¹²⁾ In Eastern Europe the Turkic official business correspondence became widespread in the so-called epoch of the Golden Horde. It was due to the high

organization by the Djouchids of peoples exploitation, intensification of their inter-state relations, i.e. the presence of socio-political requirements. Originally the formation of the Djouchids official Turkic business correspondence had been the consequence of a peculiar symbiosis of several cultures, the part of assimilating component in which was played by Kindred cultures the Kipchaks of Eastern Europe, the Uigurs of Central Asia and the settled population of the Djouchi Ulus itself of the Lower Volga, the Crimea, the Northern Caucasus, Bulgaria and Chorezm. Later on, experiencing the influence of the written tradition of contiguous Muslim Countries, this business correspondence quickly had become isolated, gaining its own distinctive features, and it developed as a part of the ruling culture of the nobility of the multiethnic empire, whose flowering and prosperity had been accompanied (as it was stated above) by the high level of exploitation of the working people of the dependent and conquered nations.¹³⁾

Against this widely accepted in Turkology and approved concept¹⁴⁾ protested A.P. Grigorieff. Without having any sufficient grounds, he is trying to prove that until 1380 the Mongolian language¹⁵⁾ was the official language of the Djouchids. Leaving the criticism of Grigorieff's arguments till the next occasion, here I would like particularly to stress that it was the official character and the leading position of the Turkic written language in the Djouchi Ulus in the XIII-XIV centuries that directly influenced the essential feature of the diplomatic correspondence of grand dukes of the XIV-XV centuries with governments of Eastern countries, and mainly Tatar khanates of Eastern Europe, and with the governments of other Muslim countries in the XVI-XVIII c.

There are known facts of Russian-Tatar bilingualism in the XV-XVI centuries: official gramotas of the Russian origin and purpose have been certified by the Russian people themselves in Tatar with the help of Uigur writing¹⁶⁾ Moscow coins of the times of Ivan the III have been minted with the parallel Tatar legend.¹⁷⁾ The originality of Tatar khan message translation into Russian language in Moscow accuracy of the Eastern terminology in Russian gramotas proper, also speak in favour of the fact that in grand dukes encirclement the Tatar language of that time was known rather well.¹⁸⁾ and finally, the observance of the main elements of the Tatar ritual of salutation by the young grand duke Ivan (the future tsar Ivan the Terrible) on meeting with the sultana Fatima¹⁹⁾ also supports our conclusion which helps to comprehend nature, history and peculiarity of Russian-Eastern correspondence.

Although we don't have the Turkic originals of the Russian-Eastern correspondence of the XIV-the beginning of the XV c., there is no doubt in the historical truth of their existence. This is supported by the data of Russian-Eastern relations of the second half of the XVth and the beginning of XVI c. Thus, according to the known inventory of Russian archives of the XVI-XVII centuries they have kept original of a great number of Turkic documents of Astrakhan, Kazan, Kasimov, Crimean, Nogai and "Orda" origin, written in "Tatar" or "Besermen" writing. For example, among the documents of Tsar's archives that have been kept in

approximately 250 boxes (with regard to double numbers), 38 boxes, i.e. more than 15%, contained documents on relations with Weighbour Khanates, 20 boxes out of 38 contained not less than a hundred of Eastern gramotas.

In what languages have these gramotas been written? In the very inventory of the Tsar's archives there are only several cases indicating their graphic and linguistic peculiarities: "Box 72. And in it there are old Kazan lists, and gramotas, written in Tatar, under the tsar Maahmed-Amin and under the tsar Abdillatif...", "Box 101. And in it there are shertni Crimean gramotas written in Besermen writing... they are not translated; there are also gramotas of Min-girei with translations..."²⁰⁾

In these quotations attributes "old" and "shertni" are printed in italics because they give an opportunity to judge about the written language of other analogous documents. Box 148, for example, contained "defteri old from Bati and from other tsars; there are no translations to them nobody can translate".²¹⁾

Hence, in that box there were remainders of the earliest layers of the described archives, i.e. documents of the times of dependence of Russian grand dukes from Saray khans, and the final indication of the inventory's compiler shows that these documents have been written in Uigur writing.²²⁾ That is the reason why in 1572-1575, in the years of compiling the inventory, these documents have not been available to Moscow interpreters, specialising, as we shall see later, in Turkic business correspondence written in the Arabic script.

At last it is necessary to note that the most of khan gramotas from the Tsar's archives were shertni, i.e. contractual²³⁾, the Tatar khans wrote them in their own language²⁴⁾. As it was mentioned in the inventory itself, authenticity and lawfulness of these documents has been confirmed by the oath on the Korean: "... two Tsar's shertni gramotas...and the list of gramotas that were shertni gramotas of the Tsar and the Crimean Tsar; also the Tatar Koran on which the Tatars gave the oath; also the gramotas in Tatar writing" (box N 218).

Hence there is no doubt that most of the mentioned in the inventory Tatar gramotas have been written in Turkic language. If the script and the language have not been mentioned in the inventory it meant the presence of their translations in "boxes". Thus, mentioning undoubtedly Turkish in language "gramotas of Turkish Shakh-sultan Suleimen from Tsargrad..." and also "Saltan's gramotas, Selim saltan"²⁵⁾, the compiler of the inventory says absolutely nothing about their script and language.

The peculiarity of the Tsar archives's inventory is also characteristic of the Embassy department's inventory of 1614. It includes a more detailed enumeration of documents mainly of the second half of the XY-XYI c., each gramota being marked separately, or in the presence of group descriptions their exact number is mentioned. All in all there have been fixed about 130 gramotas of Eastern rulers: Turkish - 16, Crimean - 29,

Iranian (Kizilbashs) – 55, Middle Asian (Bukhara and Urgench) – 20, then one or two gramotas of Kazakh, Nogai and Kumik rulers.²⁶⁾ Their language has been mentioned only in two cases: first when describing two Crimean “shertni” gramotas (“one in Russian, and one in Tatar”), it seems to be due to the availability of the Russian duplicate of the Tatar document; for the second time such indication was provoked by such a rare occasion when the Turkish sultan Suleimen has sent his message that “was written in Serbian”.²⁷⁾ Therefore the regular absence of indications on linguistic features of Eastern gramotas with availability of their authentic and sufficient translations was common, as their being foreign went without saying.

The most of documents on Russian-Tatar relations being Turkic, is also confirmed by some other materials of Russian origin, e.g. by some preserved parts of the Embassy department's archives – by lists of the official business correspondence which are in the “books” and “columns” (stolbtsi). A great part of these documents has already been published.²⁸⁾ It is worthy that these “books” and “stolbtsi” tell us not only about numerous and regular translations of Tatar gramotas into Russian in Moscow²⁹⁾, but they also give abundant information about Russian documents written in Tatar language in the offices of grand dukes. About this first of all tell the facts that grand dukes had numerous interpreters from Tatar language out of the Russians themselves, the old and new christened Tatars and “sludzili” (employees) out of the Muslims, together with their names often go such definitions as : “our Tatars” or “sludzili Tatarin (employer) (of such grand duke)” etc.³⁰⁾ At the end of XY – the beginning of XYI c. the most prominent interpreter, having been mentioned in Turkic literature³¹⁾, was Ablez-bakhshi (Abljaz Bakhshei; Obljaz bakhshei). He was an influential figure at the court of the grand prince Ivan III. For instance, he as an interpreter, wrote “for the grand prince gramotas... in Tatar language” to the Crimea and other Khanates; he translated into Russian³²⁾ letters of the Turkish sultan Bajazit; at the same time he performed the duties of the Keeper of important documents.³³⁾ All these facts testify to his relatively high position in Moscow; Ablez was not a mere interpreter-practician, but most likely he was at the head of the group of Tatar clerks. This group was a distinctive precursor of the “Tatar office”. Later it officially existed as a part of the Embassy department, which had completely been made official in 1549.

The special Tatar office had been formed because of the Turkic written language traditionally being together with Russian the functional language in Russian-Tatar correspondence. The Turkic written language was the official literary language of the Tatar khanates which had appeared on the outskirts of the former Djouchi empire. And the official language of the last state from the end of the XIII c. was kipchak-Oguz written language. It was this variety of the Turkic literary language that, having mixed with dialects of “the majority of population” of those outskirts, from the XY c. served as the base for the formation of two independent branches – Crimean-Tatar and Volga-Tatar.³⁴⁾ Because of this objective reason in the XYI-XYII c. old Tatar language officially performed in Russia the function of one of the parallel diplomatic languages in relations of this state with a number of Eastern countries.³⁵⁾ N.I.Veselovsky must have taken this into account

when making a summarizing conclusion that the embassy ceremonial of Russian dukes and Tsars up to Peter I “to a great extent had Tatar or rather Asian character”^{[36\)](#)}

After the Volga Tatar Khanates have been joined to the Russian state, relations of Russia with Muslim countries became more or less regular, e.g. with dukes and tsar in the Caucasus, with khans in Siberia, Kazakhstan and Middle Asia.

With the beginning of the second half of the XYII c. there were established embassies between Moscow and China.^{[37\)](#)} All these together with diplomatic relations of Russia with Western countries led to a constant functioning of the Whole body of interpreters from different languages (as a part of the department). In any case, in the second half of the XYIII c. when the contingent of interpreters has been reduced a little, in the department mentioned above, there were interpreters from Latin, Polish, Tatar, German, Swedish, Dutch, Greek, Persian, Arabian, Turkish, English, Gorgian and other languages.^{[38\)](#)} In 1689 there were 22 interpreters, 8 of them translated from Tatar, some of them also knew “Turkish language”.^{[39\)](#)}

It is interesting to note ethnic and social structure of Tatar interpreters in the staff of the Embassy department. The contingent of these interpreters was replenished first of all by the so-called Romanoff, Kasimoff, Temnikoff, Kadamoff Tatars, i.e. by those ethnic groups of this people who had entered into the composition of Russian state earlier than their Volga and Ural tribesmen and traditionally were “Sludilie ljudi” (employees). As a rule they were taken from high-born families, e.g. of mirzas (i.e. mirzas – the Tatar nobility of that time), who were landholders in the inner regions of the country.^{[40\)](#)} Out of this social environment came such high official as, for example, Kutlu-Muhammad, a rich landowner advocating serfdom^{[41\)](#)}; mirza Tevkeleff – interpreter of the tsar Patar I on confidential affairs, ambassador of Russia in Kazakhstan, who helped to join it to Russia peacefully, major-general, governor of the Orenburg province in 1751–1753.^{[42\)](#)}

Together with deep historical tradition great was the role of the circumstance, that in the era of Russia's rapid territorial expansion and development of diplomatic relations with eastern peoples, the government had an almost ready personnel of tolmaches and interpreters in literate Tatars, knowing Eastern and Russian languages. All these facts have brought in the long run to such a phenomenon that Turkic documents of XYII–XYIII centuries coming from the Russian office, to say nothing of those of the XIX c.; were in Tartar language (namely in Old Tatar) but not “abstractedly” Turkic.^{[43\)](#)} It was due to this objective reason that in relations of Russia not only with Crimea (earlier with khanates of Volga region and Siberia), Turkey and Turkic-speaking rulers of Caucasus, Kazakhstan, Middle Asia and also with Iran, India, Mongolia and even China. Russian ambassadors and envoys had been provided with gramotas–Russian in language and main functions and also with their opposite duplicates in old Tatar language.^{[44\)](#)} In response to Tatar versions of Russian gramotas Sefevidian Iran was sending its messages in Farsi or Old Azerbaijanian language, khanates

of the Middle Asia wrote in Old Uzbek or Tajik and Tirkey – in the Great Mongols, who had forgotten the language of their ancestors, sometimes tried to answer also in Turkic language.⁴⁵⁾

Rather peculiar was the beginning of correspondence with China. So, for example, in 1654 and 1674 when sending embassies to Pekin but not possessing precise information about language situation there, the Posolsky Prikaz (Embassy Department) had accompanied Russian gramota with its translations – duplicates at first only in Tatar, later in Latin and Tatar languages.⁴⁶⁾

Thus, as it is evident from the survey, specific weight of old Tatar language in business correspondence between Russia and East in the XYII-XYIII c. was significant. It continued to play the role of the functional diplomatic language. Because of this objective reason there is an enormous number of documents in different Turkic dialects and in old Tatar as well not only in depositories of Moscow, Leningrad, but also in archives of Outlying towns of Russia, e.g. in Kazan, Ufa, Orenburg, Astrakhan, Simpheropol, Tobolsk, Tomsk and later in Alma-Ata, Makhachkala, etc. Contents of these documents are of great value for the study of century-old history of relations between Russia and East.

All the same functional development of the Old Tatar language was not identical with that of Old Turkic languages, both in respect of time and space. On the one hand the sphere of action of the Old Tatar language became considerably narrow even in duplicating Russian gramotas owing to appearance in Russia, as a result of Peter's reforms, of experts of a number of languages.⁴⁷⁾ It has become limited only to relations with Turkic addresses. On the other hand, with further intensification and modification of administrative culture of the state itself in its correspondence with local administration of autonomously managed outskirts of Russia, the tsarist government significantly intensified the use of the Old Tatar language.⁴⁸⁾ In this way it helped to broaden the sphere of its action.

Further more, the Old Tatar language itself, having been imposed by tsarism on other Turkic peoples⁴⁹⁾ and influencing their style and vocabulary, experienced the opposite influence.

We observe it in a more complicated structure of the mixed Old Tatar language⁵⁰⁾, which was to some extent a result of mastering by Russian interpreters the peculiarity of other Turkic languages.⁵¹⁾ For this reason the meaning of the term “Old Turkic language” became at that time somewhat relative. At last, from the beginning of the XYIII c. when the purposeful training of interpreters was established together with enlisting the services of the “prepared” personell of Tatars, there increased specific, weight of interpreters of other nations – the Bashkirs, Kazakhs and naturally the Russians themselves who had studied “the Old Tatar language”, Kazan, Astrakhan, Orenburg, Podolsk etc.⁵²⁾

Thus, Russian-Eastern correspondence in Turkic languages in the XVIII-XX cc. considerably differed from that of the preceding centuries and become a far more complicated phenomenon.

As an example we might name numerous documents of the correspondence of Russian administration with North-Caucasian rulers. For example, only in the fund of the Central State archive of Dagestan ASSR "there are no less than 3 and a half thousand documents", written in Turkic dialects.⁵³⁾ These documents are composed by native speakers of both Turkic and Iberian-Caucasian languages. In respect of their linguistics they are rather mixed, though "they don't go beyond the limits of the main vocabulary fund of literally Turki".⁵⁴⁾ So, the language of these documents might have been called the variety of the Old Turkic literary language of the North-Eastern Caucasus of the XVII - XVIII cc.⁵⁵⁾ If modern Dagestan philologues have every reason to consider turkisms of Dagestan languages as the result of the everyday close intercause of native speakers with Azerbaidjans, Kumiks and Nogais⁵⁶⁾, then the development of Russian-Dagestan's Turkic correspondence should be interpreted as a continuation of the Russian-Eastern correspondence with its roots going back to preceding centuries.⁵⁷⁾ Hence together with due regard for modern ethnogeographical features of the region it is also necessary to bear in mind the historical factor itself, which has played a considerable role as well. There is no less solid in volume Turkic material on the history of Russian-Kazakh relations of XVIII - the beginning of XIX c. For example, we have looked through about 140 files out of six funds of ЦГА Каб. СССР (ф. 3, 4, 21, 64, 78, 345) and we have revealed more than 1200 units of Turkic documents, concerning not only different sides of Russian-Kazakh relations, but also giving the richest material on socio-political history of the Kazakh society of the periods mentioned. So, for instance, only in two funds there are files with dozens and dozens of Turkic documents about famous uprisings of Sirim Datov, Isatai Taimanov, Kenesar Kasimov.⁵⁸⁾ It seems doubtful to have a detailed and objective study of the history of these uprisings without new reading, new understanding of the contents of documents, coming from rebels themselves.

As far as Turkic sources on social history are concerned, we can not avoid another complex of such documents, dating back to the Great peasant war (1773-1775), under the command of E.I. Pugachev. As we have already mentioned, it was a deep tradition of the intercause of the tsarist administration with Turkic "inorodtsi", in the east of the country - in the Old Tatar language that caused the emergence of numerous documents of rebels in this language.⁵⁹⁾ We should only repeat that together with more than 300 documents, that had left the camp of the rebels of different in ethnical composition, there had been preserved a vast correspondence of the Tsarist administration with progovernmental circles in provinces - with starostas of tatar auls, with Baskir bais, with foremen etc. On the whole, a total number of Turkic documents of the Pugachev cycle exceeds 1000 units.⁶⁰⁾

We could have continued this informational survey in some other directions as well, but it is not necessary as yet, because on the one hand, it is the aim of a special investigation and on the other hand – everything written here is just enough making a summary the main points are as follows:

- functional application of Turkic written language (mainly of its Old Tatar version) in the Russian–Eastern correspondence of XY – XYIII cc., as it is shown by materials numerous in number and convincing in quality, had a long-term tradition and rather wide sphere of action; and it was not incidental, as it was treated earlier;

- by their general contents and informational diapason these documents are the valid source both on the history of different aspects of Russian–eastern relations and on the culture, social history of some peoples of our country;

- all stated above testifies to the necessity of a more intensive study, i.e. of introducing into scientific circulation of the entire complex of Turkic materials of this circle. This assumes revealing, preliminary description of them and further publication of separate collections.

All these makes actual the training of Turkologists– documentalists,

Notes

- 1) Bartold V.V. Works. – Vol.9. – Moscow, 1977. – pp.372–373
- 2) Ibid. – pp.373–374. For the first time Tatar translation of Russian gramota was sent to Iran in 1588 (Bushev P. P. Istorija posolstv i diplomaticheskikh otnoshenij Russkogo i Iranskogo gosudarstv v 1586–1612 gg. – M., 1976. – p.82); but Bushev's explanation of the term “Tatar language” (p.82 and 373) is not right.
- 3) Kononov A. N. Istorija izuchenija turkskikh jazikov v Rossii. Dooktjabrskij period. – 2 –e izd., dop. i ispr. – L., 1982. – p.13.
- 4) Menges K. G. Vostochnije elementi v “Slove o polku Igoreve”. – L., 1977. – pp.157–168.
- 5) Artamonov M.I. Istorija Khazar. – L., 1962. – pp.365–384.
- 6) Ibid. pp.114–115, 155–156.
- 7) For more information see: Grekov B. D., Kalinin N. F. Bulgarskoje gosudarstvo do mongolskogo zavoevanija. – Materiali po Istorii Tatarii. – Vol. I. – Kazan, 1948. – pp.143 –144; Smirnov A.P. Drevnlaa Rus i Voljskaja Bulgarija. – Slavjane i Rus. – M., 1968.
- 8) See: Kononov A. N. Istorila izuchenija... , pp.18–23; Pletneva S. A. Drevnosti chernikh Klobukov. – Arkheologija SSSR. Svod arkheologicheskikh istochnikov. – Vol. EI – 19. M., 1973. – pp.24–28; of the same auther. Polovetskije kamennije izvajanija. – Ibid. – Vol. E4 –2, M., 1974. – pp.13–24.
- 9) Kononov A.N. Istorija izuchenija... – pp.22–23.
- 10) Ibid. – p.24.
- 11) Ibid. – p.20.

- 12) Sukhomlinov M. I. O jazikoznanii v drevnej Rossii. – Uchenije zapiski Vtorogo otdelenija AN. – Book 1, 1854.
- 13) According to numismatic data and information of Ibn Fadlan application of arabic written language in Volga Bulgaria dates back to the time of the very beginning of the X century. (Fasmer R.R. O monetakh voljskikh Bolgar X veka, – Izvestija obschestva arkeologii, istorii i etnographii pri Kazanskom universitete. 1925. – Vol. XXXIII, T.I:Kovalevsky A. P. Kniga Akhmeda Ibn-Fadlana o ego puteshestvii na Volgu v 921-922 gg. – Khjarkov. 1956.– pp.131-135, 138-139 and etc.). In the same X c. Ibn Ruste reports about the beginning of elementary literacy spreading. (Khvolson D. A. Izvestija o Khazarakh, burtasakh, bolgarakh, madjarakh, slavjanakh i russakh Abu-Ali Akhmeda ben Omara Ibn-Dasta. – Spb. – p.23).
- 14) Small number and bad dating of East European runic monuments; debatableness of reading and interpretation of texts don't give us yet the possibility of making some concrete conclusions on this problem. Vasiljev D.D. Graphicheskij fond pamjatnikov turkskoj Runicheskoi pismennosti aziatskogo areala (opitsistematizatsii). – M., 1983. – pp.42-43.
- 15) Bartold V.V. Works. – T.5. – M., 1965. – p.140.
- 16) For more information see: Documenti na polovitskom jazike XVI v. (Sudebnye akti Kamenets-Podolskoj armjanskoj kolonii). – M., 1967. – pp.57-59, 106-107.
- 17) Patterns of uigur documents see in: Radloff W. Uigarische sprachdenkmaler. – L., 1928. Recognizing the importance of uigur culture for the Turks of Eastern Europe of the XIII c., we can say nothing specific about similar influence before mongol conquests.
- 18) For more information see: Usmanov M.A. Jalovannije akti Djouchieva Ulusa XIV-XVI vv. Kazan 1979. – pp.94-111, 194-293. At the same time I take into account, that in the early stage of this state's development the Mongolian language also has been used some time in writing letters to the Grand kagans, the early Khulaguids. May be this language has been used for the daily round intercourse by separate descendants of mongolian Kins. (Ibid. – pp.100-101).
- 19) Survey of sources about the problem and the latest conclusions on it see: Samoilovitch A.N. To the history of Crimean-Tatar literary language. – Vestnik nauchnogo obschestva tatarovedenija. – Kazan, 1927. – N 7; Borovkov A.K. O pit filologicheskogo analiza tarkhannikh jarlikov, vidannikh Khanami Zolotoi Ordi russkim mitropolitom. – Izvestija AN SSSR. Serija literaturni i jazika. 1966. – T. XXV. – Vip. I; Nadjip E.N. Istoriko sravnitelnij slovar turkskikh jazikov XIV v. Na materiale “Khosrau i shirin” Kutba. – Vol. I. – M., 1979. – p.31 and next; Arakin V.D. Turkskije leksicheskie elementi v russkikh povestiakh i skazaniakh XIII – XV vv. – Sovetskaja turkologija. Baku, 1973. N 3; of the same author. Turkskije leksicheskie elementi v pamiatnikakh russkogo jazika mongolskogo perioda. – Turkizmi v vostochnoslavjanskikh jazikakh. M., 1974; Baskakov A. N. Russkije familii turkskogo proiskhojdenija. M., 1979 and next.
- 20) Grigorijev A.P. O fitalnij jazik Zolotoi Ordi XIII-XV vv. – Turkologicheskij sbornik. 1977., M.
- 21) For example, charter of the Great duke Vasilij Vasiljevitch in 1435 contained such resolution in Uigur language: “bulai un gurduk”, i.e. “we approved in such form”, and testament of his wife grand duchess Sofia in 1453 had analogous superscription: “altmishda janbar aında” – “in the sixtieth year, January”, that corresponds to date of 6960 “since the creation of the world” (see; Obolensky M.A. Vostochnije nadpisi nastarinnykh russkikh gramotakh. – Izvestija Imp. Russkogo arkeologicheskogo obschestva. – Spb., 1861. – Vol. II. – T. I. – pp.22-24). Age old russian way of dating testifies to Moscow origin of these resolutions (see: Usmanov M.A. Jalovannije akti, pp.112-113; of the same author. Zavetnaja mehta Khusaina Faizkhanova. Kazan, 1980.– pp.55-56.)

- 22) For example: "Maskau akchasi budir. Iban." – "These are Moscow money. Ivan." (Savelijev P.S. Moneti djouchidov, djagataidov, djelairidov i drugije, obraschavshiesja v Zolotoi Orde v epokhu Tokhtamisha. Spb., 1857. – p.154).
- 23) Usmanov M.A. Termin "jarlik" i voprosi klassifikatsii ofitsialnikh aktov Khanstv Djouchieva Ulusa. – Aktovoje istochnikovedenije. M., 1979. – pp.227–228.
- 24) Veljaminov–Zernov V.V.Issledovanie o Kasimovskikh tsariakh i tsarevichakh. – P. I. –Spb. 1863. – pp.306–307; Kononov A.N. Istoriya izuchenija..., p.12. The reality of the peculiar Russian–Tatar bilingualism in surrounding of great dukes is confirmed by the fact, that in the XV and XVI cc. there was in Moscow a big stratum of "slujilij" Tatars of Kazan, Kasimov and Astrakhan high born feudal lords including tsarevitches, who gradually turned to christianity. Occasionally some of their representatives happened to reach a high social position; for example, the son of Kazan Khan Ibragim, Khudaikul after adopting christianity in 1505 under the name of Peter and marrying sister of Vasilij III was appointed as successor to the throne of the Grand duke. And another tatar tsarevich Simeon Bekbulatovich in 1575 was proclaimed the "tsar" or "Grand duke of whole Pussia" (for more details see: Zimin A.A.Ivan Groznij i Simeon Bekbulatovitch v 1575 g. – Iz istorii Tatarii. IY. – Kazan, 1970. – pp.146–149). According to some data there were some "Tatar books" in the library of Ivan Groznij (see: Bibliotheca Ivana Groznogo. Rekonstruktsija ibibliografic– heskoje opisanije. – L., 1982. – p.55, 83). Tatar was a commonplace language in the XVI c. in Moscow, this is corroborated by the fact that the whole information of Gerbershtein about the Tatars has been furnished with eastern terms and with great accuracy of their meaning (Gerbershtein Sigismund. Zapiski o Moskovskikh delakh. – Spb., 1908. – pp.137–164.)
- 25) Opisi Tsarskogo arkhiva XVI veka i arkhiva Posolskogo Prikaza 1614 goda. Pod red. S.O.Shmidt. M., 1960. The content of these two archives – Tsar's and Posolsky Prikaz – coincides in some components, because "on the base of some documentary materials" of Tsar archive later "was formed" the archive of the Posolskij Prikaz (Ibid, p.6). But it seems that originals of early eastern gramotas have perished completely.
- 26) Opisi Tsarskogo arkhiva..., jashiki No.12–16, 22–25, 31–39, 48–52, 65, 70, 72, 86, 88, 89, 94, 101, 105, 106, 135, 139, 145, 148, 201, 218 (boxes with gramotas are printed in italics). In three boxes (N. 12, 14, 16) were kept 34 gramotas.
- 27) Ibid. – p.26, 28 (printed in italics by author – M.U.).
- 28) Ibid. – p.32.
- 29) Using of special term "defter", which in the Middle Ages the meaning of a book, register, maybe hints at lists, duplicates of documents of census of population by Mongolian Khans in Russia in 1257 and following years; any way, mentioning of Batu–Khan's name seems for us not to be occasional.
- 30) Ibid. Boxes No.12–16, 52, 88, 89, 101, 135, 201, 218.
- 31) Patterns of "shertnije" (from the arabic word "shart") gramotas see: Materiali dlja istorii Krimskogo Khanstva, izvlechennije po rasporyajeniju Imp. Akademii nauk iz Moskovskogo glavnogo arkhiva ministerstva inostrannikh del. Izd. V.V.Veljaminova– Zernova. Spb., 1864; ИРАДА, f. 123, op.2, gramotas no 36, 39, 41; op.3, no 4, 5.
- 32) Opisi Tsarskogo arkhiva..., p.21, No.31. Salemen – Suleiman I Kanuni (1520–1566); Selim I Groznij (1512–1520).
- 33) Ibid. – p.86, pp.91–94, 96–97.
- 34) Ibid. – p.81, 91.

- 35) Sbornik Russkogo Istoricheskogo obschestva. Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh snoshenij Drevej Rusi s derjavami inostrannimi. – T. 41. – Spb., 1884; T. 95 Spb., 1895 (then – Sb., Rio). In the T. 41 are published documents of 1474–1505, and in the T. 95 – of 1508 – 1521.
- 36) So, in above mentioned volumes Sb. Rio (41, 95) there are Russian translations of more than 220 jarliks–letters (see: Usmanov M.A. Termin “jarlik”..., p.229); dozens of such documents addressing to Polish–Litovian Royals, are published (sbornik knijazja Obolenskogo, T. I., M., 1838. Sbornik Mukhanova. 2–e izd., dop., Spb., 1866; Akti, odnosijaschiesja k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii, sobrannije i izdannije Arkheographic– heskoju Komissieju. – T.I. – Spb., 1846. – and etc.).
- 37) Russian podjachies–interpreters and tolmachs: white Ivancha, White Boris (or Tarkhanov Boris), Belouchin Mikhail, Ilja (or Ileika, Jushkov shurin), Klimka, Martinets, Sergeev Elizar, Kolujanin Onfureika, Maksimov Deniska, Maloi Andrei, Novokshenov Fedor, Serebrijanij Mikhail, newchristened Petrushka (here and then writing of names are not reconstructed. – M.U.); tatar tolmachs and envoys in Russian survice: Asan, Akhmetek, son of Jakshi–Khodji, Baijak, Bakhtijar, son of Temershika, Kambar, Keldish, Konjaj, Kudash, Kutlu–Zaman, Rezep, Tutai, Usein, Khozen, son of Barla–Khodji, Chura, Julush, Jakush and many others (documents and pages see in the indexes: Sb.Rio, T41, 95); names of slujili Tatars from Russian missions are conserved in abovementioned inventories: Burkota Terberdeev, Bulat, Makshi Kobijakov, Suundijak, Baranchei Ishimov, Bakhtijar Baitchurin, Bogildei Rozgildin, Isenchura Baikishev, Baigildei Sobanin took part in embassies to Crimea; Baibir Taishev and Isenchura Baikishev (once more) were sent correspondingly to Bukhara and “Kazaks Ordas” (Tsar archieve's inventories, p.100, 102, pp.104–106, p.132, 135, 136); in documents of Russian–Iranian relations of 1586–1612 conserved the names of tolmachs and interpretes from Tatars: Kuchuk–Bakhshi Ustakasimov, Devletbakhshi Chekaev, Aidar Pavlov, Isen Ali Derishev, Nagaibak and others. (Bushev P.P. Istorija posolstv... , doc. see in index).
- 38) Kononov A.N.Istorija izuchenija turkskikh jazikov. – p.30.
- 39) Sb. Rio, T. 41, p.75, 78, 87, 120, 122, 147, 322 and others.
- 40) “... those jarliks are not written in a book, but all are given... to Ablez Bakhshi together with Tsar jarliks” (Ibid. – p.422).
In other russian sources is mentioned one “oglan of gorodetskij tsar strong Obljaz”, who supposedly tried to influence the development of Russian–Orda conflict in 1480; according to other data, this Obljaz was not the oglan, but murza; V.V. Velijaminov–Zernov thought, that the name Obljaz “may be the abbreviation of the name Abul–Ghazi...” (Velijaminov–Zernov V.V.Issledovanie, Part I. p.133). This name with the same success may be the abbreviation of 'Abdal–'Aziz.
- 41) Samoilovitch A.N.K istorii sredneaziatzko–turetskogo litera– turnogo jazika. –Mir–Ali–Shar. L., 1928, pp.3–5, 20–23; Borovkov A.K. Leksika sredneaziatskogo tefsira XII–XIII vv. M., 1963, p.21; Nadjip E.N. Kipchaksko–oguzskij literaturnij jazik mamlukskogo Egipta XIY v.Avtoreferat doct. dis. M., 1965. – pp.15–20 and others.
- 42) Tumasheva D.G., Usmanov M.A., Khisamova F.M. Ob osobennostijakh razvitija starotatarskoi delovoi pismennosti. – Sovetskaja arkheologija. – Baku, 1977, No.3, pp.52–55.
- 43) Veselovsky N.I. Tatarskoje vlijanie na russkij posolskij tseremonial v Moskovskij period russkoi istorii. Spb., 1911. p.I.
- 44) Belokurov S.A. O Posolskom prikaze. M., 1906. p.9; also see: Bartold V.V.Works, T.9. pp.368–371
- 45) Belokurov S.A. O Posolskom prikaze, p.54.

- 46) Ibid. – pp.131–132, 135 and 138–139 (for example, Kutlumamet Ustakasimov, Kuchukai Sakaev, Suleiman Tonkachev, Petr Tatarinov, Dmitrij Seitov, Takhtaralei Bajnin, Kdralai Sakaev, Rezep Baitsin).
- 47) Ibid. – pp.55–57, 146–152 (for example, Suleiman Murza Ton Kachev and Rezep Baitsin possessed patrimonies in Kasimov, Kdom, Temnikov, Saransk, Svijajsk and other districts).
- 48) In XVIII c. such rich feudal lords–serf–ownerships were rare among the Tatars, see: Usmanov M.A. *Tatarskije istoricheskije istochniki XYII–XYIII vv.* Kazan, 1972 – pp.29–30.
- 49) For more information see: Khanikov Ja. V. *Svedenija o rode Tevkeleva. – Vremennik Imp. Moskovskogo obschestva istorii i drevnostei Rossijskikh.* Otd. 3, Kn. 13. M., 1852, pp.19–21; *Kazakhsko-russkije otnoshenija v XYII–XYIII vv. S. documentov i materialov.* Alma–Ata, 1961, pp. VII–IX, 37 and others.
- 50) For more information see: Tumasheva D.G., Usmanov M.A., Khisamova F.M. *Ob osobennostjakh razvitiya...*, pp.53–54, 60–61; analysis of different conceptions see: Faseev F.S. *Starotatarskaja delovaja pismennost.* Kazan, 1981, pp.16–39.
- 51) Patterns of publications see: *Russko–indijskije otnoshenija v XYII v. Sb. documentov.* M., 1958 pp.207–209, 363–365; *Materiali po istorii Uzbekskoj i Tadjikskoj i Turkmenskoj SSR.* Part I, L., 1932. Originals or lists of Tatar originals: *ИРАДА*, f. 106 (Balkhinskije dela), op.2, d. No.16; f. 109 (relations of Russia with Bukhara), op.2, d. No.3/6; f. 134 (relations of Russia with Khiva), op.2, d. No.45, 46; f. 77 (relations of Russia with Persia), op.2, d. 42, 75. Rough copies of lists and copies of this and other hundreds of documents, composed in the Tatar office: f. 131 (Tatar gramotas), d. No.1–10. About Tatar documents on correspondence with Mongolian and Kalmik leaders see: Chimit–Dordjiev Sh. B. *Neopublikovannije pisma mongolskikh (oirotskikh) Khanov kak istochnik po russko–mongolskim otnoshenijam XVII veka.* – *Trudi Tomskogo gos. universiteta im. V.V. Kuibisheva.* Tomsk, 1961, T. 150, p.96; Usmanov M.A. *Novij document o Stepane Razine (tatarskij pervod neizvestnoi gramoti Alekseja Mikhailovitcha).* – *Voprosi istoriografii i istochnikovedenija.* Sb. IY, Kazan, 1969. –pp.321–328.
- 52) For example, in XVI–XVII cc. more than 55 letters were recieved from “Kizibash” rulers (opisi Tsarskogo archiva..., pp.91–92); in *ИРАДА* only texts of Sefevid gramotas of XVII– XVIII cc. are intact: f. 77, op.2, d. No.24–29, 44, 77–in Farsi and 58, 62, 63, 66, 70, 71, 75, 76 – in Azerbaidjan language (published pattern: *Russko–Indijskije otnoshenija...*, pp.365–368). Letters of Middle Asian rulers: *ИРАДА*, f. 109, op.2, d. No.4, 5 21; f. 134, op.2, d. No.6, 7, 12, 16, 34, 47 and other published patterns: *Materiali po istorii Uzbekskoi, Tadjikskoi i Turkmenskoj SSR*, p.418, 432, 449). Numerous originals of old turkish and old Crimean gramotas are presented in: *ИРАДА*, f. 89 (Relations of Russia with Turkey), op.2, “gramotas”, and f. 123 (Relations of Russia with Crimea), op.2, “gramotas” (published documents: *Materiali dlja istorii Krimskogo Khanstva...*).
- 53) *Russko–indijskije otnoshenija...*, p.369.
- 54) *ИРАДА*, f. 62 (Relations of Russia with China), op.1, Part I, l. 141. With Muhammad–Jusuf Kasimov to India were also sent Tatar and Latin duplicates of Russian gramota: “bude v Indee russkogo pisma perevest nekomu, i im te gramoti dlja podlinnogo vrazumenija otdat” (*Russko–indijskije otnoshenija...*, p.194).
- 55) For more information see: Veselovsky N.I. *Svedenija ob ofitsialnom prepodavanii Vostochnikh jazikov v Rossii.* – *Trudi III Mejdunarodnogo cjezda orientalistov.* Spb., 1879–1880.

- 56) Such a purposeful policy is reflected both in legislative acts and in practical enactments in provinces. For example, in 1880 military governor of Orenburg took the order "to receive Tatar letters, which had been sent... to his highness' name (Polnoje Sobranije Zakonov Rossijskoj imperii. Sobranije pervoje. Spb., T. XXVI, No.19325, p.65), and in 1852" 38 "Tatar clerks were appointed to 38 assistants of canton chievers of Bashkiri-Mescheriak army with discharge of these clerks from all natural duties" (Ibid, T. XXVII, 2-e izd., otd. 1, No.26456, p.479). About practical enactments see: ИРА Kaz. SSR, f. 4, op.1, No.2666. – "Case about permission to kazakh official personae to carry on business correspondence in official personae to carry on business correspondence in Tatar language"; No.1218– "About appointment of Rafikov Z. as mullah-clerk to sultan Djangerov"; No.2262 – "Case about appointment Culba-Khodjin as clerk to ruler of Djugra by Chiklin tribe bij Musin"; No.4640 – "Case about appointment to service to Khan Shirgaziev Idigi of clerk Khabibullin S."; f. 78, op.1, No.25 – "Case about appointment of Kamaletdinov as clerk to Barshev family" etc.
- 57) Such a policy had objectively brought to breaking off the development of Russian-Turkic clerical work in local language and to reinforcement of Tatar language (Tumasheva D.G., Usmanov M.A., Khisamova F.M. Ob osobennostijakh razvitiya...– p.54), this was marked by Khusain Faikhanov on the example of the language of the Buke Orda Kazaks (the middle of XIX c.) (see: Usmanov M.A. Zavetnaja mehta... , p.100).
- 58) About historical causes of specific "mixed characters" of Old Tatar language see: Usmanov M.A. Tatarskije istoricheskiye istochniki... , pp.63-68.
- 59) Earlier, for example, to the end of XVIII c., Russian clerks in the system of Turkic languages distinguished Tatar from Turkish, marking out interpreters from this language (Belokurov S.A. O Posolskom prikaze, pp.131-132). Analysis of a pattern of such documents, composed by Kazan Tatar, see: Korsh F.E. Universali Petra Velikogo k budjatskim i Krimskim Tataram. M., 1893, Otd. ott., pp.7-14.
- 60) Kononov A.N. Istorija izuchenija..., pp.36-37, 129-138. About tendency of changing the contingent of tolarchs and interpreters see initial data of documents: Materiali po istorii Bashkirskoi Assr. T. III. M.–L., 1949; about application of Old Tatar language among Bashkirs see: Baskakov N.A. Altajskaja semja jazikov i ee izuchenije. M., 1981. – p.114.
- 61) ИРА Dagestanskoy SSR., f. 379 (Commandant of Kizlijar). Information about approximate number of documents was kindly given to us by G.M. Orazhev (letter of 03.03.1983). Besides, a great number of documents on XVII – beginning of XVIII c. is in ИРАДА (f. 101, 104, 116, 121, 129 and also 131).
- 62) Orazhev G.M. – P. Lingvisticheskaja Kharakteristika turcojazi- chnikh documentov iz archiva kizljarskogo komendanta. – III konferentsija molodikh uchenikh (Tezisi docladov). – Makhachkala, 1980. – pp.42-43.
- 63) In favour of this also speak data of Chechen-Russian correspondence see: Kusheva E. N., Usmanov M.A. K voprosu ob obshchestvennom stroje vainakhov (Pismo 1675 g. Shibutskogo djamata tsariju Alekseju Mikhailovitchu). – Sovetskaja etnographija. M., 1978, – No.6, – pp.99-104.
- 64) Turko-dagestanskije jazikovije contacti (Sb. statei). Makha- chkala, 1982. pp.14-18, 63-64 and others.
- 65) For example, in mutual relations of Russian State with principalities of Northern Caucasus in XVI c. together with Russian people are also often found "Slujili" Tatars both as interpreters-tolarchs and messengers (Kabardino-Russian relations in XVI-XVIII cc. T. I, XVI-XVII vv. M., 1957, p.4, 7, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 27, 30, 46, 59, 63); in XVII c. among tolarchs

begin to prevail people Russian by origin or of orthodox faith (Ibid. p.98, 162, 220, 228, 265, 279, 281, 334, 337 and others).

66) For example, ЦГА Казахской ССР, ф. 3, оп.1, д. 167, 365, 369, 486, 562; ф. 4, оп.1, No.200, 214, 218, 237, 269, 320, 353, 414, 586, 1200, 1273, 1366, 1707 and others; ф. 78, оп.1, No.1, 9, 14, 20 etc.

67) Ibid., ф. 4, оп.1, No.190, 443, 1965, 4347, 4380; ф. 78, оп.1, No.83, 86, 93, 94, 97, 98 and others.

68) For more information see: Tumasheva D.G., Usmanov M.A., Khisamova F.M. Ob osobennostijakh razvtija..., pp.55-57; Faseev F. S. Starotatarskaja delovaja pismennost, pp.8-11, 67 and others. A complex of such documents gathered as investigating material in one file (ЦГАДА, ф. 6, No.416, Part II), in number of 188 unites is published (in arabian graphic and in translation into Russian) as a separate collection: Vozzvanija i perepiska vojakov Pugachevskogo dvijenija v Povol'je i Priuralija. Kazan, 1988, p.463.

69) Besides, Tatars and Bashkirs such documents were written by Kazakh and Mari rebels.

70) ЦГАДА, ф. 6, No.507, 592, 593 and etc.