

**THE STATE IN EARLY MODERN RUSSIA**  
**NEW DIRECTIONS**

**EDITED BY**

**PAUL BUSHKOVITCH**

**Bloomington, Indiana, 2019**



Each contribution © 2019 by its author. All rights reserved.  
Cover design by Tracey Theriault.

ISBN: 978-089357-471-0

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bushkovitch, Paul, editor.

Title: The state in early modern Russia : new directions / edited by Paul Bushkovitch.

Description: Bloomington, Indiana : Slavica Publishers, [2019] | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017060184 | ISBN 9780893574710

Subjects: LCSH: Russia--Politics and government--1533-1613. |

Russia--Politics and government--1613-1689. | Russia--Politics and government--1689-1801. | Despotism--Russia--History. | Russia--Civilization.

Classification: LCC DK106 .S828 2019 | DDC 947--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017060184>

Slavica Publishers  
Indiana University  
1430 N. Willis Drive  
Bloomington, IN 47404-2146  
USA

[Tel.] 1-812-856-4186  
[Toll-free] 1-877-SLAVICA  
[Fax] 1-812-856-4187  
[Email] [slavica@indiana.edu](mailto:slavica@indiana.edu)  
[www] <http://www.slavica.com/>

## Contents

Paul Bushkovitch

Preface ..... 1

Petr S. Stefanovich

*Poliud'e* and the Evolution of Taxation from Rus' to Russia ..... 7

Russell E. Martin

Familial Order, Dynasty, and Succession in Early Modern  
Russia: Toward a Gendered History of the Muscovite Dynasty ..... 29

Michael S. Flier

Branching Out:  
The Roots of Muscovite Dynastic Representation ..... 59

Charles J. Halperin

The Nature of the Muscovite State During the  
Reign of Ivan IV: The Tyranny of Concepts ..... 77

Nikolai Petrukhintsev

The Duration of Integration as a Factor in Russian  
History and Its Impact on Social and Political  
Development in Sixteenth-Century Russia ..... 97

Paul Bushkovitch

The Tsar and the Sobor: 1613–53 ..... 133

Nadieszda Kizenko

The Sacrament of Confession as Encounter with Early Modernity ..... 163

Olga Kosheleva

Education as a Problem in Seventeenth-Century Russia ..... 191

Eve Levin

The Aptekarskii Prikaz and the Limits of Western Influence ..... 219

P. V. Sedov

The Role of Tradition in the Success of the Reforms of Peter I ..... 249

Ernest A. Zitser

Multitemporality and the Politics of Time in  
the Age of Peter the Great: Rethinking Russia's "Big Bang" ..... 269

Olga Tsapina

The 1721 Church Reform and Constructing the  
Orthodox Tradition of Church-State Relations in Russia ..... 305

Nancy S. Kollmann

Frugal Empire: Sources of Russian State Power ..... 335

## ***Poliud´e* and the Evolution of Taxation from Rus´ to Russia**

**Petr S. Stefanovich**

The only work dedicated specifically to the history of taxes from Old Rus´ to the Russia of the modern era was written more than 150 years ago.<sup>1</sup> Prerevolutionary historians studied the system of taxation in the Moscow state of the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries a great deal but were little interested in its prehistory in medieval Rus´.

In the Soviet Union, this theme was generally neglected. In part, this is probably due to ideological attitudes and public expectations. The idea that taxes are an element of class oppression and that in a communist society they ought not to exist rang out from the highest podiums of the state and was supported with appropriate academic research. In the 1960s, Nikita Khrushchev put forward the abolition of taxes as one of the most important goals of the Soviet state.<sup>2</sup> In 1960, the prorector of the Moscow Financial Institute, D. A. Allakhverdian, published a work with the characteristic title *State with-*

---

<sup>1</sup> D. A. Tolstoi, *Istoriia finansovykh uchrezhdenii Rossii so vremeni osnovaniia gosudarstva do konchiny imperatritsy Ekateriny II* (St. Petersburg, 1848).

<sup>2</sup> Khrushchev, at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1959, said, “At the present time the development of the entire national economy and culture of the Soviet Union is carried out mainly through the accumulation of socialist enterprises. Due to the fulfillment of the seven-year plan, the size of these accumulations will continue to grow and eventually will be the only source providing expanded socialist reproduction and further increase the living standards of the nation. In these conditions, the existence of taxes on the population are not due to their necessity nor from the point of view of their class values, as was the case in the past in terms of income restrictions of capitalist elements, nor in terms of state revenues of the budget of the USSR, especially since the share of taxes from the population is already small and amounts to only 7.8 percent of budget revenues. All of this gives us the opportunity to decline collection of taxes from the population for the next few years.” *Kommunisticheskaia partiia Sovetskogo Soiuz. S´ezd, Vneochednoi XXI s´ezd Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuz: 27 ianvaria—5 fevalia 1959 goda. Stenograficheskii otchet* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1959), 48–49.

out Taxes, where he asserted that in the Soviet Union, “conditions had matured,” “which make taxes from the population unnecessary.”<sup>3</sup>

These ideas and slogans were utopian and today they merely call to mind the famous American saying (apparently dating back to an observation of Benjamin Franklin) that in this world there is nothing certain except death and taxes. The USSR died, but taxes live. Without having been definitively ended in the Soviet Union, in contemporary Russia they have found greater significance in the lives of its citizens. In recent years interest in the history of taxes has increased.<sup>4</sup>

With regard to the Middle Ages, contemporary historians are predominantly interested in the forms of Mongol, later Tatar, rule over the Rus’ lands from the mid-thirteenth to fifteenth centuries and the influence of that rule on the configuration of the Russian tax system. Lawrence Langer’s articles are dedicated to these questions,<sup>5</sup> as are recent publications of historians from Belarus, Hungary, and Russia.<sup>6</sup>

This focus is quite justified because it is necessary to link such important aspects of Muscovite taxation as the universality of the *tiaglo* and the census

<sup>3</sup> D. L. Allakhverdian, *Gosudarstvo bez nalogov* (Moscow: Znanie, 1960), 4.

<sup>4</sup> Two works surveying the history of taxes are those of S. A. Kozlov and Z. V. Dmitrieva, *Nalogi v Rossii do XIX v.*, 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg: Istoricheskaia illiustratsiia, 2001); and V. N. Zakharov, Iu. A. Petrov, and M. K. Shatsillo, *Istoriia nalogov v Rossii: IX–nachalo XX v.* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2006). In the former, the chapter covering the period up to the sixteenth century (Kozlov) is rather superficial in character. In the latter, the two chapters by Zakharov are notable for their detail and rigor.

<sup>5</sup> Lawrence Langer, “Muscovite Taxation and the Problem of Mongol Rule in Rus’” in “Festschrift for Richard Hellie,” pt. 1, *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 34, 1–4 (2007): 101–29.

<sup>6</sup> S. N. Temushev, “Transformatsiia nalogovo dannicheskoi sistemy drevnerusskikh zemel’ posle mongol’skogo nashestviia 1237–1241 gg.,” in *Colloquia Russica*, series 1, vol. 3: *Rus’ during the Epoch of Mongol Invasions (1223–1480): Publication after 3rd International Conference, Warsaw, 15–17th November 2012*, ed. V. Nagirnyy (Cracow: Jagiellonian University, 2013), 52–61; T. Botor, “A peremenit’ Bog’ Ordu...”: Sobiranie ‘vykhoda’ v zerkale dukhovnykh i dogovornykh gramot velikikh moskovskikh kniazei (XIV–XV vv.),” in Nagirnyy, *Rus’ during the Epoch of Mongol Invasions*, 189–97. One work is concerned with questions of taxation from the point of view of the origin of the cadastre descriptions: M. Iu. Zenchenko, “...Khotiat tatarove tamgi i desiatiiny (po povodu spornosti besspornykh mnenii o ‘tatarskom nasledii na Rusi’),” in *Odissei: Chelovek v istorii. 2010/11* (Moscow: Nauka, 2012), 487–502. Finally, an article by A. A. Gorskii speaks of the differences in tax operations of different districts of Rus’, in particular with respect to units and rates of taxation: “Utverzhdienie vlasti Mongol’skoi imperii nad Rus’iu: Regional’nye osobennosti,” in *Mongol’skie zavoevaniia i Rus’, Istoricheskii vestnik* 10 (157) (2014): 58–79. Unfortunately, only the last of these works contains the full scope of the historiography (specifically a consideration of Langer’s articles).

with Mongol rule (“the Tatar yoke”). Russian historians of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have already written about this.<sup>7</sup> The current study leads to this conclusion, although from a somewhat different side. What interests me is not so much the taxes themselves (Mongol or Muscovite) as the evolution of a phenomenon closely connected with power and the tax structure—*poliud'è*. *Poliud'è* was an institution that arose in deep antiquity and existed in Rus' until the beginning of the modern era. In my view, it is significant that in northeastern Rus' *poliud'è* is not found after the mid-thirteenth century, while in the lands that were absorbed into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania it existed until the middle of the sixteenth century. The explanation for this fact, to which this article is chiefly dedicated, leads to the more general question of the reasons for the formation and growth of the Russian state at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries.

*Poliud'è* is largely known as an archaic method of exploiting a subjugated population in tenth-century Kievan Rus'. Constantine Porphyrogenitus has left a description of it:

The severe manner of life of these same Russians in winter time is as follows. When the month of November begins, their chiefs together with all the Russians at once leave Kiev and go off on the “*poliudia*,” which means “rounds,” that is, to the Slavonic regions of the Vervians and Drugovichians and Krivichians and Severians and the rest of the Slavs who are tributaries of the Russians. There they are maintained throughout the winter, but then once more, starting from the month of April, when the ice of the Dnieper river melts, they come back to Kiev. They then pick up their *monoxyla*, as has been said above, and fit them out, and come down to Romania.<sup>8</sup>

Constantine even introduced a Slavic word (in Greek transcription—*τὰ πολύδια*), which Rus' used to reference this phenomenon, a term that for the Greeks seemed strange and foreign.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, A. S. Lappo-Danilevskii's discussion of Russia during the era of Ivan III, which opens with the assertion that “tax-paying obligations arising under the influence of the Tatar Yoke had very important consequences for the political system in general, as well as for the taxation system in particular.” A. S. Lappo-Danilevskii, *Organizatsiia priamogo oblozheniia v Moskovskom gosudarstve so vremen Smuty do epokhi preobrazovaniia* (St. Petersburg: Tip. I. N. Skorokhodova, 1890), 16–17.

<sup>8</sup> Konstantin Bagrianorodnyi, *Ob upravlenii imperiei: Tekst, perevod, kommentarii*, ed. G. G. Litavrina and A. P. Novosel'tseva (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), 50–55; Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, 1, Greek text ed. Gyula Moravcsik, English trans. R. J. H. Jenkins (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Publications, 1967), 63.

Usually the chronicle description of the campaign of the Kievan prince Igor' to the Drevliane in the mid-940s is associated with this evidence.<sup>9</sup> The word *poliud'e* itself is not used here, but some details are identical to those in Constantine's description of the winter visitation of the subjugated population.

Although there are many accounts of *poliud'e*, there are contradictory interpretations of its essence: was it for the sole purpose of obtaining sustenance (as Constantine presents it) or were there other aims, such as court administration, worship, and the collection of tribute. My recent comparative analysis of the chronicle records with those of Constantine as well as accounts by the Arab writers ibn Ruste and Gardizi, evidently based on ibn Khordadbeh's ninth-century geographical tractate, confirms the correctness of those scholars who understand *poliud'e* as a "multifunctional" institution. That said, it appears that *poliud'e* underwent an evolution.<sup>10</sup> The "original" custom of the "Slavini" involved the ruler or head of the "tribe" making the rounds of the populace and collecting tribute in one form or another, depending on the size or, more accurately, on the growth of the family and clan—this was *poliud'e*. This practice must be seen in relation to the archaic idea of the leader or ruler's responsibility for fertility and peace in the community. The leader was obligated to support the well-being of the population which recognized his power and which he "nourished."<sup>11</sup> Karol Modzelewski locates the root of this concept in the ideas of the community's ancestral ties and in the personal responsibility of the head of the community, as the "great relative," for its prosperity.<sup>12</sup> The tribute collected was not too burdensome; the crucial idea was that it was thought of as a voluntary gift. At this stage, the visitation probably had a ritual character.

<sup>9</sup> See two somewhat differing chronicle versions: *Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis' starshego i mladshhego izvodov*, ed. A. N. Nasonov (Moscow-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk, 1950), 109–12; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei (PSRL)*, 1: *Lavrent'evskaia letopis'*, ed. E. F. Karskii, 2nd ed. (Leningrad, 1926), 54–57.

<sup>10</sup> See P. S. Stefanovich, "Ob evoliutsii drevnerusskogo poliud'ia," in *Rus', Rossiia, Srednevekov'e i Novoe vremia*, vyp. 3, *Tret'i chteniiia pamiati akademika RAN L. V. Milova* (Moscow: Orgkomitet Chtenii pamiati akademika RAN L. V. Milova, 2013), 50–56; Stefanovich, "Drevlianskaia dan' kievskim kniaziam," in *Po liubvi, v' pravdu, bezo vsegoi khitrosti': Druz'ia i kollegi k-80 letiiu Vladimira Andreevicha Kuchkina. Sbornik statei*, ed. B. N. Floria (Moscow: Indrik, 2014), 19–74.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. D. Třeštík, "Počátky přemyslovské státnosti mezi křesťanstvím a pohanstvím," in *Stát, státnost a rituály přemyslovského věku: Problémy, názory, otázky. Sborník příspěvků z konference konané dne 18. října 2005 v Brně*, ed. Martin Wihoda and Demeter Malat'ák (Brno: Maticе moravská pro Výzkumné středisko pro dějiny střední Evropy, 2006), 25–46.

<sup>12</sup> K. Modzelewski, *Barbarzyńska Europa* (Warsaw: Iskry, 2004), 401–25.



In the tenth century, the meaning of the visitation moved in a pragmatic and economic direction. The Rus', who subjugated the Slavic and other peoples of Eastern Europe, used these visits not only to feed themselves, but also to collect tribute. The form and size of this tribute are repeatedly and unambiguously indicated in the chronicle. Apparently, the collection of tribute was timed to coincide with the already existing practice of the visitation with refreshments and the collection of gifts. Although the dues became coercive, some "trappings" of voluntariness remained.

The references to poliud'é in the sources of the twelfth–thirteenth centuries testify to the original connection of poliud'é with the voluntary relations of reciprocity between the leader and the population, above all the evidence found in the 1130 *zhalovannaia gramota* (charter of grant) of Princes Mstislav and Vsevolod to the Novgorod Iur'ev Monastery in the *volost'* (rural district) of Buitsy.<sup>13</sup> In the document, it is said that, in addition to the "tributes" of *vira* and sale of this *volost'* and other grants, the monastery also received "the autumnal poliud'é of *pol'treitiadesiate hryvnia*" (that is, 25 hryvnia). Here, the poliud'é is called "*darovnym*," that is, it is spoken of as a gift, a voluntary offering.

At the same time, the letter speaks of poliud'é not as a visit, but as a defined tax. The prince may transfer the tax to different persons or institutions, in this case, to the monastery. This is, of course, a new phenomenon, but it arises from ancient roots. Poliud'é here is a fixed payment to the prince (in practice farming) in place of the expenses the local population would have to bear during a princely visit.

In this form poliud'é figures in the 1136 *ustavnaia gramota* (foundation charter) of Prince Rostislav to the bishopric of Smolensk.<sup>14</sup> The Smolensk prince transferred a portion (a tithe) to the bishop from his earnings in the form of *istyé kuny*, that is in monetary (or quasi-monetary) form—specifically in tribute from *pogosts*<sup>15</sup> and *volosts*. In this it is specifically stipulated that revenue from poliud'é (and also from court-imposed fines—*prodazha* and *vira*) should not be taken into consideration. But in two places—Kopys' and Luchina, towns on the Dnieper, which had commercial and military functions—the tribute was not collected (probably due to specific aspects of these settlements), and here the prince in his revenues, from which the bishop's tithe was chosen, took into account the poliud'é. Poliud'é was collected in the form of dues of a defined

<sup>13</sup> *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*, comp. V. G. Geiman et al., ed. S. N. Valka (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1949), no. 81, 140–41.

<sup>14</sup> *Drevnerusskie kniazheskie ustavy XI–XV vv.*, comp. Ia. N. Shchapov (Moscow: Nauka, 1976), 141–43.

<sup>15</sup> *Pogost'*—a rural district as a tax unit.

sum—four hryvnia from Kopyś' and a few hryvnia (the exact number is lost because of a defect in the manuscript) from Luchina.

In the pre-Mongol period, poliud'ė was preserved in its more ancient form as a visitation, combining "feeding" (*kormlenie*) with different administrative and fiscal affairs. This is mentioned in some chronicle accounts concerning the Rostov-Suzdal' lands dating from the mid-twelfth century to the beginning of the thirteenth century.<sup>16</sup> These accounts are brief and of the same type: they say that the prince from time to time is not in the capital but "on poliud'ė" in one or another town of his dominion. In the context of these reports it obviously means that poliud'ė did not mean a tax but a princely trip (apparently, relatively long and large-scale) around the territory under his rule with all sorts of intentions. Thus, when Iurii Dolgorukii was on poliud'ė in 1154, he founded the city of Dmitrov.<sup>17</sup>

It seems that it is in this same ancient, broad meaning that poliud'ė is mentioned in a birchbark letter from the late twelfth century (preserved in fragments). The author was located somewhere on the Pasha River in Obonezh'ė and reported that to Novgorod "[tri ra]zy ti esm['] khodil v" poliudie semo" (I have gone here three times on poliud'ė).<sup>18</sup> The lands of Obonezh'ė (along with several others) were allocated to the Novgorod republic as a "gift" to the princes for their "upkeep" (*soderzhanie*) until they occupied the Novgorod throne. Obviously, the author of this letter either went on poliud'ė with the same prince or with people who were commissioned by him.

Thus, in the pre-Mongol period the poliud'ė was still preserved in the form of a prince's visit to his territory, but in a series of customs it received a narrower (specialized) meaning as a specific tax. This tax, in the form of defined sums from particular territories (*obshchiny*), would either go to the princes themselves or would be transferred to people and institutions of the princes' choosing as a special award.

Private deeds and descriptions of land from the fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries originating in the various Rus' oblasts that became part of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania present an impressive body of evidence concerning poliud'ė. In all of these documents, poliud'ė appears only as a tax, although in some cases there is a visible "genetic" link with the ancient princely visitations. A. I. Grusha recently collected some of

<sup>16</sup> For an analysis of this information, see P. S. Stefanovich, "Poliud'ė po letopisnym dannym 1154–1200 ss.," *Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki*, no. 4 (2015): 97–103.

<sup>17</sup> *PSRL*, 42: *Novgorodskaia Karamzinskaia letopis'*, ed. Ia. S. Lur'ė (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2002), 104.

<sup>18</sup> "Berestianaia gramota," in A. A. Zalizniak, *Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt* (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2004), no. 226, 409.

these references relating to the Belorussian lands.<sup>19</sup> The older and more interesting ones relate to the Ukrainian lands; these were the subject of investigations by M. V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii and M. S. Hrushevs'kyi, but a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of this material is still to come.<sup>20</sup>

The earliest reference in this body of evidence to poliud'é is contained in a 1411 charter of Vitovt to the bishop of Wilno for several villages. Following Polish models, the letter is in Latin. Among the dues owed the bishop from a village located in Svisolochka volost' (western Belarus), "modo stacionis poludze apellato" is mentioned. Poliud'é (communicated in the Latin original as a Slavic word) is here identified with the word *stan*, *stacio*—"tribute" in medieval Poland. *Stacio* originally meant the obligation of the population to provide for the life and livelihood of the ruler and/or his agents during their trips around the territory of the state, but by the late Middle Ages it had already come to denote a tax with a fixed sum that was paid to the ruler or lord.

In the inventories of the Principality of Kiev concerning Zhitomir and the surrounding area of the Ratenskoe starostvo<sup>21</sup> (Kholm skaia zemlia), 1500–70, and of the Pinskoe starostvo (Pinsk okrug<sup>22</sup>), 1561–66, poliud'é is one of the taxes paid by the rural Pinsk population, which, usually, was second in importance after tribute.<sup>23</sup> The tax was collected in the form of honey, marten furs, or money. Its rate (relatively small) was more or less fixed and pegged to the old economic and tax-paying units of *zemlia* (land) in the Kiev region and *dvorishche* (land holding in Lithuania) in the Kholm and Pinsk lands. In contrast to taxation tribute, when the amount of poliud'é was set, there was no attempt to take into account the real composition of these units.<sup>24</sup> This de-

<sup>19</sup> A.[I.] Grusha, "Paliuddze na Belarusi," in *Minulaia i suchasnaia gistoryia Magileva: Zbornik navukovykh prats udzel'nikau Drugoi Mizhnarodnai navukovoi kanferentsyi "Gistoryia Magileva. Minulae i suchasnats' "*, ed. I. A. Pushkin (Mogilev: n.p., 2001), 26–30.

<sup>20</sup> M. V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii, *Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo pri Iagellonakh* (Kiev, 1901), 89–102; M. S. Hrushevs'kii, *Istoriia Ukraini-Rusi* (Lviv, 1905), 120–32.

<sup>21</sup> *Starostvo*—governorship of a *povet* (Lithuanian rural district).

<sup>22</sup> *Okrug*—rural district.

<sup>23</sup> See "Liustratsiia Kievskoi zemli ok. 1471 g.," pt. 7, vol. 2 of *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Ros-sii* (Kiev, 1890), 109; "Opisi Ratens'kogo starostva z 1500–1512 r.," ed. M. Hrushevs'kii, *Zapiski Naukovogo tovarstva imeni Shevchenka* 26 (1898): 1–40; *Pistsovaia kniga byvshego Pinskogo starostva, sostavlennaia po povelenniu korolia Sigizmunda Avgusta v 1561–1566 godakh pinskim i korinskim starostoiu Lavrinom Voinoiu (s perevodom na russkii iazyk)*, pt. 1–2 (Vil'na, 1874).

<sup>24</sup> For example, in the Pinsk starostvo, the sum for poliud'é was everywhere one and the same, with the dvorishche 7 groszy 4 peniaze, no matter the size of the territory or

velopment, as well as the tax rate, makes one think that the tax traces back to antiquity (that is, administered when the *zemlia* and *dvorishche* were standard tax units, which were comparable in economic strength) and natural resources were exchanged for money (i.e., they were commuted).<sup>25</sup>

Royal scribes who described the Ratenskoe starostvo in the 1560s compared the *poliud'e* to tribute and to *stacio*, to *pochta* (accolade) or to *poklon* (bow), which went to the representatives of the local administration. The choice as to what "poliud'e" was called was due perhaps, to the form in which the collection was taken. For some kinds of *dvorishche* it was in the form of honey, in which case it could be presented as a honey tribute, but when it was in the form of money, it was *stacio* or *poklon*. The scribes understood neither the essence, nor the origin of the collection, and perhaps neither did the tributaries themselves. Thus, one of the scribes gave an amusing "etymological" explanation of *poliud'e*: "The honey tribute is made up of three parts: one is called *jedenzova*, or autumnal [*jesennyi*], the other is called *poliud'e*, because from the multiplication of people so too is the tribute multiplied, and the third part is called *bobrovnichii*" (myodowa dań troyakiem sposobem skladayą: jedenzową danni, albo yeszienni; drugi zową polyudziem, bo za przimnozeniem lyudzi mnozi się y dań; trzeci zową bobrowniczi).<sup>26</sup>

A few of these private grants are analogous to those in the *zhalovannaia gramota* of Mstislav and Vsevolod to the Iur'ev Monastery in 1130. In 1427, a certain Prince Dolgodat allocated land to the Kievan Nikolskii Monastery, from which different tributes came, including *poliud'e*.<sup>27</sup> In 1447, one well-off person founded a church in Radashkovichy (not far from Minsk, later a starostvo in the Minsk *povet*) giving the monastery land with peasants, who paid *poliud'e* consisting of a few barrels of honey.<sup>28</sup> In 1491, Princess Kobrinskaia

---

the number of inhabitants in the *dvorishche*, moreover the *dvorishche* might consist of one to six *uvolki* (*uvolok* = *voloka*, about 21 hectares of land in Lithuania).

<sup>25</sup> Hrushevs'kii, *Istoriia Ukraini-Rusi*, 127.

<sup>26</sup> *Arkhiv Iugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, 2, chap. 7 (Kiev, 1890), 282.

<sup>27</sup> V. Rozov, *Ukrains'ki hramoti*, 1: XIV v. i persha polovina XV. v Kyiv (Kyiv: n.p., 1928), no. 58, 108. However, it is possible to doubt with regard to the origin and dating of this award. The fact remains that the record of the reward was placed in the manuscript described in the nineteenth century, but was then lost. In the twentieth century, it was suggested that the manuscript was created only in the nineteenth century and in that case the record can be considered a later forgery. A. P. Vizir', "Sobranie knig XV stoletia v otdele rukopisei TsNB AN USSR," in *Problemy rukopisnoi i pechatnoi knigi*, ed. A. A. Sidorov (Moscow: Nauka, 1976), 69.

<sup>28</sup> *Kodeks dyplomatychny katedry i diecezji Wileńskiey*, T. 1, zeszyt 1 (1387–1468), ed. J. Fijałek and W. Semkowicz (Cracow, 1932), no. 187, 211–12. I thank A. I. Grusha for pointing out this evidence.

presented a village to the Spasskii Monastery in Kobrin (Volhynia) with all its revenues (*dachki*), including poliud'é.<sup>29</sup> In 1499, a certain nobleman, Ivashko Pashkevich received from the grand prince seven *doorishche* with peasants and all the taxes in the Lutsk povet, including "with that tax which they give to the castle of our Lutsk starosta every year of sixty grosh" (i s' toiu posh-linoiu, shto na zamok" nash" Luchosk" staroste na poliude na god" daiut' po kope groshei).<sup>30</sup>

In a series of documents, poliud'é appears among the viceroy's revenue (*korm*) from the people of the volost'.<sup>31</sup> This is understandable because poliud'é was originally entrusted to the ruler (prince), who visited the territory, but the princes who no longer made these visits transferred the collection to those who traveled in their place, their viceroys. The poliud'é was collected in this form in the volosts of the grand prince: the aforementioned Svislochkaia volost', the Mogilevskaia (both of the oblasts of the former Polotsk principality, contemporary Belarus), Checherskaia (the Old Rus' Chernigovskii principality, contemporary Belarus), Propoiskaia (the Old Rus' Smolensk principality, contemporary Belarus), and Bchitskaia (Mozyrskii povet; Old Rus' Kievan land, contemporary Belarus). We know about these collections, generally from the documents, which arose from the various conflicts between the rulers (viceroys) and the population. In these disputes, the population usually stuck to the old ways, including the traditional poliud'é, which was fixed to be relatively small in size, but the rulers attempted to increase and expedite the exaction, adding various innovations (*noviny*). Although here and there the people of the volost' were able to defend their interests, the results of the struggle were predetermined. Since the beginning of the land survey (*volochmaia pomera*) in the 1560s, poliud'é disappeared from the sources.

On the whole the geography of references to poliud'é in the Old Rus' areas which, after the Mongol invasion, were outside the system of the Grand Principality of Vladimir is the following. They fell within the southern part of Polotsk, the upper reaches of the Dnieper in the Polotsk-Chernigov-Smolensk borderland, the right bank of the Polesie, Volhynia, and the Kiev region. It turns out that this geographic area is quite wide and given the element of accident in the preservation of the documentation, we have every reason to think that poliud'é in Old Rus' was widespread and also widely known, if not in all the lands of the principality, then in the majority.

<sup>29</sup> *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii* (St. Petersburg) 2, 32 (1863): 23–24.

<sup>30</sup> *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka* (hereafter *RIB*), vol. 17 (St. Petersburg, 1910), stl. 781.

<sup>31</sup> See A. S. Grushevskii, *Gospodarskie ustavy o dokhodakh namestnikov-derzhavtsev* (Petrograd, 1916), 18–21.

There is one circumstance that demands special attention. The fact is that *poliud'e* is recorded in documents beginning in the sixteenth century in two neighboring volosts on the river Sozh (a left tributary of the Dnieper)—Chechersk and Propoisk. Upstream, closer to Smolensk, is the town of Krichev, of the “native” Smolensk lands (today in the Mogilev oblast of Belarus). In one of the documents, *poliud'e* is connected with the disputes of the population of Krichev volost' with the grand prince's viceroys, but in a context quite different in comparison to the references in documents from Chechersk and Propoisk. In 1522, King Sigismund I, in answer to the complaint of the residents of Krichev volost', banned viceroy Vasilii Semenovich Zhilinskii from making “great and new wrongs.” Among the claims of the residents, are those which are paraphrased in the document thus: “you are traveling on *poliud'e* to them in a great sweat, but before then, our first viceroys did not go to them on *poliud'e*” (*na poliude dei do nikh" u velikom" pote ezdish', a pered" tym" dei pervye derzhavtsy nashi do nikh" na poliude ne ezdzhivali*).<sup>32</sup> In such a manner in 1522 the viceroy attempted to “travel” in *poliud'e* in the Krichev volost'—obviously, just as the viceroys did in neighboring oblasts—but, it turns out, that in this oblast the population no longer knew about such a custom.

In the Smolensk land, as it follows from the 1136 charter of Prince Rostislav (see above), in the pre-Mongol period *poliud'e* was well known. In the beginning of the sixteenth century it persisted in the volosts in the former Smolensk-Chernigorsk borderland (Chechersk and Propoisk). Why, nevertheless, in that time in the Krichev volost' had the viceroys long ago “not traveled on *poliud'e*”? What reason for this peculiarity of Krichev? This question is clarified if we turn to the lands of northeastern and northwestern Rus'.

As has been pointed out above, judging by the pre-Mongol chronicles, the Vladimir-Suzdal' princes knew well what *poliud'e* was. Meanwhile, from the middle of the thirteenth century, neither chronicles, nor acts, nor land surveys, nor any other sources from the Rus' lands dependent on the Mongols (afterwards the Horde), make any mention of the *poliud'e*.

In his own time, V. D. Nazarov turned his attention to references to taxes under the names *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* in the charters of grant of the Rostov and Perm' bishops from the end of the fifteenth to the sixteenth centuries and saw in these taxes the echo of the ancient *poliud'e*—that is, the same relic of the pre-Mongol period as in the lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.<sup>33</sup> The historian, however, in sharing this observation in a conference

<sup>32</sup> *Akty Litovsko-Russkogo gosudarstva, izdannye M. Dvornar-Zapol'skim*, vyp. 1 (1390–1529 g.) (Moscow, 1899), no. 162, 184–85.

<sup>33</sup> V. D. Nazarov, “*Poliud'e* i sistema kormlenii: Pervyi opyt klassifikatsii netraditsionnykh aktovykh istochnikov,” in *Obshchee i osobennoe v razvitiu feodalizma v Rossii i Moldavii: Problemy feodal'noi gosudarstvennoi sobstvennosti i gosudarstvennoi ekspluatatsii*

presentation, did not analyze the whole body of these references in detail. Below is such an analysis, which should show how valid the conclusions are concerning their connections with the Old Russian poliud'è.

This concerns a relatively small set of documents—a collection of episcopal charters of grant in the collection of the well-known historian and archeographer P. M. Stroev that were transferred to the archive of the Imperial Archeographic Commission and published in 1915. The collection includes (a) nineteen charters of the Rostov archbishops from 1455 to 1579, seventeen of which were given to the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery for the church in its estates, one charter from 1489 given to the Ferapontov Monastery for the church in its village, and one letter from 1576 to the peasant volost' in relation to the local church,<sup>34</sup> and b) two charters of the bishops of Perm' and Vologda for the church in the estates of the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery in Vologda region (*oblast'*).<sup>35</sup>

In granting the charters the archbishops released the churchmen of various churches from tribute, which by a general rule the clergy of their eparchies were required to pay to them, and established for the clergy either a direct episcopal court or a court of the hegumen of that monastery in the estate of which the church was located. The meaning of the charters was not only a release from the payment, but also from the visit of the archbishop's bureaucrats, whom the local clergy were required to support during their visits to their dependent territory. In the list of taxes from which the clergy of the corresponding churches were exempt the *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* appeared. However, the references to these two taxes were not regular.

In five of the oldest charters (1455–68), the text speaks of the release in simple terms without a detailed enumeration of the taxes, and *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* are not mentioned. Such references are found in three charters of the Rostov archbishop Tikhon (in office 1489–1503): in a 1489 charter *liudskoe*, in a 1493 letter *pshenitsa* but without the epithet *poliudnaia* and in a charter from 1500 only *liudskoe*.<sup>36</sup> Two letters of Archbishop Ioann from 1520 and 1526 again simply speak of tribute without the enumeration of concrete taxes. Sub-

---

(*rannii i razvoitoi feodalizm*). *Chteniia, posviashchennnye pamiati akademika L. V. Cherepnina. Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii* (Moscow: Institut istorii SSSR ANSSSR, 1988), 169.

<sup>34</sup> *Arkhiv P. M. Stroeva*, 1, ed. S. F. Platonov and M. G. Kurdiunov, Russkaia istoricheskaiia biblioteka 32 (Petrograd: Imp. Arkheograficheskaiia kommissiia, 1915), no. 25, stl. 22–23; no. 29–31, stl. 26–28; no. 34, stl. 31–32; no. 57, stl. 78; no. 64, stl. 89–90; no. 69, stl. 98; no. 98, stl. 163–64; no. 110, stl. 179–80; no. 127, stl. 217–18; no. 138, stl. 246–48; no. 148, stl. 261; no. 262–66, stl. 528–37; no. 286, stl. 564–66.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 167, stl. 289–90; no. 256, stl. 519–21.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 57, stl. 78; no. 64, stl. 90; no. 69, stl. 98.

sequently, in three charters of archbishops Kirill and Dosifei (1533–42) *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* are mentioned together.<sup>37</sup> In three of the five charters of Archbishop Iona from 1576 *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* are again mentioned together.<sup>38</sup> One only mentions *liudskoe*<sup>39</sup> and the other just *poliudnaia pshenitsa*.<sup>40</sup> Finally in a 1579 letter of Archbishop David there is only *poliudnaia pshenitsa*.<sup>41</sup> In two letters of the Perm'-Vologda bishops they mention only *liudskoe*. In total there are eleven references to *liudskoe* and nine to *poliudnaia pshenitsa* (with the exception of the first charter in the chronology where there is one reference without the epithet *poliudnaia*); in six charters these taxes are listed together in the same row.

What conclusions can one draw from this information?

First and foremost, the enumeration of *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* together in the same letter indicates that these are two different collections. *Liudskoe* is always listed in a series of monetary collections. For example, in the earliest charter from 1489

whoever will be at that church, the igumen, priest, or deacon, they will not need to give to them my *petrovskaia* and *rozhesvenaia* tribute, neither tithe, nor *danskie poshliny*, nor *desiatinnichi poshliny*, nor *dovodshchychi*, nor *zaezd'chichi*, nor *zazyvshchychi*, nor *blagoslovennaia kunitsa*, nor *iavlennaia kunitsa* with the *gramota*, nor *polot'*, nor any other taxes, nothing along these lines, nor treasury *altyns* nor *pischee* nor *liudskoe*...

и у тое церкви кто будутъ игумень, и попь, и дияконъ, ненадобъ имъ моя дань петровская и рожественая, ни десятина, ни данские пошлыны, ни десятинничы пошлыны, ни доводщычи, ни заѣздъчичи, ни зазывщычи, ни благословенная куница, ни явленная куница з грамотою, ни полоть, ни иные никоторые пошлыны, ничто по ряду, ни казенныхъ алтыновъ не даютъ, ни писчето, ни людскаго...

*Liudskoe* here appears together with “treasury *altyns*” and “*pischee*.”

*Pshenitsa* is an obligation in kind. This is evident, for example, in its first reference in a charter from 1493: The bishop indicated to his officials that they

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., no. 127, stl. 218; no. 138, stl. 247; no. 148, stl. 261.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., no. 262, stl. 528; no. 264, stl. 532; no. 265, stl. 534.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., no. 263, stl. 530.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., no. 266, stl. 537.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., no. 286, stl. 565.



should not take from the clergy “meat or grain for my tribute according to my charter, nor altyns” (u moe dani polot' i pshenits ne imali po sei moei gramote, ni altynov). Meat (*polot'*) and bread (*pshenitsa*) are in one category and money (*altynny*) is separate.

It turns out that *liudskoe* is actually a tribute to the bishop and his officials and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* was to feed his agents who were traveling in the localities.

In addition, there is a striking volatility in the form of the charters of grant. References to *liudskoe* and *pshenitsa* are not in all the charters of grant and the references are not all the same. The absence of these two taxes in the oldest charters may be explained by the fact that either they are to be understood in general wording or that they simply did not exist or existed in a different form or under different terminology. The fact that *liudskoe* is mentioned in an older charter (1493) without epithets and that the definition of *poliudnaia* appeared later (1533) favors the idea that we are dealing not with a practice which was developed sometime in antiquity and was reflected in the established terminology, but rather with something just emerging.

*Liudskoe* is mentioned both earlier and more often. That having been said, it only appears in the charters of the Vologda bishops, and in one charter given to a peasant *volost'* church.<sup>42</sup> The Rostov archbishops wrote about the (*poliudnaia*) *pshenitsa* in one charter given to the Ferapontov Monastery and in a few charters given to the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery, but in all charters the churches receiving benefits are located in the estate that is in the Belozero district (*uezd*) (properly, the Belozero *desiatina* of the Rostov Eparchy). Obviously, this refers to some local peculiarities about Belozero; *liudskoe* was collected more or less everywhere, but *poliudnaia pshenitsa* was only collected here.

It is true that in three charters only *pshenitsa* is mentioned and not *liudskoe*, but this omission can be explained as accidental. This follows from the fact that the churches in the same estate of the Belozerskii Monastery—the Romanov and Rukin *slobody*—are mentioned in the charter of the Rostov archbishop, where it says only *pshenitsa* (1493) and then in the charter where both taxes, *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa*, are mentioned (1576).<sup>43</sup> Clearly, the churches in both *slobody* were from the outset released from all episcopal taxes, but in one letter, in the enumeration of all possible tributes, they simply forgot to mention *liudskoe*.

It is possible, not coincidentally, that in two charters where the *poliudnaia pshenitsa* is mentioned but the *liudskoe* is not (1576 and 1579), a certain col-

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., no. 266, stl. 537.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., no. 64, stl. 90; no. 265, stl. 534.

lection called the “autumn visit” is mentioned but not in other charters. Perhaps it was the same tax, known by two different names *liudskoe* and “autumn visit” (*osenii ob’ezd*).

In any case, neither the terms used in the charters nor the selection of terms can be regarded as a frozen form that dates back to ancient times and was repeated in the charters regardless of the actual circumstances. From a formal point of view there are no reasons to doubt that the bishops in their own charters meant specific collections and that in the enumeration of privileges they used the current terminology.

V. D. Nazarov expressed such doubt, assuming that, in Belozero, “they in fact did not sow wheat” and concluded that the term *poliudnaia pshenitsa*, “was borrowed from acts relating to other regions.”<sup>44</sup> It is not possible to agree with this statement. On the one hand, as we have seen, there is no reason to believe that certain “acts” from certain “other regions” influenced the form of the charters of the Rostov and Perm’-Vologda bishops. On the other hand, as various documents show, including those in the archive of the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery, wheat was cultivated in the Belozero region in the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries.<sup>45</sup> Archeologists affirm that there are grains of wheat present in the washings of the cultural layer in the Belozero settlements beginning in the tenth–eleventh centuries. Wheat culture was the third most disseminated following barley and rye.<sup>46</sup> It is possible that wheat was brought here, but the frequency of findings and the presence of wheat grains in different sites favors the notion that wheat grew there *in situ*.<sup>47,48</sup>

Thus, at issue is the general conclusion that the references to *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* in the episcopal charters “led directly to Poliud’e.”<sup>49</sup> This

<sup>44</sup> Nazarov, “Poliud’e i sistema kormlenii,” 169.

<sup>45</sup> Thus, in the 1460s–90s, “feed” (*korm*) came to the monastery from the Beloozersk and Uglich princes, including in the form of wheat. Institut istorii, *Akty sotsial’no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Severo-vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV–nachala XVI v.* 2 (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958), no. 186, 118; no. 283, 190.

<sup>46</sup> N. A. Makarov, S. D. Zakharov, and A. P. Buzhilova, *Srednevekovoe rasselenie na Belom ozere* (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul’tury, 2001), 118–19.

<sup>47</sup> Such an opinion was allegedly expressed in the work: A. Al’sleben, “Arkheobotanicheskie materialy: Zernovye produkty v pitanii srednevekovogo naseleniia,” in *Arkheologiiia severnorusskoi derevni X–XIII vekov: Srednevekovye poseleniia i mogil’niki na Kubenskom ozere*, 3: *Paleoekologicheskie usloviia, obshchestva i kul’tura*, ed. N. A. Makarov (Moscow: Nauka, 2009), 13.

<sup>48</sup> I am grateful to N. A. Makarov, who took part in a long-term excavation in Belozero, for the consultation.

<sup>49</sup> Nazarov, “Poliud’e i sistema kormlenii,” 169.

conclusion is difficult to accept, given that these two designations refer to different taxes—one monetary, the other in kind. In all known cases, poliud'É always appears as a tribute, and in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania it was paid with either money or honey, but not with grain (bread). Finally, it is not clear how in the system of revenue from the clergy to the bishops in the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries there could be any elements of the ancient system of princely taxes. These systems evolved in parallel and unevenly, each in its own ways. In the charter of Rostislav to the Smolensk cathedral clergy of 1136, poliud'É was mentioned, but it was not itself payable to the bishop, only a tenth from all the revenues owed to the prince, including poliud'É.

In my view it is necessary to explain the appearance of liudskoe and poliudnaia pshenitsa in the episcopal charters of the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries as a result of the evolution of the system of episcopal taxation itself, and princely poliud'É has nothing to do with it here. The fact is that around the turn of the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries an important milestone is recorded: tribute for bishops began to be collected from the clergy of the eparchy not at a fixed rate (as it was earlier), but by taking into account the revenues which the clergy received at a given church.<sup>50</sup>

The revenues of the parish churches depended generally and mainly on the number of parishioners, that is the *people* “coming” to a given church—the greater the number of parishioners, the larger the income of the clergy. This idea is stated explicitly in Metropolitan Daniil's decree on the description of parishes, issued between 1522 and 1533, specifying how many parishioners there were at each church.<sup>51</sup> There is no evidence for the description of parishes deriving from other eparchies earlier than the beginning of the seventeenth century. However, judging from indirect evidence, the principle of levying tribute for the church based on the number of parishioners was rooted in all the eparchies much earlier. Just as the terms liudskoe and poliudnaia pshenitsa speak of this—they point to the fact that the fees collected for the bishop took into account the number of *people* at a given church. In practice, this means that these people, the parishioners, collected the fees themselves. It was applied as a proper tribute to the bishop (*liudskoe*), and the upkeep of the episcopal officials (*poliudnaia pshenitsa*).

It is significant that similar terms are found in the charters of different bishops. For example, in one of the oldest surviving charters of the Novgorod rulers in 1543, the right of the ruler's *desiatil' niki* to be put up by the clergy of

<sup>50</sup> See particularly P. S. Stefanovich, *Prikhod i prikходskoe dukhovenstvo v Rossii v XVI–XVII vekakh* (Moscow: Indrik, 2002), 116–20.

<sup>51</sup> *Akty istoricheskie, sobrannnye i izdannnye Arkheograficheskoiu kommissieiu* (St. Petersburg, 1841), no. 129, 1: 191.

the parish church is referred to as “having feeding for people” (*korm liudt-skoj imati*).<sup>52</sup> This means that the *desiatil'niki* and their assistants stayed at the homes of the priests and other clergy of the church, but supplying the episcopal officials with all they needed (*korm*) did not fall to the clergy alone (obviously it would be too much for them), but to all the people-parishioners.

Etymologically, terms and expressions of this kind do not go back to the word *poliud'e* but rather to the word from which it was itself derived—*liudi*. The latter is very often used in the practice of assessing and collecting taxes in northeast Rus' in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It suffices to mention, for example, the stable expression “tribute/taxes/to have feeding/levy duties on the people” in the princely agreements and testaments.<sup>53</sup> Thus, there is no basis for deriving the terms *liudskoe* and *poliudnaia pshenitsa* from gray antiquity aside from their chance occurrence with the word *poliud'e* from the pre-Mongol period. These terms are related to the system of collecting episcopal tribute based on the number of parishioners, which developed relatively late, in the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries.

Finally, it would be proper to mention that in the acts of that period there is an example when the word *poliudnyi* is used generally without regard to any tax or collection and its meaning directly corresponds to the morphology of the word *po-liudnyi* as in “distributed/having been distributed among the people.” Among the acts of the Pskov-Pechera Monastery there is a fragment preserved of the so-called *obodnaia* charter of 1490/1491 (6999) for that land, which was given by the “Lord Pskov.” These lands were sold to a certain *slobozhanin* “v oderen'” that is, as private property. In the charter it was stipulated that the wood boards (the stumps and blocks [*kolody*] with bees), which happened to be on the land that was sold, would remain accessible to those who previously owned them, “and what is in both these beehives, ecclesiastic and *poliudnaia*, those beekeepers are to know their own hives from tradition and from their charters” (a chto v tom obode bort' tserkovnaia i poliudnaia, i tem bortnikom" znati svoia bort' po starine, po svoim gramotam").<sup>54</sup> Production from part of

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., no. 142, 1: 208.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, in the agreement of Vasilii II and the Suzdal' prince Ivan Vasil'evich (1448–49): “[W]e will take from you for the tsar's vykhod according to the description of the people” (*imati mi u tobe vo tsarev' vykhod po opisi po liudem*), or in the testament of Vasilii II 1461–62: “and according to that document they levy taxes *po sokham* and distributed among the people” (*da po tomu pis'mu i oblozhat po sokham i po liudem*). L. V. Cherepnin and S. V. Bakhrushin, eds., *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV–XVI vv.* (Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka, 1950), 157, 197.

<sup>54</sup> L. M. Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty XIV–XV vekov*, ed. A. M. Sakharova (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1966), 72.

the beehive was for some church institutions (*bort' tserkovnaia*) and part was owned by various people; these were called poliudnyi beehives.<sup>55</sup>

Thus, in "Mongol" or "post-Mongol" Rus', there was already neither a visitation, nor a tax under the name of poliud'é. Krichev, in Smolensk, in this relation turned out to be closer to the Vladimir-Suzdal', Riazan'-Murom and Novgorod lands than Polotsk or Vladimir-Volhynia.

Logic suggests that the reasons for the disappearance of the poliud'é from the administrative-financial practice of the princes of northeastern and northwestern Rus', must be sought in certain changes that arose in this practice. These changes, however, occurred primarily because these Rus' lands were included in the system of exploitation that was established by the Mongol khans and was supported by the Horde. As is well known, the key element of the exploitation was the responsibility to pay taxes to the khans of the empire or the Horde.

Thanks to specialized works it is possible, in general, to see how the Mongols collected taxes from conquered Rus'. In northeastern Rus' and in Novgorod, systematic taxation was established in the 1250s after the census, when it was put in the "chislo."

As a rule, the Mongols placed one indirect tax (*tamga*) and two direct ones on the conquered population. One of the direct taxes was a monetary payment from adult men or households (*qubchir*), the other was collected from the land, usually in the form of agricultural products (*qalan*).<sup>56</sup> In Russian sources the indirect tax was well known and was called *tamga*. Of the direct taxes the sources mention only one, which is always called *dan'* (tribute). What this tribute was exactly remains unclear, but the chronicles that refer to it always mean monetary payments. The main thing is that it was collected from all strata of the population with the exception of the clergy. This was a very important innovation in comparison with the pre-Mongol period, when a large part of the population, perhaps even a majority did not pay direct taxes.

In most of the territory of the Grand Principality of Vladimir the tax in kind (*qalan*), it seems, was not collected. At the very least, there is no mention of it. However, there is data indicating that this tax was familiar in the southern oblasts of old Rus'. According to the documents from the end of

<sup>55</sup> In this case the use of the word *poliudnyi* was incorrectly interpreted as "relating to poliud'é—tribute from the people for the prince" in the *Slovar' russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vv.*, vyp. 16 (Moscow: Nauka, 1990), 288. The church poliud'é beehives obviously had no relation to the prince's poliud'é.

<sup>56</sup> "[Q]ubchir, poll tax on adult males paid once a year in cash, and qalan, basically an agricultural tax, collected for the most part in kind." Thomas T. Allsen, *Mongol Imperialism: The Policies of the Grand Qan Möngke in China, Russia, and the Islamic Lands, 1251–1259* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 144 et seq.

the fifteenth to the sixteenth centuries from Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, in Podolia, Volhynia, and the Kiev region there existed a special category of dependent people called *kalannye* (*kolannye*), who were obligated to certain services for the king (grand prince). I agree with I. A. Linnichenko that originally these were the people whom the Mongols conquered in Rus', who they specifically identified for agricultural work and dues in kind.<sup>57</sup> It is understandable that if a category of people received its name from the name of a tax which it was obliged to pay, then the remaining population would differ from it in that it would not pay this tax. In the northeast, the Mongols may not have collected such a tax at all because of the scarcity of agricultural production in the forest zone of Rus'. Perhaps, the obligation to pay this tax was placed on some relatively minor areas and population groups, but the information about this has not been preserved.

Indeed, this tax money was collected in considerable amounts in northeastern and northwestern Rus'. In the historical literature of the Middle Ages and the modern era it is known as tribute (*vykhod*), a name which it already received when the grand princes of Vladimir acquired the right to collect tribute owed to the Tatars and send it to the Horde (roughly from the beginning of the fourteenth century).<sup>58</sup> For the collection of the tax and control over the population and local leadership, the Mongols appointed specialized officials—*baskaki*.<sup>59</sup> For their upkeep and the guarantee of their administrative activities, they were allotted special groups of people—*chislenye liudi* (obviously on the same principle according to which other defined groups paid the *kalan*). How the census and the determination of taxes took place and what kind of discontent in the population this caused is evident from the famous story of

<sup>57</sup> I. A. Linnichenko, *Cherty iz istorii soslovii v Iugo-zapadnoi (Galitskoi) Rusi XIV–XV vv.* (Moscow, 1894), 87, 92–97, especially 97.

<sup>58</sup> There is much written concerning the *vykhod* and in particular on its dimensions: see the literature in the works of Lawrence Langer and other authors mentioned above in notes 5–6. On the name itself, see Peter Golden, "Vyxod: Aspects of Medieval Eastern Slavic-Altai Culturo-Linguistic Relations," in *Studies on the Peoples and Cultures of the Eurasian Steppes*, ed. C. Hriban (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române; Brăila: Muzeul Brăilei, Editura Istros, 2011), 393–412 (originally published in *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 7 (1987–91): 83–101.

<sup>59</sup> Concerning these, see the latest works of S. A. Maslova: "Baskacheskaia organizatsiia na Rusi: Vremia sushchestvovaniia i funktsii," *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy medievistiki*, no. 1 (51) (2013): 27–40; and "Mongol'skaia administratsiia na zavoevannykh zemliakh: Darugi i baskaki," in "Mongol'skie zavoevaniia i Rus'," special issue, *Istoricheskii vestnik* 10 (157) (2014): 80–109.

the Novgorod chronicle about the assessment of tribute from the Novgorodians in 1257–59.<sup>60</sup>

The introduction of new taxes, which was accompanied by the creation of a new administration, was to radically change the tax system of Rus'. In particular, in the conditions of ruin and economic decline following the Mongol invasion of 1237–40, the princes surely had to give up a part of their revenues that was traditionally for them. We know that the princes did not give up the indirect taxes, at least most of them: with the *tamga* they continued to gather the pre-Mongol *os'minch'e*, *myt*, etc. The traditional labor obligations were preserved, despite the fact that the Mongols introduced a new obligation, the upkeep of the postal service (*iam*). It is logical to assume that, for the benefit of the Mongols, the pre-Mongol direct taxes were "translated," transformed into this tribute that the new rulers demanded. Poliud'é, which as has been mentioned above, had time in the pre-Mongol period to evolve into a special tax and was just such a payment. The princes simply stopped collecting it and all direct taxes were "concentrated" in one payment—a tribute, which the *baskaki* collected and sent to the Mongol (Horde) khans.

The Smolensk land, before it became part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (finally under Vitovt), was taken under Tatar-Mongol rule.<sup>61</sup> In the 1250s–90s, Smolensk was in the system of the Grand Principality of Vladimir, and in it the orders were propagated that were adopted in the remaining lands which were under the authority of the Mongols, particular in the area of taxation. This circumstance makes it possible to explain the difference in the neighboring volosts on the Sozh River, which in the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries were part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Apparently Chechersk was at one time located on the northwestern border of the Chernigov principality (split into a number of political units after the invasion of Batu) and Propoisk, before the invasion of the former Smolensk border city, which previously fell under the rule of the Lithuanian princes and to a lesser degree felt the pressure of the Mongols. Here poliud'é, was preserved. In Krichev, located closer to Smolensk and its fate divided, the Smolensk princes were forced to pay the Mongol tribute and to accept Mongol officials; they gave up poliud'é, like the princes of the northeastern Rus' principalities.

The fate of the ancient poliud'é makes one wonder about the fate of the Old Rus' heritage in different Rus' lands in the later Middle Ages and on what

<sup>60</sup> *Novgorodskaiia pervaiia letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov*, 82–83, 309–11.

<sup>61</sup> See A. N. Nasonov, "Mongoly i Rus': Istoriia tatarskoi politiki na Rusi," in "*Russkaia zemlia*" i obrazovanie territorii Drevnerusskogo gosudarstva: Istoriko-geograficheskoe issledovanie. *Mongoly i Rus': Istoriia tatarskoi politiki na Rusi* (1940; St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2002), 304–05; A. A. Gorskii, *Russkie zemli v XIII–XIV vekakh: Puti politicheskogo razvitiia* (Moscow: Institut rossiiskoi istorii RAN, 1996), 37–41.

the power of the Russian state that emerged at the end of the fifteenth century was based.

Poliud'e in the Old Rus' lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the fifteenth to the first half of the sixteenth centuries was just one of the components of the tax system of the state, but it was a characteristic element. It gives evidence of the archaic and mosaic-like qualities of the tax system, which reflect the complex history and structure of the state. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania we see not only the strong disparity in taxation but, most importantly, the freedom, for a large part of the population, from direct taxes. Not just the nobles (*znat'*), but also the populations of the largest cities, primarily the capitals of the former lands of Old Rus' such as Polotsk, did not pay direct taxes on a regular basis. Of course it is well known that they collected, for example, *serebshchina* and *tatarshchina* for the Grand Ducal coffers. However, these were apparently one-time charges, not fixed ones, and each time the size was determined anew and the purpose of the fees was to meet the emergency needs of foreign policy (at least in theory). Only the "tributaries" (*danniki*) and a few other categories of the rural population (apparently far from all) paid all other known direct taxes—*pososhchina*, *dymshchina*, and others, but not the townsfolk and certainly not the nobles.<sup>62</sup>

Things were quite different in the lands of northeastern Rus', which experienced a restructuring of the tax system under Mongol rule. It is known that the tribute and *tamga* (and also the *iam* obligation) established by the Mongols eventually were transferred to the hands of the Riurikovichi. Initially (in the first half of the fourteenth century), the Horde khans just gave the collection of taxes to the princes and then, with the gradual weakening of control and dependence of the Horde, the princes began to survey the population and take ownership of the collected taxes on their own, paying the *vykhod* in fixed amounts. Those same Russian princes received a developed, centralized tax system, which covered almost the entire population. The Kalitovichi princes of Moscow developed it only slightly and perfected this system.

Initially, the Mongols made the material condition of the people—male taxpayers—the basis of the surveys and assessment. However, the circumstances and methods for the extraction of revenues were different for different people. In Old Rus' the principal line of differentiation was between urban and rural populations. Therefore, during the allocation of Mongol tribute different tax units were established: in the cities—homestead taxation, in the villages—*po sokham* or *po obzham*, but city households (*dvory*) and artisanal-commercial enterprises were equated to *sokhi* in defined proportions. As a result, the *pososhnaia* tax system covered, in principle, the whole population in the

<sup>62</sup> See M. V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii, *Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo pri Iagellonakh* (Kiev, 1901), 698–765.



villages and in the city. The first coherent facts of this system come from Moscow documents from the 1440s, when it developed some of its unique features, but it dates back to the Mongol description in *chislo*. Lawrence Langer rightly emphasized this and concluded that the princes of Muscovy used the principles and mechanisms of taxation that the Mongols established in Rus': "Muscovy absorbed the Mongol tribute into a traditional system of princely household governance, subverted Mongol taxation to its own ends, and created a government that was neither Mongol, Western, nor Byzantine, but was, instead, uniquely Muscovite."<sup>63</sup>

This system was common for the entire population and for all territories that fell under the power of the Moscow princes, and it allowed them to extort from their subjects much greater resources than the archaic and mosaic-like system of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the fifteenth to the first half of the sixteenth centuries. The methods of assessing and collecting taxes in that state were, in fact, medieval. Adherence to *starina* (old time), the preservation of local traditions, the predominance of indirect taxes to the detriment of direct ones, the liberation of whole groups of the population from obligations to the treasury, the violation of general rules by private judgments and grants, etc. The "innovative" system of taxation, which the Moscow princes created on the Mongol base, corresponded much better to the general tendencies of the development of European states of the early modern era. From this, it is possible to see one of the reasons for the miraculous appearance *ex nihilo* of this enormous state on the map of Europe at the end of the fifteenth century. It is no accident that in the confrontation with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Ivan III and Vasili III had success for a long time. Behind these successes there were resources, and taxes gave these resources. In this sense the common view of the Moscow state as backward and archaic, forced to catch up to its more developed and progressive Western neighbors, is hardly justified.

*Translated by Daria Ezerova*

---

<sup>63</sup> Langer, "Muscovite Taxation," 129.

