

УДК 94

**BAPTIZED AND NOT BAPTIZED NEMCY
IN THE MUSCOVITE SOCIETY OF THE 16TH CENTURY*****Jukka Korpela****(University of Eastern Finland)*

The east European trade of slaves was big business. It had long roots at least from the age of Vikings and thousands of prisoners were transported yearly from Crimea and Kazan' – Astrakhan to the markets of Central Asia, Asia Minor and Mediterranean area and finally even to India. The wars of the 15th and 16th centuries may have increased the number of northern slaves in the Muscovite – Volga markets.

The slaves of the trade were divided into two main categories. First there were ordinary cheap manpower and secondly extraordinary cases which were bought for the harems for noble families and as luxury.

The point of this article is to illuminate the difference between baptized and unbaptized persons in the connection of the slave trade. It is namely curious that this religious aspect was stressed so seriously, and therefore it requests for an explanation.

This phenomenon belongs only to the late 16th century. The state formation had created the Baptism as a criterium for the subject of ruler and this as a side product the protection against slave trade. From the author's point of view one should pay attention to:

1) The slave trade of blond (nemci) girls must have been a big issue already early, because the administration building did not of course form the request.

2) Earlier the religion of the trading objects was a concern of the Church but not of the ruler. When the new economic thinking created an idea of realm economy, the people living in the realm became to means of production and tax payers. This required to limit their kidnapping away.

3) Because the religion became to be a criterium in state formation it became accidentally also a qualification of slave trade.

4) The traders did not take otherwise care of religious issues in this connection, and therefore the illegal trade may have continued also with baptized persons.

Keywords: Eastern European trade of slaves, Muscovite – Volga markets, «nemcy», baptized and unbaptized slaves, realm economy.

A. Problem

When the Nogai ruler Izmail-bek sent a delegation headed by the high-ranking diplomats Temer and Bek-Cüra to Moscow in the late summer of 1561 one of the items he ordered Bek-Cüra to buy him in Moscow markets was two nemci girls [15, p. 174]. The Persian delegation of Kaja

and hadži Hosrev was ordered to buy three girls and three nemci slaves in Moscow for Safavid Shah Abbās in 1592–1593 and a further 30 nemci slaves in Kazan' on their journey home. The next winter the Safavid ambassador hadži Iskender had a long shopping list from the Shah to ask for in Moscow, including 20 slaves in addition to various kinds of furs, wax, birch bark and many other items. In the meeting the Muscovites allowed hadži Iskender to buy five “more” “nemci” slaves on his way home [34, p. 165, 170, 190, 204, 213–214].

These stories are many in the diplomatic documents of these years and it is clear that Nogai, Tartar, Persian, Caucasian and Turkmen nobles and tradesmen were interested in “nemci” slaves, and especially female ones, which were a very expensive luxury. Izmail-bek gave for his envoys Temer and Bek-Cūra 400 roubles for two girls, whereas according to Novosel'skij the average price for a good slave in Crimea was 40–80 roubles [15, p. 178; 32, p. 434 – 436].

Muhammad-Ali, ambassador of the Buhārān Khan Abdallāh, was allowed to buy “nemci” slaves in 1589 but forbidden to take baptized ones, while the Muscovite officials refused to sell hadži Iskender baptized slaves and insisted that he should buy unbaptized ones. The authorities even followed the delegation of Andi-bek, Ali Hosrov and hadži Hussein along the Volga to ensure that no baptized “nemci” slaves were taken to Persia. Likewise in 1600, the Moscow authorities allowed the trader Muhammed to buy only unbaptized “nemci” (girl) slaves for Shah Abbās [28, no. 12; 34, p. 214, 306, 310, 312; 42, p. 57–58].

The east European trade of slaves was big business. It had long roots at least from the age of Vikings and thousands of prisoners were transported yearly from Crimea and Kazan' – Astrakhan to the markets of Central Asia, Asia Minor and Mediterranean area and finally even to India. Most slaves originated from the Russian – Ukrainian lands but some prisoners were transported even from north European forests due to their exceptional qualifications. The wars of the 15th and 16th centuries may have increased the number of northern slaves in the Muscovite – Volga markets [22; 23, p. 86–88].

The slaves of the trade were divided into two main categories. First there were ordinary cheap manpower and secondly extraordinary cases which were bought for the harems for noble families and as luxury [29, p. 22]. The luxury slaves were young, because they must be trained to their duties. Skin colour mattered also. White slaves were more expensive in generally [22].

The blond or white colour was especially important in the markets of South. According to Ibn Battuta and Afanasij Nikintin white female slaves were expensive and valuable in the Indian markets. They were more expensive in the Italian markets than the black ones and white slaves were better qualified than the other in Egypt, too [49, p. 595–596, 19, l. 200–202, p. 102–103, l. 207ob, p. 106, l. 214–216, p. 109–110; 14, p. 185–326;

20, p. 120–121; 26, p. 26, 39, 126 (note 48), 133 (note 103)]. The markets of white slave were mostly in eastern Europe.

Such exceptional cases were worth of transportation even beyond distance. When in Karelian Isthmus (the area between Finland and Sankt-Petersburg) a kidnapped girl cost 5 altyn in the mid of 16th century [35, 7064 (1556); 13, p. 147] and the price level was in Moscow 200 roubles as was in our example case above, the business was profitable and sound, because 200 roubles is equal to 6,666 altyn!

The point of this article is to illuminate the difference between baptized and unbaptized persons in the connection of the slave trade. It is namely curious that this religious aspect was stressed so seriously, and therefore it requests for an explanation.

B. Nemcy

The word “nemcy” refers basically to a person whose speech is not understandable, in Old Russian language. In early medieval times it means especially west Europeans (Germans), but after the late 12th century also Scandinavians were “nemcy”. Finns got this label after the 14th century when the western part of their living area came under the rule of the King of Sweden. Estonians, Latvians and other Baltic people were “nemcy” after they had joined to Roman Catholic church. Thus in late medieval use the concept meant simply western Christians. Siberian and northern Pagans were called by ethnic names and Slav Orthodox Christians Rus’. The only exception in this respect was Roman Catholic Slav speakers which were usually called by their ethnic names [25, p. 42–55].

The concept “nemcy” is problematic in the documents concerning the slave trade, because it is only registered in the 16th century Old Russian language documents, although it tries to reflect an understanding or wish of Turkic or Persian speakers, who were trying to buy such “nemcy” slaves with big money. The basic Russian meaning of the word was most probably totally obscure for the Tatarian traders, because they had neither a clear picture of Germans or West Europeans. E.g., Ottoman traveler Evliya çelebi (d. 1682) uses very odd vocabulary concerning West Europeans, and Germans he may have called “dudushka”, because it sounds similar like the Italian word for Germans “tedesco” [1, p. 48, note 10 (p. 301)]. Moreover the form of the Christian religion of the slaves could not have been in the interest of the Islamic buyers so that it could have formed a special request with high price and thus the core of the odd concept. On the other hand the word “nemci/y” or something like that did not exist in the language of Crimean Tatars in the 17th century according to Imre Baskin [5, p. 154–155]. Most probably the word “nemci/y” has got a special meaning in the Tatar Slave trade. It was a direct loan from Old Russian not in the meaning of a German or a Swede but in the meaning of the type of northern slave type (blond, white, blue eyes etc.), which usually came from Baltic Frontier.

If we look at the Russian contemporary description of “nemci”, they certainly existed among the Russian population as a separate group, which we must define by some way. The ambassador of Czar Feodor, Prince Andrej Dmitrievič Zvenigorodskij, explained to Shah Abbās on January 15th, 1594, what a rich land Siberia was and what development efforts had taken place there. According to the Prince, there were also many Lithuanian and nemci inhabitants [34, p. 265; Burton, 9, p. 79–80].

The register of townspeople in Kazan’ compiled in 1565–1568 contained some “nemci” “puškar”, i.e. gunmen and mercenary soldiers [41, p. 21–22 and commentary tablica 3, p. 183]. In the beginning of the 17th century there are already other “nemci” people. The persons named Griška and Ondrjuška in Korotaj and Isengil’dejko in Nižnjaja Aiša were from Livonia (“Latyš”), Griška and Isengil’dejko being referred to with the epithet “prihodec”, “newcomer”, while Anca Kutlejarov and Danilko in Ursek, Matyš in Starye Menger and Hristofor Kondrat’ev in Unba were “nemci”. The “nemci” Anca Sontaleev and “Latyš” Jakuško Derbyšev were both living in Ursek [37, 103ob., 104, 109, 132ob., 138, 138ob., 177, 180ob., 220ob].

The sources contain also few nemci slaves. The Tartar civil servant Bek-bulat Begišev had a “nemeckoj (latyš) polon” on his estate in the region of Svijažkoj, near Kazan’, who had escaped with his wife and children in 1621 [1, no. 7]. “Nemci” are no longer recorded in the register for Kazan’ by the mid-17th century, but some family names refer to “nemci”, e.g. Ontoška Prokof’ev Nemcin, and there was also a village called Nemčino on the “Nogajskaja doroga” [38, 162, 387ob].

Records for Nižnij Novgorod are available only after the 1620s. A village termed “Staraja Nemeckaja sloboda” and a burial ground “nemeckoe kladbišče” were located on the River Oka, and there were several people referred to as “nemeč” living in the area, some of which were “novokreščen” and had typical Russian names, such as Ivan Jakovlev. Further along the River Oka there was a village described as “Sloboda nižegorodckih nemeč i litvy”, with an explanation that it was inhabited by “inozemci” (foreigners) who were also called “nemci” even though their names were mostly Russian ones, with certain exceptions such as Ganko Prokoev, Tomilko Ostaf’ev, Adam Svideretckij, Adam Ivanov and Indrik Miller. These people were from Livonia or Sweden and may have been free migrants, prisoners of war, slaves or a combination of all these [36, col. 173–178].

The tax books of the region of Staraja Russa contain little material from the late 15th century but much more from the early 17th century. The registers have few ethnic references, but those that do exist are family names such as Ivaško Nemčin, Mihal Litvin, Jakim Koreljanin, Jakim Latyš and Bogdan Latyš [40, p. 4 (l. 140 ob.), 4 (l. 141), 26 (l. 94 ob.), 35 (l. 4), 36 (l. 7), 43 (l. 29), 52 (l. 63), 104 (l. 285), 136 (l. 60), 151 (l. 93), 254 (l. 348ob.)]. The expression “nemci” is used in these registers exclu-

sively to denote the foreign troops which devastated the area in the early 17th century [E.g., 40, p. 146, 151, 164, 169, 170]. The books of the city of Novgorod from the early 17th century do not alter this picture. There were western tradesmen such as Grigorij Grigor'ev, who was a house owner in the Sofia district, and a "galanskie zemli nemčin", a Dutchmen, but otherwise the ethnic references to "nemci" concern the devastation of the city by Swedish troops [39, p. 1–65, the references on p. 6, 10–11].

The copybook of Novgorod d'jak Aljab'jev opens up a perspective on the roles of slaves of various kinds (debt, voluntary, service, prisoners) in local society. The book was compiled in the late 16th century but contains documents (appeals, administrative decisions, court orders) starting from the end of the 15th century.

The local society in the territory of Novgorod consisted of free farmers and slaves ("holop"). There was also a lot of children who had been born while one of their parents was a slave and were therefore slaves themselves [51, col. 3].

This slave population included some people who were prisoners from Sweden or the Baltic region and who were also labelled as "nemci". Marinka, mentioned in 1588, was a "holop" and Lithuanian prisoner, Palagijca, the daughter of Petrov, was a Livonian taken prisoner in 1578, and Jurka a western Christian and prisoner abducted from Vyborg in 1593. Ovdokimko, recorded in 1597, was a "nemčin" and a prisoner from Tartu, while Ofimka was a Livonian girl taken prisoner in 1565. Another Ofimia was a Livonian girl prisoner captured in 1566, and Oleško a prisoner from Polock in 1565. Mitka, recorded in 1595, was a prisoner from Pärnu [51, col. 14 (no. 41), col. 18 (no. 54), col. 18 – 19 (no. 55), col. 101 (no. 284), col. 104 (no. 292), col. 165 (no. 449), col. 195 (no. 526)].

The register of Aljab'jev and other similar source collections [2, I: 1–3, III: 1–3, IV: 10, 12, 20, 21, IX: 1, 3] confirm the picture obtained from the tax registers. Western prisoners were sold in the countryside and became workers and servants there. They were like all the other ordinary people: free peasants, immigrants and debt slaves. They married and had families, they joined the local society. The memory of their origins must have eventually disappeared after a few generations and a language shift.

C. Re-baptism

Although the Islamic slave owners were for sure not interested in the form of Christianity of their slaves, the religion did matter, however, in the trade in humans from another perspective. Since Islam did not allow the enslaving of Moslems, the Islamic realms were forced to buy Christian or pagan slaves. On the other hand, as Christians were similarly barred from selling other Christians into slavery, Jewish traders and Moslem corsairs played an active role in this business in the Mediterranean. It also meant that trade was directed more towards Africa and the Russian steppes, because there were suitable people available there (pagans, here-

tics, etc.) [17, p. 69–72; 50, p. 158–161; 46, p. 42–43, 57–58, 62, 64, 66–67; 43, tome I: 468, 683, tome III: 2956].

Table 1. Numbers of Ethnic Definitions in the Kazan' region Tax Register of 1602–1603¹.

Newly Baptized	Cheremiss	Chuvash	Tartars	Nemci	Others	Total
180	10	204	139	10	537	1080

A Newly Baptized category is to be found here and there in the tax registers up till northern territories of Karelia, Dvina and Kola. The registration of a person as newly baptized may indicate a non-Orthodox prisoner, immigrants, or equally well a Tartar who had integrated into Muscovite society.

It was common all over the Christian world to re-baptize and re-name slaves [20, p. 37, 435–562; 17, p. 98–103; 14, p. 185–326]. The most common names among the Slav origin people in Venice were Piero, Stefano and Paolo and Christian names were used for Pagan slaves too: Dimitria was “sclava pagana Bulgara” in 1406 and Marina “sclava pagana Circassea” in 1424 [20, p. 157, 394, 556; 16, p. 98–103]. Islam societies used the same praxis [30, p. 122].

The documents tell directly of some Finnish and Baltic prisoners who were re-baptized into Orthodox Christianity. The Baltic prisoner Indrik was renamed Ivaško in 1544 and the Vyborg prisoner Feklitsa became Avdotija in 1597. Matts Manuelsson and Anna Michaelsdotter became Lev and Olenka in 1591. Piritka (Birgitta) from Vyborg likewise came to be known as Solomanitka after an Orthodox baptism in 1593 [51, col. 37 (no. 109), col. 63–64 (no. 177), col. 142–143 (no. 388), col. 165 (no. 448)].

Forty Armenian businessmen appealed to Czar Aleksej 1666. They explained, how they run business in the lands of qizilbaş (Persia), in Osman empire, India and in the lands of nemci (western Europe). Everywhere they are able to follow their Orthodox Christian Armenian faith except in Moscow. Here they are not allowed to go to church and no priest will visit a dying Armenian and pray with him [3, no. 9 (p. 42–43)]. Indeed, at least after the Makarian reforms, the Muscovite church regarded all other Christians, even other Orthodox than the subjects of the Moscow Orthodox church as non-Christians.

Therefore due to practical reasons many of those who arrived free to the service or a more permanent stay in Muscovy took often a re-Baptism, because they could so more easily act in the society. Thereafter they were

¹ The numbers are collected from the index of the edition and therefore only approximate figures.

”novokreščen” like Armenian Serkis Avanesian who arrived from Crimea 1632 and got a new name Kirill Avanesov [3, no. 2 (p. 4)].

But not all did take a Baptism due to some reason and therefore there were in the landscape people who were ”non-Baptized”. Juško Martynov was born a “Latin Christian” and worked in the territory of Novgorod in 1597. He had married Svetna, the daughter of a slave, and their children (Ždanko, Mark, Onusica, Ofimica) were slaves, because they were born in slavery (on their mother’s side). Juško may initially have been a free immigrant from Sweden [51, col. 122 (336)].

The Muscovite church did not separate the re-Baptized from each other according to their background. All former west Christians, Moslems or Animist belonged to the same group. Therefore a big group among the registers consists of those Tartars who took a Baptism. Partly it may have been easier in local society to be a peasant among other Christian peasants, partly they were Tartar nobles who joined to the Muscovite service and were willing to be promoted in the hierarchy. Some baptized had Tartar names, such as Vasilij Hasanmurzin, and sometimes Tartars and newly baptized people were put into the same group, e.g. “the 40 houses of newly baptized, translators and service Tartars”, or “the villages of the people of Archbishop, monastery people, newly baptized, Tartars and Chuvash” [41, p. 18, 20, 28, 29, 35, 51, 61 and commentary tablica 10, p. 196; cf. also 7, *passim*].

D. Mercantilism and Protection of Resources

West European pre-modern princes tried to submit a geographical territory in the meaning of the realm under their sovereign rule. This way of thinking became dominant in the state formation in the 15th century. Territories, tax payers (= subjects), resources and power were divided between princes and registered in the princely documents, when the new administration, legal system and army was established. The resources were protected and administered according to the ideology of Mercantilism, which limited the export of strategic (valuable) goods, submitted the foreign trade and production under state control and issued privileges for limited number of actors in each field [8, p. 482–485].

The princes of Muscovy have followed these tendencies since the early 15th century and submitted also trade under their control. After the Muscovite occupation of Novgorod, the trade office of Hanseatic League was closed 1494, and when it was reopened 1514, it was not anymore an independent trade institution but under the control of Moscow [10, p. 402–403]. Likewise Crimea was put under blockade and the Prince tried to close a direct trade agreement with the Ottoman Sultan, which also succeeded [48, p. 63–66]. The third direction of this kinds of actions took place in the Volga region, when Prince Vasily III tried to exclude Muscovite traders from the Kazan’ summer markets in 1524 and to estab-

lish his own ones in Nižnij Novgorod, which finally succeeded, however, only in the 17th century [45, p. 157; 48, p. 134; 6, p. 179].

The core reason was that trade was regarded as a part of the wealth of the realm and not anymore as a private matter of the traders. The realm requested a share of the surplus, and this required limits, instructions, orders and control. The Muscovite ruler issued privileges for certain traders to certain areas and items as well as corporations of traders got monopoly rights. This all created source material for modern historians which did not exist from the earlier periods unless the trade itself existed [47, p. 187–196, 209–211; 12, p. 62–63, 119–129, 135–136]!

According to Sigismund Herberstein, Polish and Lithuanian traders had free entry to Moscow while Baltic traders must go to Novgorod and Turkic and Tatar traders to “Chloppigrod” [45, p. 57–58, 78]. Traders from Persia, Buhara, Hiva as well as Greek traders had their own privileges while Nogai traders had not a common one but individual traders had their own permission letters [31, p. 194–197]. Traders without a princely permission had no entry to Muscovite lands, as we can read in an instruction letter to the voyevod of Kazan’ [31, p. 210].

The next step was to limit the export of strategic goods. This was allowed only with special written permission of the ruler for the official tradesmen, which were in fact diplomats, members of diplomatic missions and foreign rulers. These goods were called as “zapovednye tovary”. The lists of such goods were changed sometimes, but such items were, e.g., silver coins, falcons (for hunting), weapons, expensive furs etc. This policy influenced much on the slave trade, because medieval rulers were not concerned about the trade in humans, but when the rulers started to regard the humans as their own resources as tax payers and elements in the production of the realm, they decided to limit the trade and even tried to buy back their subjects from slavery. The export of “baptized nemcy” were totally forbidden and “unbaptized” ones limited by the middle of the 16th century in this connection [9, p. 463, 469–470, 473–475, 489–490, 495–496; 47, p. 209–211; 12, p. 69, 75–76, 134–135; 18, p. 292–294].

A difference between “luxury” and “ordinary” slaves may have become clearer with export limits, because the “luxury” cases were rare, expensive and they were part of peaceful ordinary commercial activity, which was possible to control. Such items were qualified in “zapovednye tovary” while kidnapping of “ordinary” cheap slaves for manpower remained as a part of pure criminal activities, which continued among South Russian populations and among the forest populations outside the realm power until the sovereign ruler’s territorial power was implemented during the 18th century [9, p. 493–496].

The new administration and the request for the princely permission for the trade created our sources. Therefore the trade in humans became now visible, but we have no reason to believe that it had been only a novelty of the 16th century. For sure Tatar and Persian nobles were interested

in these items earlier and in the documents there is also earlier spoken about trade and gifts, but no specification was needed, because there was no administrative request for such an information and the culture was not literary. The only early literary commercial culture in East Europe was the Italian one, and their book keeping records contain lot of slaves in the Crimean trade from the very beginning in the 13th century and there is no essential change to the 16th century in this respect [24].

According to number of issued export licences the request for “nemcy” girls and boys was vivid in the trade along Volga, but such a definition “nemcy” is not recorded in the Crimean trade. Persian, Caucasian and Central Asian traders knew to ask them and were very ready to pay big money for them. It is not thinkable that there had been some real cut in this trade between Volga and the Black Sea shores. The commercial connections existed and the traders were working in the same markets. So there was a request for similar kind of slaves in the Crimea, too, but they had most probably another trade mark. Perhaps they were among Russian, Tatar and Circassian blond slaves. One simple reason for this could have been, that the Volga traders need a princely permission for this trade, while in Crimea the authorities had not such a request [24].

It may be even possible that the definition of “nemcy” for slaves was created in the Volga trade only in the 16th century after the Muscovite conquest of Kazan’, because this enabled to classify such white slaves, who were not subjects of the Moscow ruler and under his protection. When the definition was even specified with the division between the baptized and non-baptized ones, such slaves were separated from the trade who were newly joined to the realm of the Muscovite ruler. The border of the limits went along the border of tax payers, because only these were important for the ruler. The Baptism was the way to join the Muscovite society. The Baptized people were also tax payers and thus under the protection of the ruler. Thus it was reasonable from the perspective of a prisoner or immigrant to be baptized, because so he was outside the open slave trade and if kidnapped the administration of the Czar tried to buy him free.

This administration building re-oriented the slave trade also other ways. The authorities in the Central Siberian town Tara, for instance, ordered Algačak, Dalan and Čedutaj, envoys of Qalmāq taiša Turgen and Dalaj-Bogatyr’, to return all kidnapped taxpayers in 1614. The purchase of non-taxpaying natives of Siberia was still allowed in 1697, however [27, no. 12; 9, p. 469–470, 483–484, 489, 533].

As the Swedish peace delegation was told in 1556, the Livonian Chronicler Balthasar Russow recorded in 1560, the Danish ambassador Jacob Uhlfeldt noted in 1578 and chancellor of Boris Godunov Vasilij Salkovič Solkanov explained to the ambassadors of the King of Swedish-Polish union Sigismund Wasa in 1597, many prisoners were sold direct to the land of Tartars, where the Muscovite regulations and laws were not in

force and therefore the people is impossible to find back. Thus the supply and demand matched perfectly when only the priests had no time to baptize the prisoners and exclude them from the business. In these term the Baptism mattered [33, no. 2, p. 41, 9, p. 104; 4, 49a; 21, p. 203, 207–208; 44, p. 141–147]!

E. Conclusions

From the perspective of prisoners and other immigrants an Orthodox Baptism was a security measure that was worth of taking. Besides gaining the protection of the Church, the people became subjects of the ruler, who would not let them to be sold. In the central areas for the slave trade there were even villages of “nemci” where large numbers of newly baptized people were living [36, col. 173–178].

This phenomenon belongs only to the late 16th century. The state formation had created the Baptism as a criterium for the subject of ruler (“a primitive citizenship”) and this as a side product the protection against slave trade. From our point of view one should pay attention to:

1) The slave trade of blond (nemci) girls must have been a big issue already early, because the administration building did not of course form the request.

2) Earlier the religion of the trading objects was a concern of the Church but not of the ruler. When the new economic thinking created an idea of realm (state) economy and wealth, the people living in the realm became to means of production and tax payers, i.e., part of the wealth of the ruler and realm. This required to limit their kidnapping away.

3) Because the religion became to be a criterium in state formation it became accidentally also a qualification of slave trade.

4) The traders did not take otherwise care of religious issues in this connection, and therefore the illegal trade may have continued also with baptized persons.

REFERENCES

1. *Akty istoričeskie i juridičeskie i drevnija carskija gramoty kazanskoj i drugih sosejstvennyh gubernii sobrannye Stepanom Mel'nikovim* [Historical and Legal Acts and the Ancient Royal Charters of the Kazan and Other Neighboring Provinces collected by Stepan Melnikov]. Vol. I. Kazan, 1856. 231 p.
2. Akty zapisanye v krepostnoj knige XVI veka soobščeny A. B. Lakierom [Acts Recorded in the Land Register of the 16th century reported by A.B. Lakier]. *Arhiv istoriko-juridičeskih svedenij otnosjaščihsja do Rossii* izdavaemyj Nikolaem Kalačovym, kn. 2:1 [Archive of Historical and Legal Information pertaining to Russia published by Nikolay Kalachov, Book 2:1]. Moscow, 1855.
3. *Armjano-russkie otnošenija v XVII veka*. Sbornik dokumentov [Armenian-Russian Relations in the 17th century. Collection of documents]. Vol I. Pod redakciej prof. B. A. Parsamjana. Izd. AN Armjanskoj SSR: Jerevan, 1953.

4. *Balthasar Russow's Chronica der Prouinz Lifflandt*, in erneuetem Wiederabdrucke, mit Wörterbuch und Namenregister versehen, Riga: R. Hummel's Buchhandlung, 1857. 194 p.

5. Baski, Imre, Crimean Turkic-Tatar Glossary from the 17th century. *Acta Orientalia Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae* XL. Budapest, 1986, pp. 107–172.

6. Bogorodickaja, N. A. Stranički istorii nižegorodskoj jarmarki [Pages of History of the Nizhny Novgorod Fair]. *Voprosy istorii* [Questions of History]. 1979:10.

7. Beljakov, A. V. *Čingisidy v Rossii XV–XVII vekov. Prosopografičeskoe issledovanie* [The Chinggisids in Russia in the 15th–17th centuries. Prosopographical study]. Rjazan': Mir, 2011. 521 p.

8. Brezis, Elise S. Mercantilism. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Economic History*, volyme 3. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2003.

9. Burton, Audrey, *The Bukharans. A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History 1550–1702*, Curzon Press: Richmond, 1997. 664 p.

10. Dollinger, Philippe, *Die Hanse*. 3., überarbeitete Auflage, Kröner: Stuttgart, 1981. 606 p.

11. *Evlija čelebi kniga*. Putešestvija (Izvlačenija iz sočinenija tureckogo putešvennika XVII veka). Pervod i komentarii. Vypusk 3, zemli Zakavkaz'ja i sopredel'nyh oblastej maloju Azii i Irana [The Book of Evliya Çelebi. The Travels (excerpts from the writings of the 17th century Turkish traveler). Translation and Commentary. Issue 3, the lands of Caucasus and adjacent regions of Asia Minor and Iran]. Akademija nauk SSSR–Institut vostokovedenija. Moscow, 1983.

12. Fehner, M.V. *Torgovlja Russkogo gosudarstva so stranami vostoka v XVI veke* [Trade of the Russian State with Oriental Countries in the 16th century]. Trudy gosudarstvennago ordena Lenina istoričeskogo muzeja, 21. Moscow, 1952. 122 p.

13. Filjushkin, Aleksandr, *Ivan the Terrible. A Military History*, London, Frontline Books, 2008. 306 p.

14. Gioffré, Domenico, *Il mercato degli schiavi a Genova nel secolo XV*. Collana storica di fonti e studi diretta da Geo Pistarino, 11, Genova: Fratelli Bozzi, 1971. 334 p.

15. Gramoty velikago Knjazja Joanna Vasil'eviča k Nagajskim Mursam i ih k velikomu Knjazju Joannu Vasil'eviču [The Letters of Grand Prince Ivan Vasilyevich to the Nogai Murzas and Their Letters to Grand Duke Ivan Vasilyevich]. *Prodolženie drevnej rossijskoj Vivliofiki* [Continuation of the Ancient Russian Vivliophica], tom X, Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk: St. Petersburg, 1795.

16. Heers, Jacques, *Esclaves et domestiques au Moyen Âge dans le monde méditerranéen*. Collection Pluriel fondée par Georges Liébert dirigée par Pierre Vallaud, Paris: Fayard, 1996. 296 p.

17. Heers, Jacques, *Gênes au XV^e siècle. Activité économique et problèmes sociaux*. École pratique des hautes études. VI^e section centre de recherches historiques. Affaires et gens d'affaires XXIV, S.E.V.P.E.N. 1961. 741 p.

18. Hellie, Richard, *Slavery in Russia 1450–1725*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1982. 776 p.

19. *Hoženie za tri morja Afanasija Nikitina* [A Journey Beyond Three Seas of Athanasius Nikitin]. Redakcionnaja kolegija: V.P. Kozlov, L.M. Sorina,

G.S. Gorevoj, L.A. Timošina, S.N. Kisterev. Arhivnyj otdel Tverskoj oblasti: Tver', 2003.

20. Imhaus, Brunehilde, *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia 1300–1510*, Roma: Il Veltro editrice, 1997. 588 p.

21. Jacobi, Nobilis Dani Friderici II. Regis Legati, Hodoeporicon Ruthenicum = *Jakob Ul'fel'dt, Putešestvie v Rossiju* [The Travel to Russia] (otv. red. Dž. Lind, A. L. Horoškevič). *Studia Historica. Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury*: Moskva, 2002. 615 p.

22. Korpela, Jukka, "...and they took countless captives along" – Finnic Captives and East European Slave Trade during the Middle Ages. *Slavery, Ransom and Liberation in Russia and the Steppe Area, 1500–2000*. Edited by Christoph Wizenrath (Ashgate (in press(a))).

23. Korpela, Jukka, The Baltic Finnic People in the Medieval and Pre-Modern Eastern European Slave Trade. *Russian History – Histoire Russe* 41, 2014, pp. 85–117.

24. Korpela, Jukka, *Idän orjakauppa. Ihmisryöstöt Suomesta, Karjalasta ja Pohjois-Venäjältä viikinkiajalta uuden ajan alkuun*. SKS: Helsinki (in press(b)).

25. Korpela, Jukka, North-Western "Others" in Medieval Rus'ian Chronicles. *Učenyje Zapiski Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo Universiteta* [Scientific Notes of the Petrozavodsk State University], 2 (93) (2008).

26. Marmon, Shaun, *Eunuchs and Sacred Boundaries in Islamic Society*. Studies in Middle Eastern History. New York – Oxford, Oxford University Publ., 1995. 162 p.

27. *Materialy po istorii rusško-mongol'skih otnošenij. Russko-mongol'skie otnošenija 1607–1636*. Sbornik dokumentov [Materials on the History of Russian-Mongolian Relations. Russian-Mongolian Relations 1607–1636. Collection of documents]. Sostaviteli: L.M. Gataullina, M.I. Gol'man, G.I. Slesarčuk. Otv. redaktory: I.Ya. Zlatkin, N.V. Ustjugov. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj litaratury, 1959.

28. *Materialy po istorii uzbekskoj, tadžikskoj i turkmenskoj SSR. Čast' I: Torgovlja s Moskovskim gosudarstvom i meždunarodnoe položenie Srednej Azii v XVI–XVI vv.* [Materials on the History of Uzbek, Tajik, and Turkmen SSR. Part I: Trade with the Moscow State and the International Situation of Central Asia in the 16th–17th centuries] Trudy istoriko-arheografičeskogo instituta i instituta vostokovedenija AN SSSR, Tom VI. Materialy po istorii narodov SSSR, vypusk 3 [Proceedings of the Historical-archaeographic Institute and the Institute of Oriental Studies, AS USSR. Volume VI. Materials on the History of the Peoples of the USSR, Issue 3]. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1933, Part I.

29. Michalonis Litvani De moribus Tartarorum, Litvanorum et Moschorum, Fragmina decem. Multiplici Historia referta. Izvlečenija iz kočinenija Mihalona Litvina: "O nraвах tartar, litovec i moskvitjan." [Excerpts from the Writings of Michalon Litvin: "On the Mores of Tartars, Lithuanians, and Muscovites"]. Perevod s latinskago E. Šestakova. Otdelenie pjatoe. Izledovanija akty na inostrannyh jazykah po časti drevnej istorii russkago prava v perevodah i izvlečenijah. *Arhiv istoriko-juridičeskijh svedenij odnosjaščihsja do Rossii izdavaemyj Nikolaem Kalačovym*, Kniga 2:2 [Archive of Historical and Legal Information pertaining to Russia published by Nikolay Kalachov, Book 2:2]. Moscow, 1854.

30. Mukminova, R.G. *Social'naja differenciacija naselenija gorodov Uzbekistana v XV–XVI vv* [Social Differentiation of the Uzbekistan Cities'

Population in the 15th–16th centuries], Taškent, Izd. FAN uzbekskoj SSR, 1985. 135 p.

31. Muljukin, A.S. *Priezd inostrancev v Moskovskoe gosudarstvo. Iz istorii russkago prava XVI i XVII vekov* [The Arrival of Foreigners in Muscovy. From the Russian Law History of the 16th and 17th centuries]. St. Petersburg, Trud, 1909. 292 p.

32. Novosel'skij, A.A. *Bor'ba Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Tatarami v pervoj polovine XVII veka* [The Moscow State's Struggle with the Tatars in the first half of the 17th century], Moscow–Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1948. 448 p.

33. Pamjatniki diplomatičeskikh snošenij Moskovskago gosudarstva so Šveciej 1556–1586 gg. [Monuments of Diplomatic Relations of the Moscow State with Sweden 1556–1586]. Izadany pod redakcieju N.P. Lihačeva i V.V. Majkova. Pamjatniki diplomatičeskikh snošenij drevnej Rossii s deržavami inostrannymi po vysočajšemu povelenu *izdannye Imperatorskim Russkim Istoričeskim Obščestvom* (= RIO), tom 129 [Monuments of the Ancient Russian Diplomatic Relations with Foreign Powers Issued on the Highest Command by the Imperial Russian Historical Society (= RIO), Volume 129], St. Petersburg, 1910.

34. Pamjatniki diplomatičeskikh i torgovyh snošenij Moskovskoj Rusi s Persiej [Monuments of the Diplomatic and Commercial Relations of the Moscow Russia with Persia]. Izdany pod redakcieju N.I. Veselovskago, Tom 1. Tsarstvovanie Fedora Ionoviča [Volume 1. The Reign of Fyodor Ivanovich]. *Trudy vostočnago otdelenija imperatorskago russkago arheologičeskago obščestva* [Proceedings of the Eastern Division of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society]. Vol. XX. St. Petersburg, 1890.

35. Patriaršaja ili Nikonovskaja letopis'. *Polnoe sobranie russkih letopisej* 9–13 [Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles. Vol. 9–13. Patriarchal or Nikon Chronicle], AN SSSR. Moscow, AN SSSR, 1965.

36. Piscovaja i perepisnaja knigi XVII veka po nižnemu Novgorodu. Izdannija arheografičeskoj kommissiej [Scribe and Census Book of the 17th century on the Nizhny Novgorod. Published by Archeographical Commission]. *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka izdavaemaja imperatorskoju arheografičeskoju kommissieju* tom XVII [Russian Historical Library published by the Imperial Archaeological Commission, Volume 17], St. Petersburg, 1896.

37. *Piscovaja kniga kazanskogo uezda 1602–1603 godov* [Cadastres of the Kazan District 1602–1603]. Publikacija teksta, Kazan, Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo universiteta, 1978.

38. *Piscovaja kniga kazanskogo uezda 1647–1656 godov* [Cadastres of the Kazan District 1647–1656], RAN Institut Rossiiskoi istorii – Kazanskij gosudarstvennyj universitet – Institut istorii AN Respubliki Tatarstan. Moscow, 2001.

39. *Piscovye i perepisnye knigi Novgoroda Velikogo XVII – načala XVIII vv.* Sbornik dokumentov [Scribe and Census Books of Novgorod the Great of the 17th – early 18th centuries. Collection of documents]. Sostavitel' I.Ju. Ankudinov, St. Petersburg: Dmitrij Bulanin, 2003. 664 p.

40. *Piscovye i perepisnye knigi Staroj Rusy konca XV–XVII vv.* [Scribe and Census Books of Staraya Russa of the end of the 15th–17th centuries]. Publikaciju podgotovili I.Ju. Ankudinov, K.V. Baranov, A.A. Selin. Sostavitel' I.Ju. Ankudinov, Moscow, Rukopisnye pamjatniki Drevnej Rusi, 2009. 534 p.

41. Piscovye knigi goroda Kazani 1565–1568 gg. i 1646. Materialy po istorii Tatarskoj ASSR [Cadastrs of Kazan of 1565–1568 and 1646. Materials on the History of the Tatar ASSR]. *Trudy istoriko-arheografičeskago instituta AN SSSR*, tom IV. Materialy po istorii narodov SSSR, Is. 2 [Proceedings of the Historical-archaeographic Institute of the USSR, Volume 4. Materials on the History of the Peoples of the USSR, Issue 2]. Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1932.

42. Posol'stvo v Persiju knjazja Aleksandra Fedoroviča Žirovogo-Zavekina [The Embassy to Persia of the Prince Alexander F. Zhironovoy-Zavekin] (red. N. Veselovskij). *Trudy voctočnago otdelenija imperatorskago russkago arheologičeskago obščestva* [Proceedings of the Eastern Division of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society]. Vol. XXII. St. Petersburg, 1892.

43. *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*. Documents et recherches sur l'économie des pays Byzantins, Islamiques et Slaves et leur relations commerciales au moyen âge sous la direction de Paul Lemerle I, II, IV. École pratique des hautes études – Sorbonne, VI^e section. Tome premier 1329–1399; Tome deuxième 1400–1430; Tome troisième 1431–1463. Par F. Thiriet, Paris: Mouton & co La Haye, 1958–1961.

44. Relation von Odert Hastter's und Hinrich Priessman's Gesandtschaft nach Moskau, wohin sie von König Sigismund abgefertigt worden Anno 1597. Zu die jetzige Schreibweise übertragen von Georg v. Brevern. *Archiv für die Geschichte Liv-, Esth- und Curlands*, herausgegeben von Dr. F.G. Bunge. Zweiter Band. Zweite, durch neue Artikel vermehrte Auflage, Reval: Franz Kluge, 1861.

45. *Rerum Moscoviticarum commentarij Sigismundi Liberi Baronis in Herberstain, Neyperg & Guettenhag: Quibus Russiae ac Metropolis eius Moscoviae descriptio...* Basileae, 1571.

46. Rotman, Youval, *Byzantine Slavery and the Mediterranean World*. Translated by Jane Marie Todd, Cambridge (Mass.). London: Harvard University Press, 2009. 307 p.

47. Šumilov, M.M. *Torgovlja i tamožennoe delo v Rossii. Stanovlenie, osnovnye etapy pazvitija IX–XVII vv.* [Trade and Customs Business in Russia. Formation, the Main Stages of Development in the 9th–17th centuries] St. Petersburg, Bulanin, 2006. 472 p.

48. Tiberg, Erik, *Moscow, Livonia and the Hanseatic League 1487–1550*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Baltica Stockholmiensia 15, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1995. 290 p.

49. *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa A.D. 1325–1354*. Translated with revisions and notes from the Arabic text edited by C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti by H.A.R. Gibb, Vol. I–III, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1993; The translation completed with annotations by C. F. Beckingham, Vol. IV, London: The Hakluyt Society, 1994; Index to volumes I–IV compiled by A.D.H. Bivar, Vol. V, London, The Hakluyt Society, 2000.

50. Verlinden, Charles, Ist mittelalterliche Sklaverei ein bedeutsamer demographischer Faktor gewesen? *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 66:2, 1979, pp. 153–173.

51. Zapisnaja kniga krepostnym aktam XV–XVI vv. Javlennym v Novgorode d'jaku D. Aljab'evu [Record Book of the Serfs Acts of the 15–16 centuries. Presented in Novgorod to deacon D. Alyabiev]. Izdannie arheografičeskaj kommissii. *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka izdavaemaja impera-*

torskoju arheograficeskoju kommissieju tom XVII [Russian Historical Library published by the Imperial Archaeological Commission, Volume 17], Sanktpeterburg, 1898.

About the author: Jukka Korpela – Dr. h.c., Head of Department of Geographical and Historical Studies, University of Eastern Finland, Ph.D. (History), Professor (80101, Yliopistokatu 2, Joensuu, Finland); jukka.korpela@uef.fi

КРЕЩЕННЫЕ И НЕКРЕЩЕННЫЕ «НЕМЦЫ» В МОСКОВИТСКОМ ОБЩЕСТВЕ XVI ВЕКА

Юкка Корпела

(Университет Восточной Финляндии)

Восточноевропейская торговля рабами была крупным бизнесом. Он имел древние истоки, и, по крайней мере, начиная с эпохи викингов, тысячи рабов доставлялись ежегодно из Крыма, Казани, Астрахани на рынки Центральной Азии, Малой Азии, Средиземноморского региона и, наконец, даже в Индию. Вероятно, войны XV и XVI веков способствовали увеличению числа северных рабов на рынка Московии и Поволжья.

Рабы, поставляемые на продажу, делились на две основные категории. К первой категории относилась ординарная и дешевая рабочая сила. Вторая категория представляла собой чрезвычайные случаи приобретения товаров роскоши, то есть покупку (белых) рабынь для гаремов знатных родов.

Цель настоящей статьи заключается в том, чтобы осветить разницу между крещеными и некрещеными людьми в контексте работорговли. Ценность данного исследования подчеркивается тем, что исторические источники отчетливо акцентировали внимание на религиозном аспекте работорговли. Поэтому данный феномен требует подробного разьяснения.

Это явление относится только к позднему XVI веку. Становление централизованной государственности вызвало изменение восприятия крещения в качестве критерия подчинения правителю, что неизбежно привело к официальному запрету на торговлю крещеными рабами.

С точки зрения автора, следует обратить внимание на следующие обстоятельства:

1) Работорговля белыми (“немецкими”) девушками представляла собой проблему с самого ее появления, поскольку государственная администрация не нуждалась в этом виде товара.

2) Изначально практика работорговли вызывала обеспокоенность у церкви, но не у светских правителей. Но с внедрением нового экономического мышления, разработавшего концепцию государственной экономики и воспринимавшего жителей государства в качестве средств производства и налогоплательщиков; появилась необходимость в ограничении работорговли.

3) Религия стала критерием формирования государственности и подчинения правителю, что неизбежно вызвало изменение в квалификации товаров работорговли.

4) Несмотря на установление ряда ограничений, торговцы не уделяли столь значительного внимания религиозным аспектам работорговли; и, следовательно, они продолжили торговлю крещеными рабами.

Ключевые слова: восточноевропейская работорговля, рынки Московии и Поволжья, «немцы», крещеные и некрещеные рабы, государственная экономика.

Сведения об авторе: Юкка Корпела – почетный доктор, руководитель департамента географических и исторических наук, университет Восточной Финляндии, Ph.D. (история), профессор (80101, Yliopistokatu, 2, Йюэнсуу, Финляндия); jukka.korpela@uef.fi