1. RUSSIA AND THE HORDE

1.1. Different points of view

Let us remind the reader that there are two different viewpoints that concern the interactions between Russia and the Horde.

The first one was introduced by the XVIII century historians (Miller, Bayer and Schlezer); that is the very version that is taught in schools nowadays. According to this version, the entire state of Russia, originally populated by the Slavs, fell into the hands of foreign invaders (the Mongols and the Tartars) in the first half of the XIII century; they presumably came from the faraway steppes where one finds Mongolia nowadays. Let us remind the readers right away that the state of Mongolia was formed as late as in the XX century. Its level of technical and military development remains rather low to this very day. This can hardly be regarded as solid argumentation, but these days one finds it next to impossible to imagine that this country had been one of the most powerful aggressors in the Middle Ages, an empire that had conquered “half of the world”, whose influence had reached as far as Egypt and Western Europe. One can only assume that this powerful empire had degraded in some strange way. Scaligerian history offers us lots of similar examples: kingdom of Babylon fallen into oblivion, the decline of the Roman Empire, mediaeval Europe sliding into barbarism and ignorance in the dark Middle Ages and so on.

However, there is another point of view. The matter is that the consensual theory about the Mongolian conquest and the Mongolian yoke isn’t supported by any Russian source whatsoever, which doesn’t preclude anyone from teaching it in schools and refer to Russian chronicles for support. Some historians were of the opinion that Russia and the Horde had been two independent states that co-existed around the same time as empires equal in their power, whose balance of forces would shift one way or another over the course of time. The famous historian L. N. Gumilev, for instance, used to write about it ([211]).

We find it needless to cite Gumilev’s argumentation herein – interested readers can study his works themselves. We must however note that we strongly disagree with his so-called “passionarity theory”. His opinion is that this mysterious passionarity results in cyclic recurrence of historical events. However, this “cyclic recurrence” is of a phantom nature and results from the errors inherent in the Scaligerian chronology. Nevertheless, Gumilev must be credited with having been the first one to declare openly that the theory of the Mongol and Tartar yoke in Russia in its consensual Millerian version isn’t based on any
documental information whatsoever, since neither Russian, nor foreign historical sources confirm it in any way at all. In particular, Gumilev made a very reasonable observation in one of his public lectures that were read in the USSR AS Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy in particular and attended by one of the authors in the early 80’s, namely, that the entire theory of the Mongol and Tartar yoke in Russia dates to the XVIII century; its authors had been foreign (Bayer, Miller and Schlezer), and they tailored their theory to fit the popular theories about the alleged “slavish origins of the Russians”.

History of the Cossacks by A. A. Gordeyev ([183]) can also be regarded as an important contribution into the analysis of the relations between Russia and the Horde. Gordeyev demonstrated that the predecessors of the Russian Cossacks had once been part of the “Tartar and Mongol” army, basing his research on the Western European descriptions of Mongolia and on a number of Russian sources.

Our own study of historical sources, Russian as well as foreign, has brought us to the conclusion that both Gumilev and Gordeyev were on the right track; however, they didn’t manage to comprehend the issue in question in its entirety.

1.2. Our hypothesis formulated in brief

The key to the mysteries of Russian history is the simple fact that the Mediaeval Mongolia and Russia were really the same state. In particular, we are referring to the following hypothesis of ours.

1) The mediaeval Mongolia was a multinational state whose borders had initially been the same as those of the Russian Empire. Russia has never been conquered by any foreign invaders. The original population of Russia consisted of the same ethnic groups as one finds inhabiting its territory to this day – the Russians, the Tartars etc.

2) The very name “Mongolia” (or “Mogolia”) is likely to be a derivative of the Russian word for “many” (mnogo), which is also related to such Russian words as mnogo, mosch, mog and mnozhestvo (“many”, “might”, a past tense form of the verb “can” and “multitude”, respectively. Alternatively, it may be a derivative of the Greek word megalion, or “the great”, according to N. M. Karamzin and a number of other authors; however, it is possible that the word megalion also derives from the Slavic word mnogo. We don’t find the names “Mongolia” or “Mogolia” in any Russian historical sources – however, said sources often mention “The Great Russia”. It is a known fact that foreigners had used the word “Mongolia” for referring to Russia. We are of the opinion that this name is merely a translation of the Russian word for “great”.

Linguists consider the term “Velikorossiya” (or “Velikaya Rossiya”) to be a carbon copy of the Greek formula “Mega Rossiya”. The Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language by M. Fasmer, for instance, tells us that the term “The Great Russia” (“Μεγαη Ρωσ-σια”) was coined by the Constantinople patriarchy ([866], Volume 1, page 289). However, the origins of the word may just as well be Russian. At any rate, what we see is that the old Greek name for Russia used to begin with the word “Mega” – a possible derivative of the Russian words mog, mosch and mnogo as mentioned above. They may have transformed into “Mogolia” and then “Mongolia” over the course of time.

3) The so-called “yoke of the Tartars and the Mongols” is a wrong definition of a specific period in Russian history when the entire population of the country was separated into two primary strata – the civil population ruled by the Princes, and the Horde (or the regular army) ruled by military commanders (Russians, Tartars etc). The Horde had obeyed the power of the Czar, or the Khan, who was also the head of the state. There were therefore two active administrations in Russia during that period: military (functioning within the Horde), and civil (local).

4) It is a commonly known fact that Russia had once paid tribute to the Horde – a tenth of all property and a tenth of all populace. Nowadays it is presumed to prove Russia’s dependent position under the yoke of the Tartars. We are of the opinion that this tribute should really be called a tax paid by the people in order to keep a regular army, a. k. a. the Horde, twined with the obligatory recruitment of young people. Cossacks would get drafted in childhood and never return home; this recruitment was the very “tribute of blood” that had allegedly been paid to the Tartars by the Russians. This practice had also existed in Turkey up until the XVII century, being the furthest thing from the “tribute paid to the conqueror by an enslaved nation”. The Empire used to keep a reg-
ular army in this manner; refusal to pay would naturally ensue punitive expeditions sent to the rebellious regions. These expeditions are what historians present as “Tartar raids” nowadays; they would obviously lead to violent excesses and executions at times.

5) The so-called “conquest of Russia by the Mongols and the Tartars” is of a figmental nature. Nobody had conquered Russia – the phenomenon known under the name of the “yoke” nowadays had really been an internal process that involved the consolidation of Russian principalities and the aggrandizement of the Khans’ (Czars’) power. We shall discuss this “conquest”, or unification, of Russia that took place in the XIV century below.

6) The remnants of the regular Russian army (Horde) have survived until our day, still known under the name of the Cossacks. The opinion of certain historians that the Cossack troops consisted of serfs who either ran away or were deported to the Don region in the XVI-XVII century quite simply doesn’t hold water. In the XVII century the Cossacks lived all across Russia – the sources that date to the epoch in question mention Cossacks from the regions of Yaik, Don, Volga ([183], Volume 2, pages 53 and 80), then Terek, Dnepr, Zaporozhye and Meshchera ([183], Volume 2, page 76), Pskov ([84], page 73), Ryazan ([362], Volume 5, Chapter 4, page 230; also [363], Volume 5, page 215), as well as city Cossacks, or ones residing in cities ([183] and [436]). One also finds mentions of Cossacks from the Horde, the Azov region, the Nogai Steppe etc ([362], Volume 5, page 231).

We must inform the reader that, according to The Cossack Dictionary and Handbook ([347], see under “The Zaporozhye Cossacks”), the Dnepr or Zaporozhye Cossacks were known as the Horde Cossacks before the XVI century. Furthermore, “the Lower Zaporozhye was known as the yurt (homeland) of the Crimean Cossacks” ([347], page 257). This once again confirms our hypothesis that the Cossacks (whose actual name might derive of the Russian word “skakat”, “to ride”. Also, the word yurt translates as “dwelling”, “homeland” etc; Cossacks frequently used the word in the names of their settlements and encampments. The Mongolian word yurt may a possible derivative of “orda” or “rod” (“horde” and “clan” or “genus”, respectively); it is a Cossack term. One sees the it in such sentences as “the Zaporozhye Cossacks didn’t let their former interamnian yurt between Dnepr and Bug fall into the hands of the Turks… apparently, the governorship of Crimea didn’t consider the severance of official duty bond with its Cossacks in the Horde to be a sufficient reason for depriving them of their old yurt” ([347], page 256).

We could also try to find out about the Cossacks mentioned by N. M. Karamzin. It would be expedient to use the name index compiled by P. M. Stroyev for this purpose ([362], Volume 4, page 323). We find the following:

Cossacks from Dnepr, the Cherkasses from Kanev, Cossacks from the Lesser Russia, the Zaporozhye, Don, Volga, Meshchera, Gorodetsk (also known as Kasimovtsy), the Horde, the Azov Region, the Nogai Steppe, Terek, Yaik and Perekop ([347], page 254), Belgorod ([347], page 254) and the cities.

Nowadays there are Tartars in the Nogai and the Kasim regions – could Karamzin have called them Cossacks? Apparently, the two words were synonymous in the Middle Ages, by and large.

It appears that “as late as in the end of the XVI century, the Zaporozhye Cossacks had still seen no reason to be hostile towards their neighbours and past allies. The Cossacks had left the Khans, since the latter had been falling under the Turkish influence. The two parties had initially coexisted peacefully; the Cossacks would even take part in the competition between the political parties at the Crimean court… however, the influence of the Turks over the Khans had become too great, and the former kinship with the Cossacks was forgotten… the Cossacks were finding it more difficult with the year to deal with the Khans; however, the final severance wouldn’t follow until much later” ([347], page 256).

7) The royal dynasty of Ivan Kalita (Caliph) regnant in the XVI-XVI century is the dynasty of the Horde’s Czar Khans, and can therefore be called the Horde dynasty. This is the term used by the authors of the present book; we must however reiterate that it had been a Russian dynasty and not a foreign one.

8) The unique Horde period in history of Russia spans the XIII-XVI century, ending with the Great Strife of the early XVII century. The last ruler of this dynasty had been the Czar-Khan Boris “Godunov”.

9) The Great Strife and the civil war of the early XVII century ended with the ascension of a princi-
pally new dynasty – the Romanovs, who came from the West of Russia – allegedly, from Pskov. The old dynasty had been defeated in the civil war of the XVII century; this signifies the end of the Horde epoch. However, some remnants of the Horde had existed as independent states up until the XVIII century. The last one had been conquered by the Romanovs in the war with “Pougachev”. A new epoch began in the XVII century; the one that had preceded it became declared the “famous Great Yoke of the Mongols and the Tartars”. Scaligerian-Millerian history misdates this change of epochs to the end of the XV century.

10) The new dynasty of the Romanovs needed to strengthen its authority, since other descendants of the old Horde dynasty had still existed and made claims for the thron. The Khans of Crimea and other surviving descendants of the Horde Czars from the Cossack clans must have been among them. The Romanovian dynasty was therefore faced with the necessity of presenting the Khans as the historical enemies of Russia; this resulted in the creation of the historical theory about the military opposition between Russia and the Horde, or the Russians and the Tartars. Romanovs and their tame historians have declared the Horde dynasty of the Russian Czars alien and “Tartar”. This has changed the entire concept of the Horde epoch in ancient Russian history; the Romanovs have planted the “enemy figure” – a foe that needed to be crushed. Thus, having altered no actual historical facts, they have greatly distorted the role of the Horde in Russian history.

11) The Tartars have naturally been one of the ethnic groups living in Russia, as is the case today. However, the contraposition of the Russians and the Tartars as two opposing forces, the latter the victors and the former, the defeated party, is an “invention” of later historians introduced in the XVII-XVIII century. They were the ones who had distorted Russian history and thought up the scenario of “Slavic Russia” conquered by the “Tartar Horde”.

12) The famous White Horde can be identified as the White Russia, or Byelorussia. A propos, this name had implied a much greater territory than that of the modern Byelorussia; the entire Moscovia was known as the White Russia in the XV-XVI century, for example ([758], page 64). This might be the reason why the Czar in Moscow had been known as the White Czar. The Volga region had been the domain of the Golden Horde; it had also been known as Siberia in those days, hence the name of Simbirsk, a town on the Volga. The third most important Horde was known as the Blue Horde; its territories had included the modern Ukraine and the Crimea. The toponymy of the name might have something to do with “Blue Waters”, cf. the name of river Sinyukha (“The Blue”), a tributary of the Southern Bug ([347], page 257).

13) The distortion of the old Russian history had led to several geographical shifts that concerned a number of well-known mediaeval names. In particular, Mongolia had travelled a long way to the East, and the peoples inhabiting the territory in question were “designated to be Mongolian”. Historians remain convinced about the fact that modern Mongolians descended from the very same Mongols that had conquered the entire Europe and Egypt in the Middle Ages. However, insofar as we know, there wasn’t a single ancient chronicle found anywhere in Mongolia that would mention the expansion campaign of the Great Batu-Khan and his conquest of a land called Russia far in the West. The name of Siberia had followed Mongolia eastwards.

The readers must become accustomed to the uncommon concept that geographical names would drift from place to place in the Middle Ages; this process had only stopped with the invention of the printing press and the mass production of uniform books and maps, which had naturally led to the “solidification” of the names used for nations, cities, rivers and mountains. This process had more or less finished by the XVII-XVIII century, when the prototypes of the modern textbooks were published.

We shall stop here for a short while; the key elements of our hypothesis about Mongolia and Russia-Horde being a single state in the XIII-XVI century. Let us turn to the documents now.

2. **THE ORIGINS OF THE MONGOLS AND THE TARTARS**

2.1. Ethnic composition of the Mongolian troops

Western documents contain direct indications that the name “Tartars” had once been used for referring to the Russians. For instance: “Roussillon’s documents
often mention ‘White Tartars’ alongside the ‘Yellow Tartars’. The names of the ‘White Tartars’ (Loukiya, Marfa, Maria, Katerina and so forth) betray their Slavic origins” ([674], page 40).

We find out that even before the “conquest” of Russia, “the Mongolian troops contained a number of Russians led by their chieftain Plaskinya” ([183], Volume 1, page 22).

“Rashed ad-Din mentions that Tokhta-Khan’s army had included ‘Russian, Cherkassian, Kipchakian, Majarian and other regiments’. The same author tells us that it was a Russian horseman from Tokhta-Khan’s army who had wounded Nogai in the battle of 1300… Al-Omari, the Arabic author, reports that ‘the sultans of this country have armies of Cherkasses, Russians and Yasses’” ([674], pages 40-41).

It is known that the Russian Princes accompanied by their troops used to be part of the Tartar army, no less ([674], page 42). “A. N. Nasonov had been of the opinion that already in the first years of the Great Yoke, the darougi (“Mongolian” troop leaders) had been recruiting Russians from the ranks of the populace governed by a local baskak (governor-general)” ([674], page 42).

Let us point out the obvious similarity between the words “darougi” and “drougi” or “drouzhinniki” – this is how the elite troops of the Princes were called in the Russian army. They would obviously be in charge of recruiting new soldiers – which makes them likely to be identified as the “Mongolian” darougi.

Historians are of the opinion that the participation of the Russians in the Tartar army had been of a compulsory character – however, they still admit that “the obligatory service in the Tartar army must have happened at the initial phase; further on, Russians participated as mercenaries” ([674], page 43).

Ibn-Batouta tells us “there were many Russians in Saray Berk” ([674], page 45). Furthermore, “Russians had constituted the majority of the Golden Horde’s military personnel and workforce in general” ([183], Volume 1, page 39).

Let us reflect for a moment and imagine just how nonsensical the entire situation is. The Mongolian victors arm their “Russian slaves”, who serve in the army of the invaders without any qualms whatsoever, and “constitute its majority” on top of that. Bear in mind that the Russians had presumably just been defeated in an open battle. Even in Scaligerian history we don’t see any examples of masters arming slaves; the victorious party would, on the contrary, seize all the weapons of the defeated enemy. In all known cases of former enemies serving in the armies of their conquerors, the former had been a puny minority, which would naturally be considered untrustworthy.

What do we learn about the composition of Batu-Khan’s troops? Let us quote: “Batu-Khan’s army was described in the reminiscences of the Hungarian king and his letter to the Pope… The king had written the following: ‘When the entire land of Hungary was devastated after the plague-like invasion of the Mongols, all sorts of infidel tribes had gathered round it like wolves around a sheep-fold – Russians, Brodniki from the East [a Slavic tribe from the Azov region – Transl.], Bulgarians and other heretics from the South’” ([183], Volume 1, page 31).

Let us ask a simple question: where are the Mongols? The king mentions Slavic tribes exclusively – the Russians, the Brodniki and the Bulgarians. If we are to translate the word “Mongol” from the King’smissive, we shall end up with the invasion of “the great (Mongol = Megalion) tribes from the East” as mentioned above. We can therefore recommend the readers to translate the word “Mongol” into “the great” upon encounter, which shall leave us with a reasonable and understandable text with no mention of faraway invaders from a distant land near the Chinese border. A propos, none of the documents contain a single reference to China.

“The borders [of Mongolia – Auth.] needed to be guarded against Poland, Lithuania and Hungary in the West. Batu-Khan had founded military settlements for the observation and protection of borders; the settlers had formerly been residents of Russian principalities… These settlements had guarded the entire territory of the Horde from the West. More military settlements were founded in the neighbouring Mongolian uluses (principalities) of the Great Khan and the Khan of Central Asia; they were located along the banks of Terek and Yaik… among the Terek settlers there were Russians, tribes from the Northern Caucasus, Cherkasses from Pyatigorsk and the Alanians… The strongest line of defence… was needed to be built on the west bank of the Don… and in the North-Western principalities, the so-called Chervonniy Yar…
this region became the new homeland of a large group of ethnic Russians… There were lines of postal communication between Saray, the capital, and faraway provinces in every direction, their length reaching thousands and thousands of miles… there were *yamy* [courier stations – *Transl.*] every 25 verst [1 verst = 3500 ft. – *Transl.*]… there were boat and ferry services on every river, run by the Russians… the Mongols had no historians of their own” ([183], Volume 1, pages 41-42). The word *yama* gave birth to the word *yamshchik* (courier). This postal communication system had existed until the end of the XIX century, and only became obsolete with the introduction of railroads.

One can therefore see that the Russians had occupied key positions everywhere in the Golden Horde, or the Mongolian state, controlling roads and communications. Where were the Mongols? Giving orders, as historians are telling us? In that case, why weren’t they overthrown by their armed slaves, who had also constituted the majority of the Mongolian army, controlled roads, ferries and so on? This appears very odd indeed. Wouldn’t it make more sense to assume that the description in question relates the state of affairs in Russia, which hadn’t been conquered by any invaders whatsoever?

Plano Carpini doesn’t mention a single Mongolian governor in the account of his visit to Kiev, presumably recently conquered by the Mongols. Vladimir Yeikovich remained the local military commander, which is the position that he had occupied before Batu-Khan’s conquest ([183], Volume 1, page 42). The first Tartars were seen by Carpini when he had already passed Kanev. We learn of Russians occupying positions of power as well; Mongolians transform into ephemeral apparitions that no one ever sees.

### 2.2. How many Mongols were there? Mongols as seen by contemporaries. Mongolian and Russian attire of the epoch under study

History textbooks as used in schools are trying to convince us that the Mongols and the Tartars had been wild nomadic peoples with no literacy, who have swarmed the entire Russia and arrived from somewhere near the Chinese border on horses. It is presumed that there were “lots and lots” of these invaders. On the other hand, modern historians report things that contradict this point of view totally. The Tartars and the Mongols only occupy the top governing positions in their army; besides, there are “few of them” – the majority is Russian, *qv* above. It becomes perfectly unclear just how a handful of savages on horses could have conquered large civilized countries up to Egypt and made the inhabitants of said countries part of their army.

Let us turn to the records left by the contemporaries of the Mongols. Gordeyev gives a good overview of references to Mongols from the Western sources in [183].

“In 1252-1253 William Rubricus, envoy of Louis IX, was passing through Crimea accompanied by his entourage, on his way from Constantinople. He had paid a visit to Batu-Khan’s camp and proceeded onwards into Mongolia. He recorded the following impressions of the Lower Don region: ‘Russian settlements permeate the entire Tartaria; the Russians have mixed with the Tartars and taken to their customs, likewise garments and lifestyle… The kind of headdress worn by the local women is similar to what the French women wear; the hems of dresses are decorated with fur – ermine, squirrel and otter. Men wear kaftans and other short-skirted attire, with lambskin hats on their heads; their overcoats resemble their German counterparts’ ([363], Volume 5, Chapter 4, commentary 400. N. M. Karamzin tells us directly that “the XIII century travellers couldn’t even distinguish between the clothes worn in Russia and in the West” ([363], Volume 5, Chapter 4, page 210).

### 3. THE “TARTAR AND MONGOL CONQUEST” AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

As we mentioned in the Introduction, historians report the following:

“At the very dawn of the Horde’s existence, an Orthodox church was built in the Khan’s headquarters. As military settlements were founded, Orthodox churches were built everywhere, all across the territory governed by the Horde, with the clergy called thereto and Metropolitan Cyril relocated to Kiev from Novgorod, thus completing the restoration of the pan-Russian ecclesiastical hierarchy… Russian Princes were
divided into Great Princes, Princes and Vice-Princes; there were also the Ulus Prince [Urus = Russia? – Auth.], the Horde Prince, the Tartar Prince, the Prince of Roads and the Prince of Folk… The Metropolitan had been given a great many privileges by the Mongolians – while the power of a prince was limited to his principality, the Metropolitan’s had been recognized in every Russian principality, including the tribes living in the steppes, or the actual domains of the nomadic uluses” ([183], Volume 1, page 37).

Our commentary is as follows: such actions from the part of the Mongol invaders, pagans to the very core, according to Scaligerian-Millerian history, is most bizarre indeed. The position of the Orthodox Church is even harder to understand, since it has always urged the people to resist the invaders, which is a known fact insofar as the veracious historical period is concerned. The Mongols are the single exception – they have received the support of the Orthodox church from the very beginning of the conquest. Metropolitan Cyril comes to join Batu-Khan in occupied Kiev from Novgorod, which had not even been conquered at that time, according to historians. Our opponents will definitely start telling us about the corruption that reigned in the Russian church, and that the entire nation, princes, common folk and all, were either bought or broken. Basically, this is the core of the concept introduced by the XVIII century historians and shared by their successors. We think this highly unlikely.

We suggest a different approach to Russian history. It suffices to translate the word “Mongol” as “the great” – this instantly eliminates all absurdities, leaving us with quotidian realities of a normal state (and a great one, at that).

The hypothesis about the Mongols originating from the borderlands of the faraway China appears to be a rather late one. The mediaeval Hungarian author of the miniature one sees in fig. 3.1, for instance, draws the “Mongols” that lead captives to the Horde
as Slavic characters dressed in Russian clothes, whereas their captives look distinctly European. The “Mongolian” conquerors have only been drawn “in the Chinese fashion” since the introduction of the theory about the “Mongol and Tartar Yoke” (qv in the XVIII century drawing shown in fig. 3.2).

According to N. M. Karamzin, “the Tartar supremacy resulted in the... ascension of the Russian clergy into prominence, the multiplication of monasteries and church lands – the latter neither paid taxes to the Prince, nor to the Horde, and flourished” ([363], Volume 5, Chapter 4, page 208; also [362], Volume 5, Chapter 4, page 223). Furthermore, “only a few of the monasteries that exist until this day have been founded before or after the Tartars; most of them date to their epoch” ([363], Volume 5, Chapter 4).

We see that most Russian monasteries were founded in the epoch of the “Mongolian” conquest. This is understandable; many Cossacks would take the vows after discharge from military service. This has been customary as recently as in the XVII century ([183]). Since the Cossacks were the military power of the Horde, the construction of many monasteries in the epoch of the Horde is perfectly natural from the point of view of the state as well; the veterans needed and deserved rest. The monasteries were therefore very wealthy and exempt from taxes ([363], Volume 5, columns 208-209; also [362], Volume 5, Chapter 4, column 223). They even had the right of tax-free trade (ibid).

4.

COSSACKS AND THE HORDE

4.1. The Cossacks were the regular army of Russia (Horde)

Let us reiterate: the Cossacks had constituted the armed force of the Horde, or the “Mongolian” (Great) Empire. As we demonstrate herein, it is for this very reason that the Cossacks had lived all across the country and not just in the borderlands; the latter has been the case from the XVIII century and on. As the civil polity changed, the Cossack lands that lay adjacent to the border of the empire had kept their initial mili-
tary character to a greater extent. Hence the frontier geography of the Cossack settlements, which marked the borders of the Russian Empire in the XIX-XX century. As for the Cossacks who had lived in the country, those have either lost their martial culture eventually, or been edged out towards the borderlands, blending themselves with the inhabitants of the frontier settlements. This process must have started around the time of the Great Strife and the wars of the XVII-XVIII century, in particular – the ones fought against Razin and Pougachov, when the Horde dynasty, whose power relied on the Cossack troops, was deposed. Nevertheless, certain representatives of the old Horde dynasty had still remained amidst the Cossacks, with claims for the throne to make.

The wars with Razin and Pougachov had really been attempts to restore the former Horde dynasty in Russia (see CHRON4, Chapter 12 for more on the war with Pougachov). The documents that we have at our disposal nowadays imply that Stepan Timofeyevich Razin is likely to have been a person of noble birth and not a simple Cossack. The very fact that his name as written in documents contains a patronymic with a “-vich” is a hint all by itself – this form had been reserved for the most distinguished people in that epoch. There is foreign documental evidence in existence that refers to Razin as to the king of Astrakhan and Kazan ([101], page 329). In figs. 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 one sees a German engraving of 1671 depicting Razin. We see a turban on his head, no less (see fig. 3.4). And this is by no means a blunder from the part of the artist or a fashion of the “simple Cossacks” – Great Princes of Russia and their courtiers used to wear turbans as well, qv in the two mediaeval engravings in figs. 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 depicting the reception of foreign envoys in Russia. We see the Great Prince and his entourage in large turbans – likewise the Turkish sultans and their servitors (see fig. 3.9, for instance).

All the Russians portrayed in the old XVII century engraving as seen in figs. 3.10 and 3.11 wear turbans on their heads. The picture is from a “rare French edition entitled ‘Description of the Universe with Different Schemes of the World Attached’” ([105]). We see an old plan of Moscow with some Muscovites drawn below – six of them altogether, all wearing turbans.

More Russians in turbans can be seen in figs. 3.12 and 3.13.

Apparently, turbans had once been fashionable in Russia-Horde and were adopted in the Orient – Turkey and other countries; however, the Russians

Fig. 3.4. A fragment of an engraving dating to 1671. Turban on the head of S. T. Razin. Taken from [550], page 134.

Fig. 3.5. German inscription underneath the engraving of 1671 depicting S. T. Razin. Taken from [550], page 134.