

*Braunschweig, Berleget von Friedrich Wilhelm Mener, 1725*) tells us the following about Ivan the Terrible:

“Iohannes Basilowiz, Erzersiel *mit denen Tartarn, und brachte an sein Reich Casan und Astracan*” (Chronological Tables, 1533, page 159). The translation is as follows: “Ivan Vassilyevich had set forth and conquered Kazan and Astrakhan accompanied by his Tartars.”

Modern commentators are rather unnerved by this strange custom of the Muscovite rulers who are accompanied by some mysterious Tartars instead of an army. Our opinion is that the Tartars had been the very Cossack army (or Horde) of the Muscovite Czars. This instantly makes things a lot more logical.

Let us mention a rather curious book entitled *The Tartars of Poland and Lithuania (Successors of the Golden Horde)* ([206]). It is a collection of interesting facts that concern the large-scale involvement of the Tartars in the life of Poland and Lithuania – not only in the XVI century, but the XVII-XIX as well. It is significant that “in the early XIX century Tadeusz Czacki, one of the most prominent Polish historians, discovered an appeal of some sort in the archive, where the Polish and Lithuanian Tartars distinguish the representatives of the Jagiellonian by the name of the ‘White Khans’” ([206], page 17). Further also: “up until the middle of the XIX century, the Tartar populace living in Poland and Lithuania could be separated into three categories... the first and most privileged group was constituted by the offspring of the sultans and the murzas from the Horde. The title of the sultan was worn by members of just two clans of the Tartars in Rzecz Pospolita – the Ostryńskis and the Punskis. The eldest representative of each clan wore the title of Czarevich (normally worn by the heir to the throne); other Tartar clans were the descendants of the murzas, and their leaders wore the titles of Princes. Among the most distinguished princely clans we can name the Assanczukoviczes, the Bargynskis, the Juszynskis, the Kadyszevices, the Koryzkis, the Kryczynskis, the Lostaiskis, the Lovczyckis, the Smolskis, the Szyrinskis, the Talkovskis, the Taraszvyckis, the Ulans and the Zavickis... all of them were equal to the regnant nobility in rights” ([206], page 19).

One might wonder about the language spoken by the Tartars in Poland and Lithuania. It turns out that

the Tartars had “coexisted with the Christians peacefully. They spoke Russian and Polish and dressed just like the local populace. Marriages with Christians were rather common” ([206], page 28). Also: “Mosques with crescents of tin and gold were nothing out of the ordinary in the Eastern regions of Rzecz Pospolita... some of them resembled village churches” ([206], page 61). “Another interesting and long forgotten custom is the use of Tartar regimental gonfalons for the decoration of mosques... the Tartars used written sources of religious knowledge known to us as handwritten qitabs and chamails... the qitabs were written in Arabic, but the texts were in Polish or Byelorussian” ([206], page 72). “After the deposition of the Romanovs, the Committee of Polish, Lithuanian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian Tartars is formed in Petrograd” ([206], page 87).

Let us cite a number of old illustrations taken from [206]. In fig. 3.14 we see some soldiers from a Polish Tartar regiment as they looked in the first half of the XVIII century. In fig. 3.15 we see the soldiers from a Tartar regiment dating to the epoch of Stanisław August (the late XVIII century). In fig. 3.16 we see the headdress of a Polish Tartar soldier of the Napoleonic epoch. This headdress (with a crescent and a star) was worn by “the soldiers of the Tartar regiment in Napoleon’s army [sic! – *Auth.*]” ([206], page 45). In fig. 3.17 we see the coats of arms (the so-called *tamgas*) of the Lithuanian Tartars.

In fig. 3.18 one sees the Polish-Lithuanian national emblem of Leliw city as it was in the XVI-XVII century. Upon it we see two crescents with stars – a larger one below and a smaller one above. This emblem is cited in the foreword to Michalonis Lituanus’s book entitled *On the Customs of the Tartars, the Lithuanians and the Muscovites* ([487]).

## 5. THE REAL IDENTITY OF THE HORDE

The Horde is the old word that has once been the name of the Russian army. This explains the existence of such passages as “Prince such-and-such left the Horde to become enthroned”, or “Prince such-and-such had served the Czar in the Horde, and returned to rule over his domain after the death of his father” – nowadays we would say “nobleman such-

and-such had served the king in the army and returned to govern his estate afterwards.” There were no domains or fiefs left in the XIX century; however, in earlier epochs the princely offspring used to serve in the army (the Horde) and then return to their fiefs. Western Europe had a similar custom of sending the young noblemen to serve the king until the death of their fathers, upon which they would inherit their ancient demesnes.

Another example is as follows. A testament ascribed to Ivan Kalita tells us the following: “Knowing not what fate the Lord may prepare for me in the Horde where I am headed, I am leaving the present testament. . . I leave the city of Moscow to my children in case of my death” ([362], Volume 4, pages 9-10). The meaning of the testament is perfectly clear. Ivan was preparing for a lengthy military campaign and wrote a testament. Historians are trying to convince us that similar testaments were written every time the Princes prepared to visit the “vicious khans of the Horde”, which could presumably execute them at a whim. This is very odd indeed – a ruler could naturally have the right to execute his subject; however, this practice of writing testaments before going away to see the monarch didn’t exist in any other country. Yet we are told that such testaments used to be written all the time, despite the fact that the execution of a prince had been anything but a common event in the Horde.

We offer a simple explanation. These testaments were written before military campaigns by people who had obviously known about the risk of being killed on the battlefield; such testaments are very common indeed.

## 6. ON THE CONQUEST OF SIBERIA

The consensual opinion is that Siberia had first been conquered by the Russians in the XVI century as a result of Yermak’s campaign. It had presumably been inhabited by other ethnic groups before that time. The influence of Moscow is said to have reached Ural and Siberia around the same epoch. However, this turns out to be untrue. The governorship of Moscow used to be recognized in Siberia long before the campaign of Yermak – see evidence to confirm this

below. Yermak’s campaign was really a result of a palace revolution and the refusal to pay tribute to Moscow from the part of the new Khan. Therefore, this campaign is likely to have been a punitive expedition aimed at the restoration of order in this part of the Empire. Let us note that the inhabitants of Siberia used to be called *Ostyaki* – the name is still used in order to distinguish the Russian populace of Siberia.

Indeed: “in the XII century the Eastern and Central Asia was populated by independent tribes, which called themselves ‘Cossack Hordes’. The most important of these Hordes had resided near the headwaters of the Yenisey, between Lake Baikal in the East and the Angara in the West. Chinese chronicles call this horde “*Khakassy*”; European researchers deem the term to be a synonym of the word “Cossack”. According to the records left by their contemporaries, the *Khakassy* belonged to the Indo-Iranian (Caucasian) race and were fair, tall, green- or blue-eyed, courageous and proud. They used to wear earrings” (Richter, German historian of 1763-1825, *Joachim and Essays about Mongolia*; see [183], Volume 1, page 16).

It turns out that the Russians had inhabited the Kingdom of Siberia prior to its conquest by Yermak. “The Siberian Kingdom was ruled by the descendants of the Mongolian Khans. . . the Russians had reached the River Ob as early as in the XV century and made the local populace pay them tribute. Muscovite Princes were recognized as rulers. In 1553 Yedigey, King of Siberia, sent two officials to Moscow with presents and a promise to pay tribute to the Czar. . . however, in 1553 Kouchoum had. . . killed him and proclaimed himself monarch of Siberia and all the lands adjacent to the rivers Irtysh and Tobol, as well as the domains of the Tartars and the *Ostyaki*. Kouchoum had initially paid tribute to the Muscovite Czar. . . but as his lands had reached Perm, he began to demonstrate hostility towards Moscow and raid the lands around Perm” ([183], Volume 2, page 59).

The Stroganovs had appealed to send the punitive expedition of Yermak in order to deal with the rebels ([183], Volume 2, page 53). It has to be said that the expedition had been a failure, and so Yermak doesn’t deserve to be credited as “the first conqueror of Siberia” – it had been Russian long before his time.

## 7. A GENERAL REMARK CONCERNING THE WORD “COSSACK”

Let us add the following in re the origins of the word Cossack (the root of the word being “guz” or “kaz”). O. Suleimanov mentions in his book entitled *Az and Ya* ([823]) that the word Cossack (Coss-ack) translates as “white goose” or “white swan” from Turkic.

We may add that the name may have once been used for referring to people who breed white geese (goose = *guz?*). Bear in mind that the white goose remains a favourite and well-known folk symbol used by many Germanic peoples – one encounters it in ornaments, shop windows and coats of arms. Could this indicate a historical relation between the Cossacks and the Germans? One may note similarities in the self-discipline, the love for order and the military prowess characteristic for both nations.

Furthermore, the Cossacks are military cavalry – riders, in other words. It is possible that the word Cossack is related to the Russian word “*skakat*” (or “*skok*”) that translates as “ride” or “gallop”. One finds shops called “*Ross und Reiter*” in Germany to this day; they sell accessories for horseback riding and grooming. The word “*Ross*” is the old German word for “horse”; the modern one used commonly is “*Pferd*”.

One instantly thinks about the association between the words “*Ross*” and “Russian”. The Russians = people on horses, riders or Cossacks!

One might also mention the Prussians in this relation, as well as a multitude of details – similarities between the dress of a Cossack woman and the folk dress of the German women with its wide volants. The blouses are tailored, fitted and decorated with a basque or some detail resembling one. Cossack songs often resemble German folk songs melodics-wise; some parts of Germany are inhabited by people who look similar to the Cossacks – large people with long pronounced eyebrows.

All of the above may imply historical kinship and result from the interactions between the Horde and the Western Europe in the Middle Ages. A research of this possible kinship would be of great utility to us.

## 8. TARTAR NAMES AND RUSSIAN NAMES IN OLD RUSSIA

### 8.1. Tartar nicknames

The readers may be of the opinion that the names used in Mediaeval Russia were the same as they are nowadays. Modern Russian names are Greek or Biblical in origin for the most part: Ivan, Maria, Alexander, Tatiana etc. These are the so-called Christian names present in the Orthodox canon and given at baptism. These very names have been used in everyday life and official documentation ever since the XVIII century. However, this hasn’t always been the case.

It turns out that people used to have aliases apart from the Christian names mentioned above before the XVII century, used in official documents as well as everyday life. Many of these names were Tartar in origin, or, rather, sound Tartar (in the modern sense of the word) nowadays. Yet these very Tartar names were habitually given to Russian people in the Middle Ages. The famous oeuvre by Y. P. Karnovich entitled *Patrimonial Names and Titles in Russia* ([367]) tells us the following: “In Moscow, Christian names would often become replaced by other Christian names as well as Tartar names, such as Boulat, Mourat, Akhmat etc; these aliases would transform into semi-patronymics that later became surnames of people whose origins were purely Russian” ([367], page 51).

Gordeyev reports the following: “There were many ethnic Tartars among the Don Cossacks. Many of their atamans who had lived in the epoch of Vassily III were known under Mongol and Tartar names. According to the historian S. Solovyov, there was a particularly large proportion of atamans with Tartar names among the cavalry... With the beginning of Ivan Vassilyevich’s reign, the names of the famous atamans (from the cavalry as well as the infantry) become purely Slavic – Fyodorov, Zabolotskiy, Yanov, Cherkashin, Yermak Timofeyevich etc.” ([183], Volume 2, pages 5-6).

It is of course possible that some of the Cossacks were ethnic Tartars. Yet we are told that ethnic Russians used to have “Tartar” names as well. If this was the case in Moscow, could it be true for the Don atamans as well? We see the Tartar names disappear from

Moscow towards the end of the XVI century. The same appears to happen in the Don region; the modern custom of using Christian names as first names must date to this epoch.

For instance, “Yermak” is a name as well as an alias; it had once been considered Russian, qv above, but one might mistake it for a Tartar name nowadays. Nevertheless, it is likely to be a derivative of the name Herman (Yermak’s Christian name). The name may have had several variants – Herman, Yerman and Yermak ([183], Volume 2, page 62). There is no clear borderline between Tartar and Russian nicknames; this was noticed by N. A. Morozov, who writes: “The excerpts from Chechoulin’s brochure are rather interesting... This is based on different archive records. The only modern historical name we see here is Yaroslav... other historical names are limited to Mamay and Yermak. The rest of the old Russian names is constituted of animal names (Kobylya, Koshka, Kot, Lisitsa and Moukha – the names translate as “mare”, “tabby”, “tom”, “fox” and “fly”, respectively), names of rivers, such as Volga, Dunai (Danube) and Pechora... likewise numbers (*Perviy*, *Vtoroi*, *Desyatiy* – “the first”, “the second” and “the tenth”... the only ecclesiastical names we find are Dyak (“deacon”), Krestina (a variant of the name Christine) and Papa (“pope”); moreover, there isn’t a single Greek name anywhere!” ([547]).

We feel obliged to add that many of the above-mentioned names and nicknames sound purely Tartar, and they’re used just as frequently as Russian names at least – for instance, Murza, Saltanko, Tatarinko, Sutorma, Yepancha, Vandysh, Smoga, Sougonyai, Saltyr, Souleisha, Soumgour, Sounboul, Souryan, Tashlyk, Temir, Tenbyak, Toursoulok, Shaban, Koudiyar, Mourad, Nevruy (! – see above) etc. Let us reiterate that Batu must be a form of the word *batya* (father) – the leaders of the Cossacks were also called *batkas* etc. Mamay is most likely to be a derivative of the word *mamin* (“mother’s”). The name was used by the Cossacks of Zaporozhye in particular. In fig. 3.19 we see an ancient picture entitled “A Short Bait of Mamay the Cossack” ([169], inset between pages 240 and 241). Unfortunately, we weren’t capable of making out the minute letters underneath the picture. Another old portrait of Mamay the Cossack can be seen in fig. 3.20, accompanied by the following commentary: “The canons of the Ukrainian Cossack Mamay and Buddha Gautama from India. In the middle we see an Indian Brahman, whose earring and hairstyle resemble the Ukrainian Cossacks of the XIII-XVIII century” ([975], page 737).

One must also mention N. A. Baskakov’s book entitled *Russian Names of Turkic Origin* ([53]), which demonstrates many of the Russian first names and



Fig. 3.19. Old picture entitled “Mamai the Cossack Having a Rest” ([169], inset between pages 240 and 241). We see that the name Mamay had been popular among the Zaporozhye Cossacks. Taken from [169], inset between pages 240 and 241.



Fig. 3.20. The respective hairstyles of the Ukrainian Cossack Mamai (left) and Buddha (right).



Fig. 3.21. The crest of the Karamzin family (which N. M. Karamzin, the famous historian, had belonged to). We see a crescent with a cross, or a star, at the bottom. Taken from [53], inset between pages 160 and 161.

surnames to be Turkic in origin. A propos, Baskakov mentions that the surname of the historian N. M. Karamzin “is very obviously derived from the Crimean Tartar language or, possibly, from Turkish, namely, “qara mirsa”, *qara* being the word for ‘black’, and ‘mirsa’ – the title of a nobleman... Karamzin’s coat of arms also betrays the name’s Oriental origins – this is emphasised by the silver crescent set against a blue background, facing downwards, with two crossed golden swords above it [below it, as a matter of fact – Auth.] – those attributes are characteristic for people whose origins are Oriental ([53], page 178). The coat of arms of the Karamzins can be seen in fig. 3.21. We see the Ottoman crescent next to a Christian cross (or star) formed by two swords.

Thus, we see that a “Tartar” name didn’t necessarily mean that its owner was a Tartar. Furthermore, many Russians could have had Tartar nicknames in the Middle Ages. Many of these nicknames have no meaning in either Russian or the modern Tartar language (cannot be translated adequately, in other words). The issue of Tartar and Russian names, their meanings and their origins is a very convoluted and contentious one; we are by no means suggesting that we have found anything resembling an exhaustive explanation. All we must emphasise is that Russian people had often used nicknames that sound Tartar nowadays; it is also known quite well that there are many Turkic words in Russian.

Modern historians may attribute the above to the Mongolian conquest. Our hypothesis is different. The Turkic influence is explained by the fact that the populace of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire consisted of Russians as well as people of Turkic origins, who had naturally mingled together and lived side by side for centuries. We witness this to be the case nowadays; therefore, the two languages have obviously borrowed heavily from one another. Let us however mention that the official decrees that have reached our age are written in Russian or Slavonic exclusively.

## 8.2. The “strange” effect of the Mongolian conquest on the Russian culture

How did the invasion of the Tartars and the Mongols affect the Russian language? It is quite clear that a horde of barbarians that had presumably swarmed the country would distort and deface the purity of the Russian language, make the populace more ignorant as a whole, burning down cities, libraries, monasteries, ancient volumes et al, pillaging, looting and so forth. Historians are convinced that the Tartar invasion had set the development of the Russian culture back by several centuries.

Let us see whether this is indeed the case. One of the best gauges one can use for estimating the cultural level in general is the standard use of an acrolect for a written language – correct Classical Latin, correct Latin, Barbaric Latin and so forth. The times when Classical Latin was commonly used for writing are considered to be the golden age of culture when the immortal classical works were created. The use of Vulgar Latin or regional dialects is obviously a sign that the culture is in decline. Let us see whether this criterion applies to the ancient Russia “in the times of the Mongol yoke” between the XIII and the XV century – three hundred years are a long enough period, after all. What do we see?

According to N. M. Karamzin, “our language became a great deal more refined in the XIII-XV century” ([363], Volume 5, Chapter 4, page 224). He proceeds to tell us that under the Tartars and the Mongols “the writers followed the grammatical canons of ecclesiastical books or Old Serbian (as opposed to Vulgar Russian) most vehemently indeed... not just in conjugation and declination, but also in pronuncia-

tion” ([363], Volume 5, Chapter 4, page 224. Thus, we see correct Latin nascent in the West, and Church Slavonic in its classical form in the East. If we are to apply the same standards to Russia as we do to the West, the Mongolian invasion marks the golden age of Russian culture. These Mongols were rather odd invaders, weren’t they?

### 8.3. Russian and Tartar names illustrated by the Verderevskiy family tree

We find interesting evidence concerning the names commonly used by the Tartars in the Horde before their baptism in the “Verderevskiy Family Tree” compiled in 1686, qv in the “Archive Almanac of the Moscow Ministry of Justice” published in 1913 (pages 57-58). It tells us how Oleg Ivanovich, the Great Prince of Ryazan, had “summoned the Tartar Solokhmir from the Great Horde accompanied by a force of armed men”. This Solokhmir was later baptised and married the Great Prince’s daughter, founding the famous Russian boyar family of the Verderevskiys. His Christian name was Ivan. The Christian names of his children sound familiar to a Slavic ear as well: “Ivan Miroslavich [the new name of the baptised Tartar – Auth.] had a son called Grigoriy... Grigoriy Ivanovich Solokhmirov had four sons: Grigoriy and Mikhailo, also known as Aboumailo, Ivan, alias Kanchev, and Konstantin, alias Divnoi”.

All of the above is really quite fascinating. A Tartar pagan who had just arrived from the Great Horde is known under a purely Russian name (Solokhmir), likewise his Tartar father Miroslav. It gets even more interesting – this character was baptised and given a Christian name from the ecclesiastical canon, likewise his offspring. However, as we already mentioned, Christian names weren’t used on a daily basis; therefore, children would also receive aliases at baptism. The aliases of boyar names at the court of a Russian prince from Ryazan are Aboumailo, Kanchev and Divnoi; the former two sound “purely Tartar” nowadays, whereas the third is purely Slavic.

How could one possibly come to the educated conclusion about the “Turkic origins” of the people mentioned in Russian chronicles with names like Kanchei, Aboumailo etc? How did a Miroslav wind up in the Great Horde? Our conclusion is as follows.

There were many Slavs in the Horde, whose names were both Slavic and Pagan. Their “Tartar names” are but aliases for quotidian use.

It becomes clear why the Church Slavonic language was introduced in the epoch of the Horde – the latter was governed by the Russians who had lived in a multinational empire together with the Tartars and other nations, as is the case today.

Another interesting detail is as follows. Some of the chronicles use the word “*poganye*” for referring to the Tartars – pagans, in other words. There is nothing surprising about this fact. It is possible that the term was used for referring to the Russians who weren’t baptised; there must have been quite a few of those in the early days of the Horde.

By the way, certain Swedish sources are telling us that in the epoch of the wars between Russia and Sweden (the XVIII century), “the Russian Cossacks had been good shooters as a rule, armed with long-barrelled rifled weapons called “Turks”” ([987:1], page 22).

## 9. THE REAL IDENTITY OF THE MONGOLIAN LANGUAGE

### 9.1. How many Mongolian texts are there in existence?

What is the Mongolian language really? We are being told that the gigantic Mongolian empire hardly left any written sources in the “Mongolian” language over the centuries of its existence. This is what O. M. Kovalevskiy, a Professor of the Kazan University, wrote in the late XIX century: “Mongolian artefacts of a graphical nature are more than scarce – the only ones known to us being the inscription on a stone that presumably dates from the epoch of Genghis-Khan and the epistles of the Persian kings Argoun and Ouldzeitu to the French king... later interpreted by Mr. Schmitt in the brochure that he published in St. Petersburg in 1824... There are more manuscripts in Europe, written in the Tartar language with Mongolian letters – the translation of the Persian novel by Bakhtiyar-Name, for instance. These writing had remained unidentified for a long time, and therefore nameless; some specialists in Oriental studies suggested to use the names *Turk oriental* and *Ouighour*... anyone who knows the

Turkestan Ouighours will mistake them for Turks... but could they have been a Mongolian tribe in the days of yore?" ([759], Volume 1, pages 21-23).

What do we see ultimately?

1) The cyclopean Mongolian Empire didn't leave any written documents behind, apart from an inscription in stone, two letters and a novel. Not much by any account; furthermore, the novel is in fact in the Tartar language – the only "Mongolian" thing about it is the kind of writing used, and that according to what historians are telling us.

2) These few texts were translated and deciphered by a single person – a certain Schmitt.

3) The "descendants of the Mongolian conquerors" who have survived until our day turn out to be Turks. Modern historians are the only ones who know for certain that these Turks have once been Mongols; the Turks themselves are of a different opinion.

## 9.2. What language were the famous Khan's *yarlyks* (decrees, in particular – documents certifying the Princes' rights to their domains) written in?

Everyone who knows Russian history shall recollect that the Mongol Khans had issued a great many decrees known as *yarlyks*, and every chronicle suggests there must be a multitude of those in existence. Those are presumably the authentic written records of the great Mongolian Empire. Let us recollect all that we know about them nowadays. It is presumed that a great many documents have survived since the time of the "Great Mongolian Yoke" in Russia, all of them written in Russian – pacts signed between princes, testaments etc. One might think that must be just as many Mongolian texts at least, since the decrees issued in Mongolian would be coming from the very government of the Empire and thus preserved with special care. What do we have in reality? Two or three decrees maximum; those were discovered in the XIX century among private papers of individual historians and not in any archive of any sort.

The famous *yarlyk* of Tokhtamysh, for instance, was found as late as in 1834 "among the papers that had once been kept in the Crown Archive of Krakow and were subsequently discovered in the possession of Naruszevic, the Polish historian" ([759], Volume 1,

pages 4-5). It takes some historian to borrow documents from the state archive without bothering to return them, doesn't it? Prince M. A. Obolenskiy wrote the following about this *yarlyk*: "It [the decree of Tokhtamysh – Auth.] allows us to solve the question [sic! – Auth.] about the letters and language that were used in the *yarlyks* sent by the Khans to the Russian Princes ... this is the second such decree known to date" (*ibid*, page 28). It also turns out that this *yarlyk* is written in "odd Mongolian characters, of which there are multitudes; they are completely different from the *yarlyk* of Timur-Kutluk dating from 1397 that has already been published by Mr. Hammer" (*ibid*).

Let us sum up. There are just two "Mongolian" *yarlyks* left in existence – the rest of them date to later epochs. The latter (issued by the Crimean Khans) were written in Russian, Tartar, Italian, Arabic etc. As for the two "Mongolian" *yarlyks* (which must date from the same time, seeing as how Tokhtamysh and Timur-Kutluk are presumed to have been contemporaries), we see that they were written in two manifestly different scripts. This is very odd indeed – one finds it highly unlikely that the letters of the hypothetical "Mongolian" language could have changed so drastically over a mere decade. This process usually takes centuries.

Both "Mongolian" *yarlyks* were found in the West. Where are their counterparts from the Russian archives? This question was asked by Prince Obolenskiy after the discovery of the abovementioned *yarlyk*: "The fortunate discovery of the text by Tokhtamysh had led me to applying every effort to the discovery of other original *yarlyks* issued by the Khans of the Golden Horde, thus triumphing over the frustrating nescience of our historians and Oriental scholars about the presence of such originals in the main archive of the Foreign Office in Moscow. Alack and alas, the only result of these searches was an even deeper conviction that all the other originals, possibly of an even more interesting nature ... must have perished in fire" (*ibid*).

If we are to encapsulate the above, we shall come up with the following postulations:

1) There isn't a single trace of a single Mongolian *yarlyk* anywhere in the Russian official archives.

2) The two or three *yarlyks* that we have at our disposal were found in the West under conspicuous cir-

cumstances – in private archives of historians and not in archives, and set in different kinds of writing to boot. This brings us to the assumption that we're dealing with forgeries, hence the different letters – the hoaxers didn't synchronise their actions.

A propos, there's a Russian version of the *yarlyk* by Tokhtamysh in existence: "whereby there are discrepancies between the Tartar *yarlyk* and the respective decree in Russian ... one can however be certain about the fact that the Russian version also originated in the chancery of Tokhtamysh" (*ibid*, page 3-4).

It is very egregious that the "Mongolian *yarlyk* of Tokhtamysh" is written on paper with the same kind of watermark with the "oxen head", just like the copies of the *Povest Vremennyh Let* presumed ancient by modern historians (as we demonstrate above, these are most likely to have been manufactured in Königsberg around the XVII-XVIII century). This means that the *yarlyk* of Tokhtamysh dates from the same epoch, and may have come from the same workshop. The above would explain why this document was found in the private archive of Naruszevic and not the state chancery.

The pages of the "Mongolian *yarlyks*" are numbered with Arabic numerals: "The reverse of the second page ... bears the figure of two, which must stand for 'page two'" (*ibid*, page 14). The notes on the reverse of page one are in Latin, and the handwriting "must date from the XVI or the XVII century" (*ibid*, page 10).

Our hypothesis is as follows. This "famous Mongolian *yarlyk*" was written in the XVIII century. Its Russian version may have predated it somewhat, and served as the original for its own "ancient Mongolian prototype".

Unlike these two extremely disputable "Mongolian *yarlyks*", authentic Tartar *yarlyks* dating from the epoch of the Crimean Khans look completely different (the letter missive of the Crimean Khan Gazi-Girey sent to Boris Fyodorovich Godunov in 1588-1589, for instance). The latter has got an official seal as well as formal notes on the reverse ("translated in the year 7099") etc (see *ibid*, page 46). The missive is set in standard and easily readable Arabic script. Some of the letter missives of the Crimean Khans were in Italian – such as the one sent by Mengli-Girey to Sigismund I, King of Poland.

On the other hand, there are a great many docu-

ments that can indeed be dated to the epoch of the so-called "Great Yoke" – all of them *in Russian*, such as the letter missives of the Great Princes, ordinary Princes, testaments and ecclesiastical records. There is therefore a "Mongolian archive" in existence; however, this archive is in Russian – this is hardly surprising, since the "Mongolian" Empire = The Great Russian Empire whose official language had of course been Russian.

It has to be noted that all such documents exist as XVII-XVIII century copies, with the Romanovian corrections introduced. Real documents of the pre-Romanovian epoch were sought out diligently and destroyed by the clerks who had worked for the Romanovs. There are hardly any such documents left nowadays.

The apologists of the Millerian version might counter with the presumption that the decline of the Horde was followed by the destruction of all Mongolian documents, whereby the Mongols had instantly transformed into Turks and forgotten about their origins. Should this be the case, one must enquire about the proof of the "Great Yoke's" actual existence in the form insisted upon by the consensual version. The Romanovian theory of the "Mongolian" conquest is a very serious one consequence-wise; it should obviously be based on a ferroconcrete foundation of scientific proof. This isn't the case. The actual theory must have been introduced with the works of the XVIII century historians. Nobody had possessed so much as an iota of knowledge about the "Mongolian Yoke" previously. The few chronicles that contain renditions of this theory are also unlikely to predate the XVII-XVIII century, *q.v.* above. One needs official documentation as proof of theories as fundamental as this one – sealed, signed and proven, rather than chronicles of a literary character, easily copied and edited tendentiously. Furthermore, some of the vestiges we discover tell us about attempts to fabricate the official documents themselves.

### 9.3. In re the Russian and the Tartar letters

It is a known fact that Old Russian coins often have inscriptions made in a strange script, which looks very unfamiliar to us nowadays. These inscriptions are often declared "Tartar", with the implica-



The most amazing fact that the interpretation of these “secret characters” often proves an easy task. For instance, the inscription on the book considered “perfectly beyond decipherment” by the famous linguist M. N. Speranskiy was translated by two amateurs independently ([425]). Both came up with the exact same result, which is hardly surprising, seeing as how there was no cipher used for this inscription – just a different alphabet. The author wrote the following: “this book belongs to Prince Mikhail Fyodorovich Boryatinskiy” ([425]). See fig. 3.23.

We see the Cyrillic script to have been adopted by the Russians, the Greeks, the Serbs etc relatively recently, since another alphabet was still used in the XVII century (on seals and coins, for engravings on bells and even inscriptions inside books).

Thus, the mysterious “Tartar” letters from the Golden Horde found on Russian coins prove to be other versions of familiar Russian letters. A table of correspondences for some of them can be found in [425]. See more about this in the section of the Annexes entitled “Russian Literacy before the XVII century”.

#### 9.4. History of the Mongols and the chronology of its creation

The theory of the “Great Yoke of the Tartars and the Mongols” has lead to a great many false assumptions. We therefore feel obliged to tell the readers about the naissance of the “Tartar and Mongol theory”.

It turns out that the history of the Mongols and the Mongolian conquest in its consensual version doesn’t date any further back as the XVIII century; moreover, it had still been in formation as recently as in the XIX-XX century.

“In 1826 the Russian Academy of Sciences had approached the Russian and the Western European scientists with the offer of a 100-chervontsi grant for the writer of a scientific oeuvre on the consequences of the Mongolian conquest, the deadline being set for three years. The work that did meet the deadline was rejected ... six years after the first baffle, the Academy of Sciences made a similar suggestion once again ... formulating the objective as ‘the necessity to write the history ... of the so-called Golden Horde ... using chronicles from the Orient, ancient Russia, Poland, Hungary etc’ ... they received a gigantic oeuvre as a

response, written by Hammer-Purgstall, a German specialist in Oriental studies. The Academy declared itself incapable of awarding him with any premium. After the second “failure”, the Academy had ceased with the tender ... the very historiography of the Golden Horde, [according to B. Grekov and A. Yakoubovskiy, who wrote this in 1937 – Auth.] which hasn’t been compiled as to yet, would be a useful topic, and the scholarly inability to delve deep enough into it is edificatory all by itself ... Not a single Russian specialist in Oriental studies has written a comprehensive work on the history of the Golden Horde to date, be it scientific or popular” ([197], pages 3-5).

L. N. Gumilev wrote that “although the problem of naissance and decline of Genghis-Khan’s empire has been studied by many historians, no one managed to solve it in a satisfactory manner” ([212], page 293).

We have two XIII century sources on Mongolian history presumed authentic, one of them being *The Secret History of the Mongols*. However, the prominent specialists “V. V. Barthold and G. E. Grumm-Grzymajlo raise the question of just how far this source is to be trusted” ([212], page 294).

The second source is called *The Golden Book*; it is based on the collected works of Rashed ad-Din, the Arabic historian. However, I. Berezin, the first Russian translator of this oeuvre in the middle of the XIX century, tells us the following: “The three copies of the *History of the Mongols* that had been at my disposal belonged to the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, the ... St. Petersburg Public Library, and the third partial copy had once belonged to our former envoy in Persia. The best of these copies is the one from the Public Library; unfortunately, people’s names are often left without any diacritic marks [used for vocalizations – Auth.], and occasionally altogether absent” ([724], pages XII-XIII).

Berezin admits to having been forced to insert names arbitrarily, guided by his “knowledge” of the true chronological and geographical coordinates of their epochs ([724], page XV).

History of the next historical period (the Golden Horde and its Khans) also contains many unclear places. V. V. Grigoryev, the famous specialist in Mongolian studies who had lived in the XIX century, wrote that “the history of the Khans who had ruled in the Golden Horde demonstrates an odd paucity of names

and events; despite having destroyed the most important literary relics ... they also obliterated nearly every trace of the Horde's existence. The once flourishing cities ruled over by the Khans now lay in ruins ... as for the famous Saray, which had been the Horde's capital – we don't even know the ruins that we could attribute this name to" ([202], page 3).

Grigoryev tells us further that "Our chronicles should by rights contain definite indications concerning the epoch of Saray's foundation – yet they frustrate our hopes, since, when they tell us about Princes and their voyages to the Horde, they don't specify the Horde's location in any way, simply stating that 'Prince such-and-such went to the Horde', or 'returned from the Horde'" ([202], pages 30-31).

### 10. GOG AND MAGOG. CHIEF PRINCE OF ROSH, MESHECH AND TUBAL. Russia-Horde and Moscow Russia on the pages of the Bible

The book of Ezekiel contains a passage that is still regarded as highly contentious. The Synodal translation used by the Russian Orthodox Church gives it as follows: "Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the Great Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him, And say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the Great Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal ... Gog shall come against the land of Israel (Ezekiel 38:2-3, 38:18 ff). Rosh is also mentioned in the Book of Genesis (46:21), likewise the Horde (as Ard – see Genesis 46:21). Gog and Magog are also mentioned in the Book of Revelation (20:7).

According to some mediaeval chroniclers, Gog and Magog were the names of the Goths and the Mongols (the XIII century Hungarians had been convinced about the Tartar identity of these two Biblical nations, qv in [517], page 174). N. M. Karamzin reports that certain historians had used the names Gog and Magog for referring to the Khazars ([362], Annotation 90 to Volume 1). Cossacks, in other words, qv below.

On the other hand, mediaeval Byzantines had been certain that this passage from Ezekiel referred to the Russians, writing "Prince of Ross" instead of "Rosh" – Leo the Deacon, for instance, describing the cam-



Fig. 3.24. A fragment of the Ostrog Bible (Ezekiel 38:2-3), where the Prince of Ross is explicitly referred to as "Knyaz Rosska", or "Russian Prince". Taken from [621].

СНЕ ЧЛЧЬ. ОУТВЕРДИ / ЛИЦЕ СВОЕ НА  
ГОГА, И НА ЗЕЛЮ / МАГОГА, И НА КНЗА  
РОССКА, / МОСОХЪ, И ДОВЕЛЬ. И РЦЫ /  
ЕМЪ, СЕ ГЛЕТЪ АДОНАН ГЪ. СЕ, АЗЪ /  
НАТА ГОГЪ И МАГОГЪ КНЗА РОССКА, /  
МОСОХЪ, И ДОВЕЛЬ.  
ВЪ ТОИ ДНЬ, / ВЪ ДНИ ПРИШЕСТВІА  
ГОГОВА НА ЗЕМЛЮ / ИЛЕВЪ...

Fig. 3.25. A drawn copy of the fragment of the Ostrog Bible (Ezekiel 38:2-3) referring to the Russian Prince made by M. I. Grinchouk (MSU) for better readability.

paign of Great Prince Svyatoslav against Byzantium at the end of the alleged X century, writes the following about the Russians: "Many can testify to the fact that these people are valiant, brave, militant and mighty, likewise the fact that they attack all the neighbouring tribes; divine Ezekiel also mentions this when he says 'Here, I send against thee Gog and Magog, Prince of Ross'" ([465], page 79). Leo says "Ross" instead of "Rosh".

The same text in the famous Ostrog Bible (qv in figs. 3.24 and 3.25) contains the formula "Prince of the Rosses", no less!

Our reconstruction offers a very simple explanation.

1) The word "Rosh" or "Ros" (also "Rash" and "Ras") is used for referring to Russia (cf. with the English pronunciation of the country's name).

2) The names Gog and Magog (as well as Mgog, Goog and Mgoog) apply to the same nations of the Russian and the Tartars who had founded the empire of Magog (The Great Empire).

3) The name Meshech (MHCH or MSKH) stands for Mosokh – a legendary personality; according to many mediaeval authors, the city of Moscow received its name after this very Mosokh.

4) The word Tubal (TBL or TVL) is a reference to the Tobol region in Western Siberia, which remains an important centre of the Cossack culture. We encounter it in the Authorised Version as well: “Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, (Ezekiel 38:2), and also “O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal (Ezekiel 38:3). Gog is called “chief prince” of Meshech and Tubal, or Tobol – the title is identical to that of the Great Prince!

One cannot fail to notice the following circumstance. As we can see, the name Rosh is absent from the Authorised Version of the Bible as published by the British and Foreign Bible Society (cf. with the Russian Synodal translation).

What could be the matter here? It appears that the politically correct translator of the Bible had felt uncomfortable about the presence of this dangerous word in the Biblical context. Having understood its meaning, our interpreter decided to write the “Russians” right out of the canonical text of the Bible so as to keep the pious XIX Britons from asking unwanted questions about the activities of Russian a long time before Christ.

Let us point out that, despite his laudable vigilance insofar as the name Rosh was concerned, the translator left the equally dangerous word Tubal in the text, which is hardly surprising – the XIX century translators were unlikely to have known anything about Russian Siberia. Had the opposite been the case, this name would never have made it past their censorship.

It is, however, possible that the Biblical T-Bal is a reference to T-BAL, or T used as a definite article before the word Bal, or “white” (Babylon) – possibly a reference to the White Russia, or Byelorussia; the name Baltic must have the same root.

The place from Deacon’s book that we quoted above (where he uses the term “Ross” instead of “Rosh”) infuriates modern commentators a great deal; they write the following: “the word Rosh got into the text

due to the error contained in the Greek translation; however, the Byzantines had always interpreted it as the name of a nation, and had used it for referring to a number of barbaric peoples from the fifth century and on ... when the Rosses made their presence known to history in the IX century, the eschatological mindset of the Byzantines immediately linked them to the Biblical ‘Rosh’... The first time that we see Ezekiel’s text applied to Russians is in the hagiography of Vassily Novy: ‘A barbaric nation shall come, by the name of Ros, and Og and Mog’ (The New Basil, pages 88-89) ... the Biblical text is also distorted here, likewise in the work of Leo Deacon ... this is how the word Russia (Rossiya) was coined. As for Gog and Magog, they were referred to as nations in the Book of Revelations (20:7-8). They have been associated with hostile tribes ever since Eusebius. The most widespread opinion had identified them as the Scythians, which had lent more validity to the scholastic parallel with Russia” ([465], pages 211-212).

The passage from the Slavic Ostrog Bible quoted above, where this reference is more than explicit (“Prince of the Rossians”, or the Russian Prince) is never even mentioned by historians – they are highly unlikely to have anything to say about it.

The name Magog had also been used in the form Mog, or Mogol, which was also the name used by the early adepts of the historical science for the Mongols. This is yet another indication that the term was used for the Russian state (Ross), also known as the Empire of the Mongols and the Tartars and Megalion (The Great). Cf. the Russian words *mog*, *moshch* etc (“power” and derivatives thereof) as mentioned in detail above.

Apparently, the famous Assyria (also described in the Bible), or Syria (Ashur) is also identified as Russia (Horde) in a number of chronicles. Reverse unvocalized readings (Aramaic or Arabic) transform Syria into Ross, and Assyria (or Ashur) into Russia.

The Russian identification of the Biblical Assyria had still been remembered in the XVIII century, during the wars between Sweden and Russia. Peter Englund, a modern Swiss historian who had studied the ancient Swedish documents of the XVIII century and used them as basis for his book *Poltava. How an Army Perished* ([987:1]), reports the following: “Clergymen such as Westerman had been forced to proclaim from

every pulpit and at every battlefield that the Swedes were the chosen nation and the instrument of the Lord, who supported them. This wasn't a mere ploy aimed at impressing the hoi polloi; the King himself had been certain this were the truth. Likewise the sons of Israel, the Swedish warriors were sent to earth in order to punish the heretics and the sinners... Bizarre tricks with words were cited as proof; one of the priests addressed a squadron with allegations that the Swedes had been the Israelites of their time, since if one were to read Assur (Assyria, or the foe of Israel) backwards, one would get ... Russa!" ([987:1]), pages 19-20.

Modern historians comment this ancient testimony rather ironically, qv in Azarov's article entitled "The Battle of Poltava in the Eyes of the Swedes", *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, 11.07.1997, No. 28 (1796), page 14). Nowadays commentators treat such reports as anecdotes telling us about the horrendous scholastic ignorance of the Swedes, with gratuitous use of sarcastic omission points and exclamation marks.

Peter Englund assures us that the Assyrian references are a result of the priest's "games with words" – however, it is possible that the Swedish troops have resurrected an old Reformist slogan of the XVI-XVII century, something along the lines of "Let's crush the Assyrians!"; since the memory about the Biblical Assyria being the same country as Russia must have still been rather fresh in the Western Europe. We deem it unlikely that the Swedish priests would read linguistic lectures to the soldiers who were about to go into battle and possibly die. It was somewhat later that the XVIII-XIX century historians started to ascribe their own linguistic theories to XVIII century characters in order to justify the freshly-forged Scaligerian chronology.

By the way, the Finnish word *suuri* also means "great" – it is therefore possible that the Great Empire had possessed several "external" names: The Great = Megalion = Mongolia, as well as Suuri = Assur = Assyria.

Let us get back to what we were saying in the beginning of this section and enquire about the date when the Biblical book of Ezekiel had really been created – could it really have been an epoch preceding the new era by a couple of centuries, as Scaligerian history is trying to convince us? As we already under-

stand, the words of Leo Deacon imply that it couldn't have been written earlier than the XI century of the New Era. Otherwise one must admit that the question of Russian invasion from the North had been discussed with great interest several centuries before Christ.

## 11. THE REAL LOCATION OF NOVGOROD THE GREAT

### 11.1. What we know about the city of Novgorod (the Great)

Novgorod the Great has played a great part in the history of Kiev Russia, likewise Russia in the Vladimir-Suzdal period. Many of the renowned Great Princes have originated from Novgorod. For the sake of convenience, we shall be using the formula "historical Novgorod" or "chronicle Novgorod" for the time being in order to refrain from making an explicit geographical localization for the time being; the matter is that the town identified as its descendant today, Novgorod on the Volkhov, is very unlikely to have anything to do with its historical namesake. We shall therefore be calling it "Novgorod-upon-Volkhov", or "modern Novgorod", hereinafter – our discussion of its origins included.

Ryurik, the first Great Prince of Russia, is presumed to have come from Novgorod. Therefore, the ruling dynasty originates from Novgorod; such characters as Vladimir the Holy, Yaroslav the Great, Yaroslav Vsevolodovich, Alexander Nevskiy etc have all borne the title of a "Great Prince of Novgorod", whilst the Great Princes of Moscow had retained the title of a "Great Prince of Novgorod and Vladimir" up until the XVI century. The Archbishop of the historical Novgorod had occupied a special position in Russian ecclesiastical hierarchy – he had been the only one with the right to wear a white hood (still worn by the Russian patriarchs) up until the middle of the XVI century; starting with the XVII century, however, there has been no archbishop in Novgorod-upon-Volkhov.

Historical, or chronicle Novgorod, occupies the position of the old Russian capital in pre-XVII century Russian history. First and foremost, it is known as a trade centre and an important river port. Russia