

MEDIEVAL HISTORY OF CENTRAL EURASIA

ISCA

No. 2 (1) 2020



MEDIEVAL HISTORY OF CENTRAL EURASIA

Has been published since 2020

No. 2 (1) 2020

Nur-Sultan

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor
Shaihutdinov M. Y.

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor
Kushkumbayev A. K.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Qydyráli Darhan	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Muminov A.K.	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Samashev Z. S.	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Abuseitova M. K.	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Sabitov Zh. M.	PhD in Political Science (Kazakhstan)
Golden Peter B.	Dr., Professor (USA)
Kradin N.N.	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Russia)
Erdélyi István	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Hungary)
Uzelac	PhD in History (Serbia)
Aleksandar	
Mirgaleev I. M.	Candidate of Historical Sciences (Russia)
Zaytsev I. V.	Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Russia)
Petrov P.N.	Candidate of Historical Sciences (Russia)
Nagamine	PhD in History (Japan)
Hiroyuki	

Editorial address: 8, Kabanbay Batyr avenue, of.316, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, 010000
Tel.: (7172) 24-18-52 (ext. 316)
E-mail: medieval-history@isca.kz

Medieval History of Central Eurasia
Owner: International Science Complex Astana
Periodicity: quarterly
Circulation: 500 copies

FROM THE EDITOR

Dear colleagues!

Every scientific publication is a living, constantly evolving organism. Our journal dedicated to the relevant problems of the Middle Ages is no exception. In particular, a new column – “From the Editor” has appeared in the second issue of our journal, where a review of articles is given.

In the section “Ethnogenesis. Archaeology. Linguistics” you can find the second part of article “Actual problems of Turkic paleohistory: proto-language, proto-ethnos, proto-homeland” about the origin of the Turkic ethnic groups, written by Russian researcher N.I. Egorov. According to the historian, the synthesis of paleobiology data and comparative historical and genetic analysis of botanical vocabulary refers to the origin of the proto-Turkic populations from the South-Western district of the modern provinces of Jilin, Liaoning and South-East district of Circumgobi region of the Central Asia. In the first Millennium BC, exactly from the area mentioned above, the earliest observable migrations of proto-Turks began, northward along the Western foothills of the Greater Khingan up to Eastern Mongolia and Transbaikial, and westward migration to Ordos, the Alashan desert, the Gansu corridor, and possibly to the Tarim basin. These migrations began on the eve of the collapse of the proto-Turkic ethno-linguistic and cultural universe and continued until the ancient Turkic epoch. In our opinion, the polemic article by N. I. Egorov does not claim to be the ultimate truth and can be seen as a calling up to a broad scientific discussion.

The section “History of Juchi Khanate” starts with a joint article “New source on the history of Juchid dynasties” by Halit Eren, Ashirbek Muminov and Selahaddin Uygur, the scientists of the IRCICA research center (*Istanbul, Turkey*). This article considers the analysis of the work “Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar” (1641), written by the outstanding Turkish historian and bibliographer *Kâtip Çelebi* (1609-1657). This work has been kept in a single copy and has not yet been published. The special value of *Kâtip Çelebi's* book is that it has a special section with details of the genealogies of the Juchid dynasties. *Kâtip Çelebi* identifies five branches of the Chingisids: 1) the Chingisids in Karakorum (1206-1368); 2) their branch in Turan (1227-1370); 3) their branch in Iran and Khorasan (1256-1353); 4) their branch in Desht-i-Kipchak (1226-1502) and 5) their branch in Mawarannahr (1500-1598). The Appendix to the article contains original texts in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Indeed, the authors of the article have researched a lot of sources and thus made a significant contribution to the history of the Juchid dynasties.

The article by Zh.M. Sabitov considers the administrative reform of Uzbek Khan. According to the author, Uzbek Khan strengthened the centralization of the Golden Horde through the reform of its political institutions. The reform was successful thanks

to the support of three strata of the population: the settled tax-paying population, commercial Muslim communities, and the tribal counter-elite. Another success factor of the reforms were unexpected reprisals against the Juchids, which began immediately after the election of Uzbek as a Khan of the Golden Horde, when the Juchids who participated in the Kurultai did not have time to leave for their Khanates. As a result, there was a renewal of the elites, and the Juchids were relegated to the background. Following Mansur Olson's concept, Zh.M. Sabitov states that administrative reform of Uzbek Khan meant the transformation of the "Nomad bandit" into a "Settled bandit" with all its consequences (*large economic growth due to the political stability, culture, infrastructure construction, etc.*). In our view, this article may start a discussion on the reformers of the Middle Ages; however, it is important to avoid projecting modern political realities on the distant historical past.

The relevant issues of military history of ancient and medieval Kazakhstan are considered in the article of the Kazakh historian A.K. Kushkumbayev. The author believes that the nomad military business is directly included in the medieval history of the Turkic-Mongol peoples of Eurasia and Kazakhstan, as well as an integral part of the military system, which includes: the structure and composition of the armed forces, military strategy and tactics, a set of weapons, craft technology for making weapons, techniques for using them, etc. At the same time, military affairs are not only an integral part of the country's history, but also an important element of the economy, material and spiritual culture, social and political relations and everyday life of the people. The author believes that the military affairs of Mongol Empire were inherited by the Nogai Horde (XV-XVII centuries), the nomads of the Eastern Desht-I-Kipchak (*the land of Sheibanids*) and Moghulistan (XV-XVI centuries), the Kazakh khanate (XV-XVIII centuries), the Siberian khanate (XV – early XVII centuries), the Bashkirs and other Turkic peoples. The military history of the above-mentioned Turkic lands requires further research on key areas of military development. In our opinion, the study of the military history of the Turks requires the joint efforts of historians of all the Turkic lands, as well as the wider use of interdisciplinary approaches.

In the previous issue of our journal, it was noted that the Kazakh school of medieval studies, which is in the process of formation, should not be limited to the history of Kazakhstan and Central Eurasia, it is important to keep in mind the broader historical context, especially since the Turkic lands have always interacted with other peoples and lands, including Europe and Russia. Therefore, in the second issue of the journal, another new section has appeared – "History of the European and Eurasian middle Ages". Definitely, this will make our view of the history of the Middle Ages more correct and balanced.

This section begins with an article by M.Y. Shaikhutdinov "Marc Bloch and the development of theoretical and methodological foundations of historical science", which identifies the most important stages in the formation of Bloch's views on the

purpose of historical science. The article analyzes such fundamental works of Bloch as "The Royal Touch: Monarchy and Miracles in France and England", (1924), "Characteristic features of French agrarian history" (1931), "Feudal society" (1939-1940), "Apologia of history or the craft of a historian" (1941-1942). Special attention is paid to the contribution of Bloch to the formation of the journal "Annals of economic and social history" (1929) and the corresponding scientific school. According to the author of the article, the scientific ideas of Bloch contributed to the maturation of new theoretical and methodological approaches, increasing the attention of historians to socio-economic history, historical comparative studies, historical anthropology, spatial economic geography, collective psychology, the history of mentalities, etc. The very fact of lively discussions about the significance of Bloch's scientific heritage indicates that his works still retain their scientific value and relevance.

The article "Landscape of medieval Europe: researcher about the role of wood in the institution of the Russian culture and state system" by M.V. Shlyupikov and M.M. Shlyupikova is of considerable interest. From the authors' point of view the study of the environment's influence on each nation development, especially at the initial stages of the formation of statehood and the development of cultural patterns of behavior, is very relevant today. The article analyzes the scientific contribution of S.M. Solovyov, N.Y. Danilevsky, V.O. Klyuchevsky, and N.I. Kostomarov to the study of the Russian forest as a factor in the development of Ancient and Medieval Russia, the Moscow state and the Russian Empire. Russian historians' concepts concerning the influence of the nature of the Russian North-East on the formation of the Russian nation, the development of the economy, everyday life, culture, spiritual world, political processes and international relations are described. In our opinion, article by M.V. Shlyupikov and M.M. Shlyupikova could form the basis of a separate monograph.

The second issue of our journal ends up with another new section – "Reviews". The first review is on the work "Medieval Europe" by well-known British historian Chris Wickham. According to the author of the review, Wickham is distinguished due to critical view of established dogmas in historical science. The work "Medieval Europe" was no exception, in which Wickham states that history is devoid of expediency, historical development does not strive for something, but starts from something. Therefore, the turbulent period of the Middle Ages is of distinct interest and it is not necessary to consider it through the prism of subsequent events. The reviewer claims that Wickham thinks too categorically, but it is impossible not to notice his innovative approaches to the turning points of medieval history, as well as a wide and quite appropriate use of the comparative method. Therefore, one can consider the work of Wickham as a valuable contribution to modern medieval studies.

Editor-in-Chief
Shaihutdinov M.Y.

CONTENT

FROM THE EDITOR	3
<u>Н. И. ЕГОРОВ</u> АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ТЮРКСКОЙ ПАЛЕОИСТОРИИ: ПРАЯЗЫК, ПРАЭТНОС, ПРАРОДИНА. ЧАСТЬ ВТОРАЯ	7
<u>Halit Eren, Ashirbek Muminov, Selahaddin Uygun</u> NEW SOURCE ON THE HISTORY OF JUCHID DYNASTIES	29
<u>Ж. М. Сабитов</u> АДМИНИСТРАТИВНАЯ РЕФОРМА ХАНА УЗБЕКА	73
<u>Кушкумбаев А.К.</u> ПРОБЛЕМЫ ВОЕННОЙ ИСТОРИИ ДРЕВНЕГО	80
<u>М. У. Shaikhutdinov</u> MARC BLOCH AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCE	92
<u>М.В. Shlyupikov, М.М. Shlyupikova</u> LANDSCAPE OF MEDIEVAL EUROPE: RESEARCHER ABOUT THE ROLE OF WOOD IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE RUSSIAN CULTURE AND STATE SYSTEM	121
РЕЦЕНЗИИ	149

UDC 93

LANDSCAPE OF MEDIEVAL EUROPE: RESEARCHER ABOUT THE ROLE OF WOOD IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE RUSSIAN CULTURE AND STATE SYSTEM

M.V. Shlyupikov, M.M. Shlyupikova

Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Moscow, Russia

Abstract The study of the influence of nature, the environment, its forms and the power of influence in the development of each nation, especially in the initial stages of formation, establishment of statehood, economic development of the territory, development and consolidation of cultural patterns of behavior is highly relevant. The article presents an analysis of the historiographic heritage: the contribution of the classics of the Russian historical thought of the XIX century by S.M. Solov'ev, N.Ya. Danilevsky, V.O. Klyuchevsky, N.I. Kostomarov to the study of the forest problem and its role in Russian history. The source base of the research is the various works of Russian historians of the XIX century, dedicated to the Russian history of the medieval period and the new time, the time of the ethnogenesis of the Russian people, the formation of economic foundations, culture and Russian statehood.

The research focuses on the scientific views of the 19th century Russian historians on the influence of forests, forests, geography of space on the development of Ancient and Medieval Russia, Moscow State and Russia. The historical concepts of S.M. Solovyov, N.Ya. Danilevsky, V.O. Klyuchevsky, N.I. Kostomarov of nature influenced the nature of the Russian northeast on the formation of the Russian nationality, the development of the economy, life, culture, spiritual world, political processes, international relations. An assessment is made of the degree of forest influence, as a multifactorial phenomenon, on the dynamics and direction of social processes, the predominance of regressive or progressive tendencies of the historical movement of the Russian people and state. The authors concluded that many important aspects of the multifunctional forestry of ancient and medieval Russia were touched upon in the works of famous nineteenth-century Russian historians. Without mastering this historiographic heritage, it is impossible to start writing a full-scale Russian forest history.

Keywords: S.M. Soloviev, N.Ya. Danilevsky, V.O. Klyuchevsky, N.I. Kostomarov, historiography, Russian forest, colonization, household and mode of life, wooden architecture, applied crafts, spirituality, political institutions.

Introduction.

In the development of each nation, especially in the initial stages of formation, establishment of statehood, economic development of the territory, development and consolidation of cultural patterns of behavior, nature, the environment, its forms and power of influence have a decisive influence.

European thinkers such as I.G. Herder, G. Lessing, Sh. L. Montesquieu have long noticed this feature, tried to establish the historical relationship of man and nature. Therefore, they distinguished marine, mountain, forest, steppe peoples, peoples of the Far North, arid semi-deserts and deserts, tropical forests.

Accordingly, the environment determined the type of economic development, methods of obtaining food, social interactions and political institutions, ethical standards and aesthetic patterns, religion, law, spiritual symbols, ways of communicating with each other and others, trade, aggressiveness or defense, expansion or autarky, density or the distraction of society, the strength or weakness of kindred ties, the intensive or extensive path of the historical movement, the methods and nature of urban planning, architecture, everyday life, writing methods, literary images, weapons and military tactics and strategy, the characteristics of military units and the army as a whole, ways of its acquisition, wealth and poverty of man and state, progress or lag, stagnation of civilization.

Russia and its peoples were destined to interact, grow, "grow up", and rise civilizational in the "world of the forest". The vast sea of forest is a kind of motherly bosom of Russian civilization. This is the soil; this is the roots, water and air of the emerging state. Forest - protection, the keeper of life and freedom in times of adversity, the forest - the breadwinner, generously giving his wealth to man in the form of wood, game, mushrooms and berries, nuts, honey, furs, skins and bones of wild animals.

Forest is a mysterious world of mysterious creatures, fairy-tale heroes, full of life, energy, forming the foundations of folk culture, endowing animals and birds, all inhabitants of the forest with human features, intelligence, strength, courage, cunning, kindness and antipodes of these features: anger, treachery, greed cowardice, stupidity, hypocrisy, etc.

The forest is the best friend of a Russian person; it is shelter, fire and heat, food, clothes and shoes, household utensils, tools and crafts, weapons.

Russia is a great forest country. Huge in length, diversity, and impact on the surrounding world, the Eurasian forests were an important factor in the life of Russian people. A complex community of living, mainly plant organisms mutually creating each other and constantly interacting with soil, climate and landscape - the forest in Russian history has long been transformed from an external factor into an internal one, forming Russian statehood and types of political structure, economic life and psychology, mentality and features of religious perception of the world.

The aggressive economic expansion of man into the forest in the 20th century, which has grown into a serious environmental hazard, poses the problems of the coexistence of man and the forest, the identification of historical trends in such coexistence, and the history of forests in Russia.

An important role in the reconstruction of historical retrospective will be played by the study of historiographic heritage: the contribution of the classics of Russian

historical thought of the 19th century to the study of the forest problem and its role in Russian history.

Russian historians of the 19th century intuitively felt this interconnection of folk life and the forest, not only searched for documentary evidence, but also visually observed the remnants of this historical coexistence of the people and the forest, as conscientious scientists, to the extent of their scientific and literary talent, tried to express their basic characteristics of this "forest world".

The sources, due to the specifics of historiographic work, were the various works of Russian historians of the 19th century devoted to the Russian history of the medieval period and the new time, the time of the ethno genesis of the Russian people, the formation of economic foundations, culture and Russian statehood.

Soloviev Sergey Mikhailovich (1820-1879), the largest historian of pre-revolutionary Russia. The main work is "The History of Russia from Ancient Times" (29 vols., 1851-1879), in which, based on a huge number of historical sources, the scientist substantiated a new concept of Russian history [61]. She explained her originality by three factors: "the nature of the country" (natural and geographical features), "the nature of the tribe" (ethno cultural identity of the Russian people) and the "course of external events" (foreign policy reasons). Recognized the common features of the historical path of Russia and Western Europe and the possibility of a comparative historical research method. He proved the historical regularity and preparedness of the reforms of Peter I, their need for the country to enter the path of "Europeanization". The attachment of peasants to the land and serfdom was seen as a necessary measure, caused by the "spread" of the peasantry over the vast territory of Russia and the military needs of the state. The historical concept of the scientist had a great influence on his students (V.O. Klyuchevsky and others) and on the whole domestic historical science of the XIX century. [51].

Kostomarov Nikolai Ivanovich (1818-1885), historian, publicist, public figure, corresponding member of the Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, current state adviser, author of the multi-volume publication "Russian History in the Biographies of Its Most Important Figures" [39], researcher of socio-political and economic history of Russia. Kostomarov tried not only to reveal the conditions that led to the formation of the Russian political system, but also to determine closer the very nature of this system, its relation to the life that preceded it, and its influence on the masses. To find and catch the peculiarities of the national life of parts of the Russian state was the task of his studies in history. In connection with this main idea of Kostomarov's work, he had another idea about the need to study the tribal characteristics of each part of the people and create a regional history. He introduced and persistently carried out in all his works the idea of folk history. N.I. Kostomarov was interested in Slavic mythology [41], domestic life and customs of the Russian people [40], Zemsky Cathedrals [44], the Time of Troubles of the Moscow State [42],

schism [37], Cossacks [33], Russian foreigners [38], domination of the house Romanovs before the accession to the throne of Catherine II [36].

Vasily Osipovich Klyuchevsky (1841-1911), historian, professor at Moscow University, academician of the Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences on Russian history and antiquities, chairman of the Imperial Society of Russian History and Antiquities, secret adviser. Candidate dissertation: "Tales of foreigners about the Moscow state" (1866) [29], master's thesis: "Old Russian lives of saints as a historical source" (1871) [19], doctoral dissertation: "Boyar Duma of Ancient Russia" (1882). In the field of scientific interest V.O. Klyuchevskogo turned out to be the economic activity of the Solovetsky Monastery (1867), new studies on the history of ancient Russian monasteries (1869), the church in relation to the mental development of ancient Russia (1870), the origin of serfdom in Russia (1885), the poll tax and the abolition of slavery (1886), the composition of the representation at the zemsky cathedrals of ancient Russia (1890). His works were published in the USSR: "Works in nine volumes. The course of Russian history" [30], "Unpublished works" [23], "Historical portraits. Figures of historical thought" [20], and the real renaissance of the historical heritage of V.O. Klyuchevsky survived at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries: "A Brief Guide on Russian History" [21], "Russian History: A Full Course of Lectures: in Three Books" [26, 27], "Aphorisms. Historical portraits and studies. Diaries" [18], "On Morality and Russian Culture" [24], "Russian History" [28], "The Complete Course of Russian History" [25], "The Course of Russian History" [22]. Of course, we were primarily interested in stories related to the influence of the natural factor, the role of the forest in Russian history.

Nikolai Yakovlevich Danilevsky (1822-1885), Russian sociologist, culturologist, naturalist, geopolitician, one of the founders of the civilizational approach to history, the ideologist of pan-Slavism. The main work of N.Ya. Danilevsky "Russia and Europe" (1869) [5-8], in which he put forward the theory of isolated, local "cultural-historical types" (civilizations) that develop like living organisms. They are in a continuous struggle with each other and with the external environment, just like biological species, they go through the stages of maturation, decrepitude and inevitable death. The course of history is expressed in the change of cultural-historical types replacing each other. Danilevsky considers the "Slavic type" most fully expressed in the Russian people to be a qualitatively new, promising from the point of view of history type. Danilevsky's research interest was manifested in his attention to the population movement in Russia [10], the climate of the Vologda province (Danilevsky, 1853), Darwinism [3], and other political and economic problems [9].

In general, the source study base is sufficient to solve the tasks. The study is based on the general methodological principles of historical knowledge - historicism, scientific credibility, systematicity and objectivity. The method of structural-functional analysis was also used. It was used to study the socio-political concepts of Russian

scientists, in which society, economics, and forms of interaction with nature appear to be a complex dynamic system. In addition, special historical methods were used - historical-genetic (when revealing the evolution of views on the role of the forest in Russian history), comparative-historical (when determining the general and special in approaches to the problem of forest and man among Russian historians of the 19th century), historical system (in the course of a comprehensive analysis of different groups of sources).

Discussion.

The problem of studying the rich historical heritage of Russian historians of the 19th century S.M. Soloviev, N.I. Kostomarov, V.O. Klyuchevsky, N.Ya. Danilevsky is an actively developing topic in the study of Russian historiography. New sources are regularly introduced into circulation, especially documents of personal origin, journalism. A significant contribution to the study of the aforementioned topics was made by the monographs of N.L. Rubinstein [56], M.V. Nechkina [48], V.E. Illeritsky [15], Yu.A. Pinchuk [52], N.I. Tsimbaeva [62, 63], S.I. Bazhova [2], A.P. Shikman [58], B.P. Balueva [1], G.V. Vernadsky [64], M.Yu. Lachaeva [45], as well as collective works and general works "Essays on the history of historical science in the USSR" [50], "Historiography of the history of Russia until 1917" [16], "Encyclopedia of life and work of N.I. Kostomarov" [13] and others.

A huge number of special works and research articles on various subjects of the scientific work of Russian historians of the XIX century: K.N. Leontiev [46], A.A. Galaktionova and P.F. Nikandrova [14], A.M. Sakharov [57], V.A. Zamlin [65, 66], Yu.S. Pivovarov [53], O.A. Platonov [54], V.V. Kichurina [17], A.V. Efremova [11, 12], S.A. Nikolsky and V.P. Filimonova [49], Yu.A. Polyakova and N.V. Shcherban [55] and others. They analyzed the views of Russian scientists on the problems of the formation and development of Russian statehood, the economic structure, rural and urban life, everyday life, beliefs, religion and culture, Russian national character and self-awareness. Today, the questions of interpretations by Russian historians of the 19th century of the influence of natural factors (forests, river systems, climatic features, characteristics of the soils used, geographical location of the developed territories) on the development of the Russian world remain insufficiently studied. Attempts are just beginning to assimilate the historical heritage of classical Russian historiography related to the theme of "social geography" of medieval Russia and new-historical Russia. Much remains to be done for the scientific analysis of the problem: "historians on the role of forests in Russian history."

It should be noted that the interaction of man and nature in the Russian geographical space for a thousand years has been considered either within the narrow framework of local historical concepts, or individual topics and subjects have been studied outside their relationship with each other and outside the historical context. The first appeal to this problem was made by us more than twenty years ago, but only in the form of theses at a number of international conferences devoted to the history of the

forest [59]. Therefore, there was an urgent need to create a comprehensive study in which the main directions of the concepts of "forest history" of 19th-century Russian historians would be considered in interrelation. This study is an initial attempt to fill the indicated historiographic gap.

A steady account of the geographical factor, nature and the environment in which the history of Russia went was typical for S.M. Solovieva [60]. "Where, under what natural influences did the people act ... - here," writes S.M. Soloviev - the first questions in the history of every nation" [60, p.159].

His remarks on the role of forest spaces in the centralization of the Moscow state, which was primarily a forest state ("The Moscow state was primarily a forest state; to travelers, the whole country seemed to be a vast forest cleared for dwellings and arable land"), when parts of the population scattered over vast spaces, live a special life, are not connected by the division of occupations, when there are no big cities, when communications are difficult, there is no consciousness of common interests, then the parts fragmented in this way are brought into contact, pulled together by government centralization, which, in his opinion, is the stronger the weaker the internal connection. "Centralization makes up for the lack of internal communication, due to this lack," concludes S.M. Solovyov [60, p. 26].

Russian history took shape, in his opinion, in the long struggle between the "forest" and the "steppe", in the struggle against the invasions of the southeastern nomads and the state could establish itself, gain strength only far from the steppe, in the north, in the forest side, inaccessible, inconvenient for the nomad [60, p. 45].

The original interpretation of S.M. Solovyov's historical differences between Western and Eastern Europe: the first is stone, the second is wooden. The stone divided Western Europe into many states, delimited nationalities, protected freedom, gave strength and certainty to everything. A tree in the East created one state of unprecedented size, since people always move across a wide unlimited forest area: the lack of diversity did not make resettlement difficult, the fragility of dwellings - wooden huts, the cheapness of the material favored the population to leave invasions, taxes [60, p. 45-46]. Hence the desire of the government to "catch and attach" [60, p. 44]. "There are no solid dwellings with which it would be difficult to part, in which would have settled down for whole generations; cities consist of a pile of wooden huts, the first spark - and instead of them a pile of ash. The trouble, however, is small, driven so little that it is easy to take with you, to build a new house does not cost anything cheap material: from here with such ease the old Russian man left his home, his hometown or village; left the Tatar, from Lithuania, left the heavy tax, from the bad governor or clerk; there was nothing to wander about, for everywhere it was possible to find the same thing, everywhere Russia smelled. Hence the habit of spending in the population and the government's desire to catch, plant and attach" [60, p. 58].

The struggle of the state with the Cossacks during its inception, according to S.M. Solov'ev, there are relatively natural forms - the struggle of the forest side with the field, the steppe. Under these conditions, the forest more limited, determined, made a man settled. The stinginess of nature, which requires constant and hard work on the part of man, forms, believes S.M. Soloviev, such traits of his character as slowness, caution, consistency in achieving the goal, thoughtfulness, which are able to establish strong foundations of state life [60, p. 188-190].

At the same time, according to S.M. Solovyov's own disadvantageous aspects: it determined the severity of the climate, dampness, and the abundance of water and swamps, which made travel difficult in the summer and forced him to resort to the hard work of paving roads with wood [60, p. 46]. "Near the capital, travelers on summer nights had to lay fires to escape from myriads of mosquitoes and midges. Near this trouble there was danger, danger from a wild beast living in the forest, and even greater from a man who so conveniently hid his evil trade in the forest" [60].

In general, the movement of Russian history from the southwest to the northeast was a movement from the countries of the best to the worst, in more adverse conditions. Sad, harsh, monotonous nature could not, according to S.M. Solovyov's life-giving effect on the spirit of a person, to develop a sense of beauty in him, a desire to decorate life, to raise it above the daily, everyday monotony, to bring into a festive state, so necessary for the restoration of strength. The small population was scattered in vast desert spaces, which were constantly increasing without a corresponding increase in population. All this was poor and weak, without the possibility of independent life, without the possibility of protection when faced with any force.

"The Russian man appeared in the northeastern deserts seedless in all the sad meaning that this word had in our days. Lonely, abandoned into the world of barbarians, the last, the last of the European-Christian family, forgotten by his own and forgetting his remoteness, scattered from his siblings - these are the position of the Russian man in the northeast: and for centuries it was intended for him to move further and further further in the desert of the east, to live in alienation from the Western gatherings" [60].

The sad, harsh, monotonous nature, the Russian scientist believes, could not have a life-giving effect on the spirit of a person, develop a sense of beauty in him, a desire to decorate life, raise it above everyday monotony [60, p. 26].

According to another Russian historian of the XIX century N.Ya. Danilevsky in the early stages of the formation of the Russian nationality and statehood "nothing prevented the free resettlement of the Russian people," since "in this whole space there was no formed political body when the Russian people gradually began to leave tribal forms of life and adopt a state system. The whole country was either a desert or inhabited by semi-wild Finnish tribes and nomads", he "occupied wastelands" [5, p. 24-25]. For the most part, N.Ya. Danilevsky, it was "occupation of an empty place, perfect

... the resettlement of the Russian people almost without the assistance of the state" [5, p. 39].

"The expanse of forests, waters and steppes that Finnish hunters only roam: Zyryans, Vogulichi, Cheremis, Mordovians, the whole, measuring and Tatar nomads" allowed, according to the scientist, to make extensive resettlements almost without the participation of the government, adventurers and even robber chieftains [5, p. 63, 188-189].

According to N.Ya. Danilevsky, the forest has great cultural power, since only forests, representing a sufficient physical obstacle to the development of nomadic life, do not, however, constitute an insurmountable barrier to the founding of settled life, and, consequently, to the development of the original culture. An original culture, without any extraneous influence, could have arisen, in his opinion, only in a forest country [5, p. 230].

According to N.Ya. Danilevsky, Russians were not a nomadic people, attached to their homeland, to their climate, to their surrounding nature [5, p. 52]. Forest for the Eastern Slav, in his interpretation, is a poetic mood inspired by a mysterious thicket and twilight [5, p. 230].

The scientist is considering a method of resettlement in a forest country: from settlements - islands in the forest sea, to forest islands. "At first, individual settlements were scattered by rare islands in the forest sea. Settlements, farms, repairs occupy new places near their metropolis; small forest barriers separating them are cut down and a volost consisting of several villages is formed, between which there is no separating forest space. Small islands are grouped near this large settled island. The volosts themselves are separated by significant forest areas. The number of volosts is increasing, and the forest, in which rare villages were first interspersed, from the forest ocean takes the form of a network, all the threads of which are interconnected" [5, p. 230-231].

But vast swamps, according to N.Ya. Danilevsky, prevent this forest network from being evenly riddled with villages. Vast forest spaces remain - ditches that separate one group of villages (volosts, communities) from another. With an increase in population, N.Ya. Danilevsky, the network breaks in many places, the volosts merge with each other, merge, and finally they themselves form a continuous network in which "pieces of forest are scattered in separate groups, as before villages were scattered in the forest network" [5, p. 231]. These pieces of wood concludes N.Ya. Danilevsky, everything is decreasing, and there is a continuous sea or lake of villages in which "forest islands are scattered." These lakes do not merge, however, into one vast sea, remaining for a long time still separated by vast drags.

This course of resettlement in the forest should be followed by the course of development of the public, which explains, in his opinion, the federal structure of all

the peoples living in the forest country, whom history found during the ethnographic period of their life (as, for example, among the Germans and the Slavs) [5, p. 231].

The territorial dominance of the Russian forest indirectly softened, according to N. Ya. Danilevsky, the Tatar yoke, since the degree of culture, the way of life of settled Russian and Tatar nomads were different and any power of the latter over the former could not penetrate deeply, had to stay on one surface. This was promoted, according to the scientist, by the nature of the area, which allowed the conquerors to maintain their usual way of life in the Zadonsky and Zavolzhsky steppes [5, p. 257].

At the same time, the space and nature of the Russian region were, according to N. Ya. Danilevsky, the main obstacle to state unification, since there is no need to obey the harsh requirements of the state order, personal service, money payments, when forests represented impenetrable shelters [5, p. 258]. "Its vast forests and steppes made it possible for the rare population, still living in ethnographic forms of life, to evade the burdens imposed by the state, to elude them without active resistance" [5, p. 496].

N.Ya. Danilevsky singles out the so-called law of preserving the stock of historical forces when, at the beginning of the history of a people, part of it, being in favorable geographical conditions and in relations with neighboring nations that have reached a higher degree of culture, makes a breakthrough in progressive development. Meanwhile, the rest of the people under the protective cover of mighty nature (including forests) continues to lead a quiet life, not squandering, but accumulating, elements of future power [5, p. 437].

Forest factor, according to N.Ya. Danilevsky, will play an almost decisive role in the collection of Russian lands under the banner of Moscow after internal strife, the "Tatar pogrom", the invasions of Lithuania and the Polish government. "But in the northeast, in a dense forest country (emphasized by us - M.Sh.), Russian colonization, apart from active historical life, forms a strong reserve of Russian power, strengthens Finnish tribes and, having strengthened, is the restorer of the unity of Russia ..." [5, p. 439].

Massifs - swamps and forests - N.Ya. Danilevsky also took into account the important military-strategic factor of Russia's security in modern times. "The vast impassable swamps and forests," concludes the scientist, "cut the space along the western border of Russia into two completely separate theaters of war" [5, p. 375].

Indirectly forest spaces, swamps, impassability even serfdom in Russia did, according to N. Ya. Danilevsky, "an easy form of dependence", but only for the XVIII century. Given this geography, the weakness of economic ties, and trade, subsistence farming dominated, landowners were satisfied with the products and products of their estates, had stocks of bread, oats, smoked their wine, infused on forest berries and sweetened with honey from apiary trees [5, p. 261].

The forest also finds its place in N. Ya. Danilevsky spread of Christianity in Russia. If the new religion had to endure a strong fight against paganism, then how could the power contribute to the affirmation of Christianity against the will of the

people, with the then weakness of state power, with impassable forests, dividing the region from the region, volost from volost, the Russian scientist raises the question [5, p. 193].

In their size and architectural splendor, Russian churches could not compete with the Gothic cathedrals of Northern Europe or with the temples of Italy, N.Ya. Danilevsky, due to the lack of technical experience, material means for the construction of such huge buildings, and, most importantly, the material of manufacture - wood, which is cheap, malleable, convenient to use, but perishable [5, p. 272].

Secular architecture, ornamentation of houses and household utensils did not receive much development in Ancient Russia, according to N. Ya. Danilevsky, not only because of the simplicity of the then needs, but also because almost all the buildings were wooden [5, p. 273].

The image of the forest and Russian history are so merged, related in perception of N.Ya. Danilevsky, that he often, for the best, as it seemed to him, argumentation, used comparisons of soil, forest, a specific type of tree (for example, oak), its root system and certain socio-historical objects and phenomena of Russian, or Slavic, life in general. Here are just a few examples. In chapter III, "Is Russia Europe?" N.Ya. Danilevsky writes: "Is it possible that an organism that has been eating its juices that are pulled by its roots from its soil for so long, sticks to the other organism with its neighbors, let its roots dry and become alien from an independent plant? If the soil is lean, that is, if it lacks any components necessary for the full growth, it must be fertilized, these missing parts must be delivered, those that are already in it should be loosened with deep plowing, so that they are better and easier to assimilate, and not alien, leaving to dry their roots. (...) If not by birth, then by adoption, Russia has become Europe; the European shank is grafted to a wild game" [5, p. 60-61].

In chapter X, "Differences in the Course of Historical Education," N. Ya. Danilevsky, explaining the interaction of different peoples, again uses the image of a living tree. "If a tribe located at such a still inconscient stage of development is embraced by another, which has already begun its political growth, then the former is absorbed by the latter; for the tribe, more powerful and mature, cannot stop its growth because these tribal shortcomings meet on its way. If a foreign object is caught between a tree and its bark, the tree overgrows it and includes it in its mass. (...) Such was the fate of the Finnish tribes scattered throughout the space of Russia" [5, p. 223].

N.Ya. Danilevsky once again applies the image of the "tree" in his explanatory scheme for Peter's reforms in the first quarter of the 18th century. "Having become acquainted with Europe, he ... wanted by all means to make Russia Europe. Seeing the fruits that the European tree brought, he concluded that the plant itself, which brought them, was superior to the Russian fruitless wild game (not taking into account the age differences, not thinking that the fruiting season might not have come yet) and therefore wanted to cut down it at the very root and replace it with another" [5, p. 265].

In the story about Constantinople and "complaints about the too huge size of Russia", the possible expansion of the Russian state N. Ya. Danilevsky proposes the following dependence of size and growth "from the relation of the achieved growth to the internal expansive power of the growing. Oak and three girths thick and fifteen fathoms high cannot yet be called too large, outgrown its normal size! The state also cannot be considered to have reached its full growth, no matter how much it encloses square miles or miles, when about three million other compatriots live outside its borders ... "[5, p. 377].

Great attention was paid to the problem of the impact of forests on Russian history in his work V.O. Klyuchevsky. He considered the effect of settlement on tribal life [20, p. 38-39], the colonization of forest north-eastern region [20, p. 90], the features of household life, created under the influence of the nature of the country (dispersal of the population, insignificance of peasant plowing, mobile nature of tillage, development of forest land) [20, p. 102], various aspects of the psychology of Russian people (the struggle with nature alone, in the wilderness of the forest), formed in silent black work on the external nature, on the forest, and not on itself and society [20, p. 105].

The forest provided a variety of services to the Russian man — economic, political, and even moral: he built it with pine and oak, heated it with birch and aspen, lit it with a birch torch, shod it with his bast shoes, and equipped it with household utensils and a bast. For a long time and in the north, as before in the south, he fed the national economy with a fur-bearing animal and a forest bee. The forest served as the most reliable refuge from external enemies, replacing Russian mountains and castles. The state itself, whose first experience on the border with the steppe failed due to the fault of this neighborhood, could strengthen, according to V.O. Klyuchevsky, only in the north, far from Kiev, under the cover of forests from the steppe [22, ch. 4].

Analyzing the nature of the colonization of the regions of the Middle Oka and the upper Volga by Russian settlers V.O. Klyuchevsky emphasizes the geographical conditions for the development of the region. "Finnish tribes settled in the forests and swamps of central and northern Russia at a time when there was no noticeable trace of the presence of Slavs" [20, p. 41]. In his opinion, settlement took place, and not conquest of the region. The colonists themselves, according to the Russian scientist, "for the most part belonged to the peaceful rural population, who left the south-western Russia from the hardships there and sought among the forests of the North not safe harvests, but safe places for cultivation and crafts" [20, p. 43]. In addition, Russian immigrants, believes V.O. Klyuchevsky, the Finns did not invade the land by large masses, but seeped in thin streams, "occupying vast gaps that remained in the swamps and forests of the Finnish villages."

The Russian people, according to V.O. Klyuchevsky, this is a kind of economic system and even a special national character, and the nature of the country has worked hard on this system and on this character [20, p. 55]. The main features of the Upper

Volga region, which makes up the central region of Great Russia, are the abundance of forests and swamps, the predominance of loam in the soil and the spider web of rivers and streams running in different directions. According to V.O. Klyuchevsky, a deep imprint on both household life and the tribal character of Great Russia [20, p. 55].

Rural settlements here have gained a decisive advantage over the cities. Moreover, V.O. Klyuchevsky, and these settlements sharply differed in their character from the villages of southern Russia. In the latter, external dangers and lack of water in the open steppe forced the population to settle in large masses, to be crowded into huge villages. On the contrary, a settler in the north, V.O. Klyuchevsky, "in the midst of forests and swamps, he was struggling to find a dry place where he could put his foot with some safety and convenience and build a hut. Such dry places, open hillocks, were rare islands in the sea of forests and swamps" [20, p. 56]. On such islands one, two, maximum three peasant households could be put up. That is why a small village is, according to V.O. Klyuchevsky, the dominant form of settlement in northern Russia until the end of the XVII century. Around such small scattered villages, it was difficult to find a significant continuous space that could be conveniently plowed. Convenient places around the villages came across insignificant areas. These sites were cleared by the inhabitants of a small village. "It was an unusually difficult job: it was necessary, choosing a convenient dry place for arable land, to burn out the forest that covered it, to root out stumps, to raise virgin soil" [20, p. 56].

The then methods of cultivating the land were reported, according to V.O. Klyuchevsky, mobile, restless, nomadic nature of this cultivation. Burning the forest to *novi*, the peasant informed the loam of enhanced fertility and for several years removed an excellent crop from it, because ash serves as a strong fertilizer. But after six to seven years, the soil was depleted, and the peasant had to leave it for a long rest, to let it fall over. Then he notes V.O. Klyuchevsky, transferred his yard to another, often remote place, raised another *nov*, put a new "fix on the forest" [20, p. 57]. Thus exploiting the land, the Great Russian peasant moved from place to place in the direction of the northeast, until he reached the natural borders of the Russian plain, to the Urals and the White Sea.

In order to make up for the meager earnings from tilling on the Upper Volga loam, the peasant had to turn to crafts. "Forests, rivers, lakes, swamps provided him with many lands, the development of which could serve as an aid to meager agricultural income" [20, p. 57]. V.O. Klyuchevsky sees this as the source of that peculiarity that has distinguished since time immemorial the economic life of the Great Russian peasant, the reason for the development of local rural crafts, called handicrafts. Handicrafts, fishing, hunting, beekeeping (beekeeping in the hollows of trees), fishing, salt production, tarring, ironwork - each of these activities served as the basis for household life in whole districts.

According to Klyuchevsky, the features of the Great Russian economy that were created under the influence of the country's nature are "1) the dispersion of the population, the dominance of small towns, villages, 2) the insignificance of peasant plowing, the smallness of backyard arable plots, 3) the mobile nature of tillage, the dominance of portable or deciduous agriculture, and 4) finally, the development of small rural industries, the intensified development of forest, river and other lands "[20, p. 57].

Along with the influence of the country's nature on the national economy of Great Russia V.O. Klyuchevsky notes traces of its effect on the tribal character of Great Russia. Great Russia of the XIII-XV centuries with its forests, swamps and swamps at every step, the scientist notes, presented the settler with thousands of small dangers, unforeseen difficulties and troubles, which had to be fought every minute. This taught Great Russians, according to V.O. Klyuchevskogo, vigilantly follow nature, look at both, walk around looking around and feeling the soil, do not meddle in the water without looking for a ford, developed in him resourcefulness, a habit of patient struggle with hardships and deprivations. "In Europe there are no people less spoiled and pretentious, accustomed to expect less from nature and fate and more enduring" [20, p. 57].

By the very property of the region, each locality asked the settler a difficult economic riddle: he needed to study the place, all its conditions, in order to look out for the land. Hence, V.O. Klyuchevsky, this amazing observation, which opens in Russian folk signs. Here, all the characteristic phenomena of the annual turn of Great Russian nature are captured, its diverse climatic and economic accidents are noted [20, p. 58]. "Saints and holidays were his guides in this observation and study. ... He carried them out of the temple with him into the hut, in the field and in the forest, hanging their signs in their names ... In the signs of Great Russia, his meteorology, his business textbook, and his everyday autobiography "[20, p. 59-60]. The vernacular signs of Great Russia are wayward, Klyuchevsky believes, as the wayward nature reflected in them is willful. She often laughs at the most cautious calculations, the waywardness of the climate and soil deceive the most modest expectations of Great Russians. Contrasting the whim of nature with the whim of one's own courage, the tendency to tease happiness, play luck is, according to Klyuchevsky, the Russian "maybe".

The properties of the region determined, according to the Russian scientist, the order of resettlement of the Great Russians. Life remote from each other, secluded villages with a lack of communication could not teach Great Russians to act in large unions, friendly masses. Velikoross did not work in an open field, in front of everyone, like an inhabitant of southern Russia, he fought nature alone, in the wilderness of the forest with an ax in his hand. "It was a silent black work on the external nature, on a forest or a wild field, and not on oneself and society, not on one's feelings and attitudes towards people" [20, p. 61].

Despite all such services, the forest, according to V.O. Klyuchevsky was always difficult for a Russian person. "In the old days, when there were too many of them, he interrupted his paths and roads with his thicket, challenged the meadows and fields with difficulty in clearing thickets, and threatened livestock and cattle with a bear and a wolf. Robbery nests also twisted through the forests." The hard work of the ax and the flint, which started the forest cultivation on the pali, cleared from under the felled and burnt forest, according to V.O. Klyuchevsky, tired, annoyed. This can explain the unfriendly or careless attitude of a Russian person to the forest: he never loved his forest, concluded the Russian scientist [22, ch. 4]. Unaccountable timidity took hold of him when he stepped under his gloomy canopy. The sleepy, "dense" silence of the forest frightened him; in the dull, soundless noise of its age-old peaks, something ominous was sensed; every minute expectation of an unexpected, unpredictable danger strained my nerves, excited my imagination. And Old Russian people inhabited the forest with all kinds of fears. The forest is the dark kingdom of the one-eyed goblin, an evil spirit - a mischievous person who loves to fool around with a traveler wandering in his domain.

According to V. O. Klyuchevsky, the methods of land cultivation at that time gave a mobile, restless, nomadic character to this farming. Burning the forest in Novi, the farmer gave the loam increased fertility and for several years removed from it an excellent crop, because the ash is a strong fertilizer. But after six or seven years, the soil was exhausted, and the farmer had to leave it for a long rest, run into fallow. Then he, notes V. O. Klyuchevsky, moved his yard to another, often remote place, raised another virgin soil, put a new "fix on the forest" [20, p. 57]. Thus exploiting the land, the great Russian peasant moved from place to place in the direction of the North-East, until he reached the natural borders of the Russian plain, the Urals and the White sea.

In order to make up for the meagre earnings from farming in the upper Volga loam, the peasant had to turn to crafts. "Forests, rivers, lakes, swamps provided him with a lot of land, the development of which could serve as a help to poor agricultural earnings" [20, p. 57]. V. O. Klyuchevsky sees this as the source of the peculiarity that distinguishes the economic life of the great Russian peasant from time immemorial, the reason for the development of local rural crafts, called artisanal.

Handicrafts, fishing, hunting, beekeeping (forest beekeeping in tree hollows), fishing, salt production, tarring ironwork - of these occupations served as the basis of economic life of entire districts.

Features of the great Russian economy, created under the influence of the country's nature, according to Klyuchevsky, are "1) the dispersion of the population, the dominance of small towns, villages, 2) the insignificance of peasant plowing, the smallness of farmstead arable land, 3) the mobile nature of grain farming, the dominance of portable or shifting agriculture, and 4) finally, the development of small rural crafts, enhanced development of forest, river and other lands" [20, p. 57].

Along with the influence of the country's nature on the national economy of great Russia, V. O. Klyuchevsky notes traces of its action on the tribal character of great Russia. Great Russia of the XIII-XV centuries with its forests, swamps and swamps at every step, the scientist notes, presented the settler with thousands of small dangers, unforeseen difficulties and troubles that had to be constantly fought. This taught the great, according to V. O. Klyuchevsky's ability to keep a sharp eye on nature, to keep his eyes open, to look around and feel the ground, not to go into the water without looking for a ford, developed in him a quirkiness, a habit of patient struggle with adversity and privation. "In Europe, there is no people less pampered and pretentious, accustomed to expect less from nature and fate, and more resilient" [20, p. 57].

By the very nature of the region, each locality gave the settler a difficult economic riddle: he had to study the place, all its conditions, in order to look for land. Hence, V. O. Klyuchevsky believes, this amazing observation, which is revealed in Russian folk signs. Here all the characteristic phenomena of the annual turnover of the great Russian nature are captured, its various climatic and economic accidents are noted [20, p. 58]. "Saints and feasts were his guides in this observation and study. ...He took them out of the temple with him to the hut, in the field and forest, putting their names on their signs... In the signs of the great Russian and his meteorology, and his economic textbook, and his household autobiography" [20, p. 59-60]. Folk signs of the great Russian are wayward, Klyuchevsky believes, as the nature reflected in them is wayward. It often laughs at the most cautious calculations, the waywardness of the climate and soil deceive the most modest expectations of the great Russian. The opposition to the Caprice of nature to the Caprice of one's own courage, the tendency to tease happiness, to play at luck, is, according to Klyuchevsky, the Russian "maybe".

According to the Russian scientist, the properties of the region determined the order of settlement of the great Russians. Life remote from each other, isolated villages with a lack of communication could not teach the great Russian to act in large unions, friendly masses. The great Russian did not work in the open field, in front of everyone, like an inhabitant of southern Russia, he fought with nature alone, in the middle of the forest with an axe in his hand. "It was a silent black work on external nature, on the forest or wild field, and not on yourself and society, not on your feelings and attitudes to people" [20, p. 61].

Despite all such services, the forest, according to V. O. Klyuchevsky, has always been heavy for the Russian person. "In the old days, when there was too much of it, it interrupted the way-roads with its thicket, disputed the hard-cleared meadow and field with its importunate thickets, and threatened itself and livestock with bear and wolf. There were also nests of robbers in the woods." According to V. O. Klyuchevsky, hard work with an axe and flint, which started forest farming on the Pali cleared from under the felled and burned forest, tired and annoyed. Russian scientist concluded that this can explain the unfriendly or careless attitude of the Russian person to the forest: he never liked his forest [22, p. 4]. An unaccountable shyness took possession of

him when he entered its shadowy shade. The sleepy, " deep " silence of the forest frightened him; there was something ominous in the dull, soundless noise of its age-old peaks; every minute the expectation of an unexpected, unforeseen danger strained his nerves and excited his imagination. And the old Russian man populated the forest with all sorts of fears. The forest is the dark realm of the one-eyed Goblin, a mischievous evil spirit who likes to fool around with a traveler who wanders into his domain.

V. O. Klyuchevsky defines some features of the psychology of the Russian person as the features of the forest side: isolation, caution, lack of communication, self-doubt, difficulty in getting used to acting together, the habit of hesitating and maneuvering between the roughness of the path, the impression of not being straight, insincerity, going to the goal looking around. "Nature and fate led the great Russian so that they taught him to go out on a straight road by devious ways. The great Russian thinks and acts as he walks. Think you can come up with bendy and twisty great Russian country road? Just like a snake crawled" [20, p. 62].

The "geography of the forest" became the "geopolitics of the forest country". Russian suburbs suffered, according To V. O. Klyuchevsky, from external enemies, but the small middle Moscow Principality remained safe, and boyars and common people were drawn there from all the edges of the Russian land [20, p. 66].

V. O. Klyuchevsky also studied such a plot as "the forest and the Church", he analyzed the role of numerous forest monasteries that became strongholds of peasant colonization. The monks cleared the forest, planted gardens, plowed, mowed, as did the peasants. This is evidenced by numerous petitions to Moscow about the monastic structure. Permission to plough meant that the wild state forest surrounding the monastery was given to him for clearing for arable land. From the moment of the award, the partnership (monastery) turned into an institution and became legal entity.

Agricultural farming had to be started in the wild untouched forest, clearing it for arable land and vegetable gardens. Hermits followed the peasants or paved their way in the forests of the Volga. The deserted forest monastery served the needs of the settlers, religious and economic, and widely used their labor.

The forest served as a Russian hermit's Thebaid desert, a refuge from the temptations of the world. Since the end of the XIV century people in the desert silence looking for salvation of the soul, rushed to the forest wilds of the Northern Volga region, where only they could lay a path. But, fleeing from the world to the desert, these forest pioneers, according to V. O. Klyuchevsky, carried the world with them there. Farmers followed in their footsteps, and the numerous monasteries that arose there became strongholds of peasant settlement, serving as parish churches, lenders, and almshouses for new settlers in their old age. Thus, the forest gave a special character to the Northern Russian desert breeding, making it a kind of form of forest colonization [22, p. 4].

The forest cover gave the Russian people the opportunity to concentrate their spiritual and religious efforts and accumulate spiritual strength against the threat from the Steppe. According to Klyuchevsky, the forest helped the political and moral revival of the Russian land. "In the early 40s of the XIV century, a 20 – year-old seeker of the desert, the future monk Sergius, in a dense forest (highlighted by us-M. Sh.) ... put a small wooden cell with the same Church" [20, p.66]. "He began with himself and by a long seclusion, full of labor and privation among the dense forest (highlighted by us-M. Sh.), prepared to be the leader of other desolators" [20, p. 69]. Sergius, having begun to rule the assembled brethren, was for her a cook, a Baker, a Miller, a woodcutter, a tailor, a carpenter. Everything in the monastery was poor and meagre. "In the very fence of the monastery, the primeval forest rustled over the cells and in the autumn sprinkled their roofs with dead leaves and needles; around the Church there were fresh stumps and untidy trunks of felled trees; in a wooden Church for lack of candles smelled of kindling ... "[20, p. 70].

This was the beginning of the moral and then political revival of the Russian people. Old Russian monasticism, according to V. O. Klyuchevsky, was an accurate indicator of the moral state of its secular society. Until the middle of the XIV century, almost all monasteries in Russia appeared in cities or under their walls. Since that time, V. O. Klyuchevsky believes, " a decisive numerical advantage is given to monasteries that arose far from cities, in the forest wilderness, waiting for the axe and plow. Thus, the main goal of monasticism, in the fight against the shortcomings of the spiritual nature of man, was joined by a new struggle with the inconveniences of external nature; rather, this second goal became a new means to achieve the first" [20, p. 72].

According to V. O. Klyuchevsky, the colonies of the Sergiev monastery and the monasteries founded by the disciples made up almost a fourth of the total number of new monasteries in the second century of the Tatar yoke, and almost all of these colonies were deserted forest monasteries like their mother country [20, p. 73]. Until the middle of the XIV century, the scientist notes, the mass of the Russian population, shot down by the enemies in the interfluvium of the Oka and upper Volga, timidly huddled here on a few strips of convenient land cleared among the forest and swamps. The Tatars and Lithuania blocked the exit from this triangle to the West, South, and Southeast. The way to the North and northeast beyond the Volga remained open. But it was a remote, impenetrable land, occupied in some places by savage Finns. A Russian peasant with his family, writes V. O. Klyuchevsky, was afraid to venture into these roadless wilds. The monk is a hermit and went there as a brave scout. The vast majority of new monasteries from the middle of the XIV to the end of the XV centuries arose among the forests of Kostroma, Yaroslavl and Vologda Zavolzhye [20, p. 73].

Numerous forest monasteries, according to V. O. Klyuchevsky, became here the mainstays of peasant colonization. "The wandering population settled around the monasteries, like the roots of trees interlocking quicksand soil. For the sake of saving his soul, the monk fled from the world to the Zavolzhsy forest, and the layman clung to it

and with its help started a new Russian world in this forest" [20, p. 73-74]. Great Russia was created by the friendly efforts of a monk and a peasant. Guided by the blessing of the monk Sergius, the fighters went, some for the Oka against the Tatars, others to the North for the Volga to fight with the forest and swamp.

According To V. O. Klyuchevsky, the political order of separate princely possessions in the first centuries of the history of the Russian state was formed in close correlation with the geographical distribution of the population, and this distribution, in turn, was guided by the properties of the region and the course of its colonization.

Russian forest influence on the "history of the people", its way of life and customs in the XVI-XVII centuries was studied by the famous Russian historian of the XIX century N. I. Kostomarov [34, 43]. The role of the forest and its "derivatives": wood, animal skins and furs, meat and feathers of birds, berries, mushrooms, honey, nuts, its landscape features: cities, villages, settlements, villages and villages, were the focus of attention of the historical concept of N. I. Kostomarov. According to the scientist, home furniture and utensils, clothing, food and drink, the way of home life, leaving home and traveling, games and fun, holidays, home rituals and beliefs of the Russian people are closely connected with the forest and its products.

In the XV-XVI centuries, cities in Russia were mostly wooden, city walls and fortifications were also made of wood and earth. "In general, the countless cities that dotted the space of the Russian possessions," wrote N. I. Kostomarov, " were fortified with wooden or earthen walls, that is, with ramparts and a rear rampart. (...) For the most part, wooden fortifications were connected to earthen ones in different ways: for example, a rampart or talus was filled in, and a wooden wall or back was built on the talus; or the wall stood on flat ground, but the talus followed it; or the wooden walls were covered with gristle, that is, a pile of stones, sand and earth. Simple spears or Gables were made without scree, and their wooden walls were only protected by ditches. Often the city, surrounded by a wooden wall and a moat, was once again surrounded by a talus or wooden wall – the so-called Ostrog, and between the city and the Ostrog there was a settlement" [34, p. 1]. Some monasteries (they were generally strongholds in that century) had the same form of fortifications.

Very often, the walls of the city, N. I. Kostomarov notes, were double, triple and quarter. The space between the walls was filled with earth, or connected by cross logs. On top of them, roofs were made of planks or latticework, sometimes very high. In other places, water was carried into these ditches, and in others piles called particle were driven in. The moats themselves were protected by a special fence made of oak logs. There were several rows of such ditches behind the main wall or rampart of the city. From the ditches in the side outer walls drainage was performed and did a long series of fortifications, called Natalbany. These were posts of thick logs (usually oak), placed close together and forming a solid wall. They were double and triple, that is, in

two and three rows; these rows were connected between cross ties of logs at the top and presented the form of corridors [34, p. 1].

Sometimes, according to N. I. Kostomarov, the rows of needles went from the city for twenty versts or more and were bordered by ditches, and in places towers were arranged between them. Where it was necessary to make an exit, a gate with descending decks was arranged. From these places it was off to the side the ranks of the new dragon teeth. At their turns, the overhangs ended up in forest debris, that is, piles of felled and felled wood. The enemy, writes N. I. Kostomarov, approaching the city, had to first pass through these rubble, then get confused about the labyrinth of needles, destroy them and then reach the double and triple city fortifications [34, p. 1].

In addition to needles, according to N. I. Kostomarov, there were also fortifications called Taras, which consisted of longitudinal logs and laid on them transverse, and if they were in two rows, then covered with shingles on top. On the sides were arranged forest sites, consisting of piles of piled wood, surrounded by a moat. These sites were built, according to N. I. Kostomarov, mainly in forest areas. There was a serif clerk with a detachment who were supposed to send a message to the city in case of detection of the enemy. The southern part of Muscovy, with its sparsely populated area, was dotted with cities and jails with hollows in the surrounding area and was cut by earthen ramparts in different directions, with many forest patches and rubble [34, p. 1]. Private and state-owned siege yards and huts were built for the common people in case of war, which could accommodate up to two hundred people. The resulting inconveniences from crowding, encouraged residents, according to N. I. Kostomarov, to wander through the forests, being in danger of falling under the Tatar Lariat, rather than go under siege.

The forest was actively used for paving streets in Moscow and large cities. They were round logs, packed tightly together, one against the other. Where there was no pavement, where it was especially dirty, N. I. Kostomarov notes, planks were simply laid across the streets [34, p. 4]. Near the villages there was always left pasture land called meadow, if there were meadows, or hog, when forests surrounded the village. Due to the fact that the construction was dominated by wood, wood as the main material, there were frequent and devastating fires in the cities, destroying these cities to the ground. Measures against fires, according to N.I. Kostomaro's, they were mostly protective: they tried to make yards wider, ordered to put tubs with water on the roofs of buildings, it was forbidden to sit with fire at night and use soap dishes and even stoves in huts in the summer, and instead, residents had to cook their own food in gardens [34, p. 4].

Most of the buildings in the cities of the XVI century were made of wood. No one, according to N. I. Kostomarov, considered stone buildings more convenient than wooden ones for housing. Wealthy people began to build stone houses, but still retained the old belief that wooden houses are healthier to live in [34, p. 7]. Wooden houses were made of pine, sometimes oak solid beams, which were folded very tightly

without using a single nail, but fastened the bars, placed one above the other, by means of prongs in the lower and notches or recesses in the upper. Whole thick beams were tightly held together, and for warmth they were covered with moss, which was also placed on the doors and Windows. If a hut not covered with moss was sold, such a hut was called a log house [34, p 7].

N. I. Kostomarov noted that the ordinary roof of Russian houses was made of wood, plank, shingle or shingle. In the XVI and XVII centuries, it was customary to cover the roof with birch bark from dampness, and sometimes put earth and turf on the roof to protect it from fire. The yards are fenced by a fence, sometimes a sharp fence. Gardens with fruit trees (apples, pears, cherries) were almost everywhere found at the houses on the plantations. Forest trees, according to N. I. Kostomarov, were rarely planted and if they were found in gardens, they were mostly odorous (cherry), or especially elegant (Rowan, viburnum) [34, p. 7].

The furniture and utensils of Russian homes were mostly wooden. The main decoration of houses, according to N. I. Kostomarov, were images that were written on boards. Benches, benches, and stools served as seats, and chairs and stools were the luxury of the noble boyars, and were not used by the people at all. Tables were made of wood, mostly oak [34, p. 8].

For storage of household items, hiding places were used (a kind of dressers with drawers), chests, suitcases. The dishes were placed in the supply: these are columns laid on all sides by regiments. To store bulky household supplies in crates, barrels, cadis, and baskets of various sizes and volumes were used. For the mash of dough, wooden troughs and large vats were used; for washing clothes troughs, nights, beeches, buckets for water socks, kumgans, troughs. At the table, liquid food was poured into wooden bowls, jugs (for the poor) [34, p. 8].

Ordinary people, according to N.I. Kostomarova, was content with wooden vessels, which had the same shape as the precious ones, and bore the same names. Like utensils for food - mises, torrels, salt marshes, and drinking vessels - brothers, ladles, crusts, were made of wood in different places around the villages and sold in markets. These wooden products were decorated with carvings, which have long been the favorite decoration of things for the poor class. Noblemen did not shun wooden utensils, and burl vessels were used by the boyars and even kings and were considered luxury [34, p. 8].

Tree bark bast shoes are ancient shoes of the common people. In addition to bast shoes, worn shoes woven from twigs of the vine. Fur coats, according to N.I. Kostomarova, were the most elegant dress for the Russian, because the Russians, with the poverty of the nature of their fatherland, could only flaunt before others that furs. Many furs in the house were a sign of contentment and prosperity. The poor fur coats were sheepskin, or sheepskin coats, and hare, middle-aged people squirrel and cunny,

the rich - sables and foxes of different species: foxes, black-brown, black, gray. Fur coats from ermines were probably made, N.I. Kostomarov, only for panache [34, p 9].

In short, the forest fed, clothed, shod, warmed, protected from bad weather, and inextricably accompanied the Russian person in everyday life (furniture, utensils) and in travel (wooden saddles, carts in summer, sledges in winter, boats, ploughs and rooks on the water). Russian saddles were made of wood and dry veins, they were low, flat. The saddles were most often upholstered in Morocco with gold patterns, sometimes with velvet, and the bows were gilded. Winter men's sledges were covered with bearskin, and a Persian or Turkish carpet was placed on the back of the sledge. The horse's head was removed with chains, rings, colored feathers, and animal tails – Fox, wolf, or sable. The coachman waved a hare-skin hat with a saiga horn head [34, p. 15].

Russian road sledges, notes N. I. Kostomarov, were made mostly of tree bark or bast and preferred wooden ones for their lightness. They were covered with matting at the back, with skins on the sides, and covered with furs at the top. When going on the road, writes N. I. Kostomarov, the Russian dressed as warmly as possible: on his head he had a hat covered and lined with fur, on his hands warm mittens, on his feet fur buttons; on top he covered himself with a bearskin [34, p. 15].

They were more likely to travel along the rivers in boats, which could be found with oarsmen wherever the road adjoined the river. According to N. I. Kostomarov, it was possible to use state-owned ploughs and rowers with the state-owned Podorozhnaya. The size of the ploughs and the number of rowers on them were measured with the width of the river and the length of the path from one pier to another. The ploughs, on which many passengers were seated, were made wide, with one mast and usually with sixteen oars; cages and partitions were arranged under the deck for passengers and their Luggage. A huge canvas sail was tied to the mast, which was unfurled when the wind was fair. Instead of a rudder, a long and wide pole was used, lowered into the water [34, p. 15].

Both in winter and summer, the traveller took with him a large supply of bread, dried meat, fish, lard, honey, and other supplies collected from city to city.

The forest and its derivatives accompanied the Russian man in games, amusements, and amusements. The Russians had their own national instruments: harps, horns, snuffles, pipes, antimony (trumpets), domras, bagpipes, drums, copper horns [34, p. 18].

The favorite pastime of women in all classes, according to N. I. Kostomarov, were swings and boards. Swinging on the boards was like this: a Board was placed on a log, two women stood on the edges of it and, Bouncing, pumped one another [34, p. 18]. Skating on ice (wooden horseshoes with narrow iron bands), sledding in winter – the tree also played a primary role here.

According to N. I. Kostomarov, hunting was considered the most worthy sport of the upper class. In Russia, in his opinion, it was not only belonging to the upper classes, as in the West, because there were too many animals in the Russian forests [34, p. 18]. In

the XVI century, draught people had to go to the wolf, Fox and bear fields, which meant chasing the beast. Falconry and Gyrfalcon hunting have long been considered a noble sport of princes and tsars.

Russian society has played a very significant, if not decisive, role in the forest factor in the life of a Russian person in different periods of development. This situation is explained by the characteristics of the natural conditions of Russian communities living in the forest area. It was here that the economic life, the psychology of the forest dweller, and the main elements of complex forestry were formed.

Mastering the riches of the Russian forest region, forms of "forest exploitation" were in the sphere of research interest of famous historians of the XIX century, S. M. Solovyov, N. Ya. Danilevsky, V. O. Klyuchevsky, N. I. Kostomarov, etc. The review of their concept of Russian forestry will help to clarify the attitude of the scientific circles of the Russian society of the XIX century to the "forest factor", some aspects of the tsarist forest policy, which is a necessary basic element of the historiographical picture of the history of Russian forestry.

Settling on the plain, the Eastern Slavs occupied mainly the forest side of it. In this desolate, wooded region, the researchers noted, the newcomers engaged in fur trapping, forest beekeeping, and grain farming. The spaces convenient for these trades did not run in vast continuous strips: among the forests and swamps, it was necessary to find more open and dry places and clear them for arable land, or to make in the forest certain devices for hunting and beekeeping. Such places were remote from one another among the Islands of the sea, forests and swamps. It was on these Islands that the settlers set up their lonely courtyards, dug them out, and cleared fields for arable land in the vicinity, making borti and traps in the forest.

The nature of forestry and agriculture destroyed the idea of the indivisibility of ancestral property. The forest was adapted to fishing by the efforts of individual courtyards, the field was cleared by the labor of individual families. Such forest and field plots, according to Russian historians, should have received the meaning of private family property early.

Conclusions

Thus, the works of famous Russian historians of the XIX century touched on many important aspects of multifunctional forestry in ancient and medieval Russia. Without mastering this historiographical heritage, it is impossible to start writing a full-scale Russian forest history. Russian historical thought's contribution to the development of the forest problem and its role in Russian history will help to determine the formation of scientific and public opinion on this problem in Russia of the XIX century, to determine the historiographical heritage of forest history in the USSR and modern Russia.

In recent decades, forest history has focused on the evolution of the forest environment in connection with social and economic development. However, aspects

such as the need for and market for forests, agriculture and pastoralism, and the evolution of forest technology have had different impacts on forest ecosystems according to the processes, systems, and practices involved in these activities.

Therefore, more attention should be paid to the scale of research. A local scale that takes specific forests allows for the use of different sources (written documents, iconography, investigative materials, oral interviews, etc.), but this may be possible when integrating different research levels that also address common issues. Along this path of historical analysis of the environment, social and political factors that affect the forest – in time and space – much can be achieved in the effective management and development of forest resources.

References

1. Baluev B.P. Spory o sud'bakh Rossii: N.Ya.Danilevskiy i yego kniga «Rossiya i Yevropa». [Disputes about the fate of Russia: N.Ya. Danilevsky and his book "Russia and Europe"]. M.: Editorial URSS. 1999. 280 p. [in Russian].
2. Bazhov S.I. Filosofiya N.Ya.Danilevskogo [Philosophy N.Ya.Danilevsky]. M: RAS Institute of Philosophy. 1997. 216 p. [in Russian].
3. Danilevsky N.Ya. Darvinizm. [Darwinism]. T.1-2. SPb. 1885-1889. [in Russian].
4. Danilevsky N.Ya. Klimat Vologodskoy gubernii. [Climate of the Vologda province]. SPb: Type. Imperial Academy of Sciences. 1853. 226 p. [in Russian].
5. Danilevsky N.Ya. Rossiya i Yevropa. [Russia and Europe]. M: Kniga. 1991. 576 p. [in Russian].
6. Danilevsky N.Ya. Rossiya i Yevropa: Vzgl'yad na kul'turnyye i politicheskiye otnosheniya Slavyanskogo mira k Germano-Romanskomu / sostavleniye, vstupitel'naya stat'ya i kommentarii A.A.Galaktionova. [Russia and Europe: A look at the cultural and political relations of the Slavic world to the German-Romanesque / drafting, introductory article and comments by A. A. Galaktionov]. SPb: Publishing house "Glagol". 1995. 552 p. [in Russian].
7. Danilevsky N.Ya. Rossiya i Yevropa, [Russia and Europe]. M: ITS «Drevneye i sovremennoye». 2002. 550 p. [in Russian].
8. Danilevsky N.Ya. Rossiya i Yevropa / Sostavleniye i kommentarii YU.A.Belova / Otv. red. O.Platonov. Izd. 2-ye. [Russia and Europe / Compilation and Comments of Yu.A. Belova / Ed. ed. O.Platonov. Ed. 2nd.]. M: Institut russkoy tsivilizatsii, Blagosloveniye. 2011. 816 p. [in Russian].
9. Danilevsky N.Ya. Sbornik politicheskikh i ekonomicheskikh statey. [Collection of political and economic articles]. SPb: Type. brother. Panteleev. 1890. 684 p. [in Russian].

10. Danilevsky N.Ya. Statisticheskiye issledovaniya o raspredelenii i dvizhenii narodonaseleniya v Rossii za 1846 god. [Statistical studies on the distribution and movement of population in Russia for 1846]. SPb: Type. MIA. 1851. 447 p. [in Russian].
11. Efremov A.V. Bor'ba za istoriyu. Kontseptsiya N.Ya. Danilevskogo v otsenke sovremennikov. [The fight for the story. The concept of N.Ya. Danilevsky in the evaluation of contemporaries]. M: Pashkov dom. 2006. 165 p. [in Russian].
12. Efremov A.V. (2005). Bor'ba za istoriyu. Vl.Solov'yov kak kritik N.Danilevskogo. [The fight for the story. Vl.Solovyov as a critic of N. Danilevsky]. *Nash sovremennik*. 2005. №6. pp. 205-215. [in Russian].
13. Entsiklopediya zhizni i tvorchestva N.I.Kostomarov (1817-1885). [Encyclopedia of the life and work of N.I. Kostomarov (1817-1885)]. Kiyev, Donetsk: Yugo-Vostok. 2001. 570 p. [in Russian].
14. Galaktionov A.A., Nikandrov P.F. Slavyanofil'stvo, yego natsional'nyye istochniki i mesto v istorii russkoy mysli. [Slavophilism, its national sources and place in the history of Russian thought]. *Voprosy filosofii*. 1996. №6. pp. 120-130. [in Russian].
15. Illeritsky V.E. S.M.Solov'yov. [S.M. Solovyov]. Otv.red. A.A.Preobrazhenskiy. M: Nauka. 1980. 192 p. [in Russian].
16. Istoriografiya istorii Rossii do 1917 goda [Historiography of the history of Russia before 1917]. Ucheb.dlya stud.vyssh.ucheb.zav-y: v 2 t. / Pod red. M.YU.Lachayevoy. M: Vysshaya shkola. 2003. [in Russian].
17. Kichurin V.V. S.M.Solov'yov: khristianin i uchonyy. [S.M. Solovyov: Christian and scholar]. SPb: Petropolis. 2001. 116 p. [in Russian].
18. Klyuchevsky V.O. (1993a). Aforizmy. Istoricheskiye portrety i etyudy. Dnevnik. [Aphorisms. Historical portraits and sketches. Diaries]. M: Mysl'. 1993. 415 p. [in Russian].
19. Klyuchevsky V.O. Drevnerusskiye zhitiya svyatykh kak istoricheskiy istochnik. [Old Russian Lives of the Saints as a historical source]. M: AST, Astrel'. 2003. 395 p. [in Russian].
20. Klyuchevsky V.O. (1991a). Etnograficheskiye sledstviya russkoy kolonizatsii Verkhnego Povolzh'ya. Vliyaniye prirody Verkhnego Povolzh'ya na narodnoye khozyaystvo Velikorossii i na plemennoy kharakter velikorossa. [Ethnographic consequences of the Russian colonization of the Upper Volga region. The influence of the nature of the Upper Volga region on the national economy of Great Russia and on the tribal nature of the Great Russian]. Klyuchevskiy V.O. Istoricheskiye portrety. Deyateli istoricheskoy mysli. M: Pravda. 1991. 623 p. [in Russian].
21. Klyuchevsky V.O. Kratkoye posobiye po russkoy istorii. [Brief guide on Russian history]. M: Rassvet. 1992. 192 p. [in Russian].

22. Klyuchevsky V.O. Kurs russkoy istorii. [The course of Russian history]. M: Al'fa-kniga. 2017. 1197 p. [in Russian].
23. Klyuchevsky V.O. Neopublikovannyye proizvedeniya. [Unpublished works]. M: Nauka. 1983. 416 p. [in Russian].
24. Klyuchevsky V.O. O нравственности i russkoy kul'ture. 2-ye izd. ispr. i dop. [On morality and Russian culture. 2nd ed. corrected and add.]. M: Drofa. 2006. 301 p. [in Russian].
25. Klyuchevsky V.O. Polnyy kurs russkoy istorii. [Full course of Russian history]. M: AST, Astrel'-SPb. 2010. 544 p. [in Russian].
26. Klyuchevsky V.O. (1993^б). Russkaya istoriya: polnyy kurs lektsiy: v 3 kn. [Russian history: a full course of lectures: in 3 books]. M: Mysl'. 1993. [in Russian].
27. Klyuchevsky V.O. Russkaya istoriya. Polnyy kurs lektsiy. [Russian history. Full course of lectures]. M: OLMA-PRESS Obrazovaniye. 2004. 831 p. [in Russian].
28. Klyuchevsky V.O. Russkaya istoriya. [Russian history]. M: Eksmo. 2009. 912 p. [in Russian].
29. Klyuchevsky V.O. Skazaniya inostrantsev o moskovskom gosudarstve. [Legends of foreigners about the Moscow state]. M: Prometey. 1991. 335 p. [in Russian].
30. Klyuchevsky V.O. Sochineniya v devyati tomakh. [Works in nine volumes]. Pod red. V.L.Yanina. M: Mysl'. 1987-1990. [in Russian].
31. Kostomarov N.I. (1996^с). Gosudari i buntari. Gospodstvo doma Romanovykh do vstupleniya na prestol Yekateriny II: sb. monogr. I issled. [Sovereigns and rebels. The rule of the house of Romanov before accession to the throne of Catherine II: Sat. monograph and explored]. M: Charli. 1996. 480 p. [in Russian].
32. Kostomarov N.I. Istoricheskiye proizvedeniya. Avtobiografiya. [Historical works. Autobiography]. Kiyev: Izd-vo pri KGU. 1989. 438 p. [in Russian].
33. Kostomarov N.I. (1995^б). Kazaki: sb. monogr. i issled. [Cossacks: Sat. monograph and research]. M: Charli. 1995. 608 p. [in Russian].
34. Kostomarov N.I. Oчерk domashney zhizni i нравов великорусского народа в XVI i XVII stoletiyakh. [Essay on the domestic life and customs of the Great Russian people in the XVI and XVII centuries]. SPb: Tip. Karla Vul'fa. 1860. 215 p. [in Russian].
35. Kostomarov N.I. Oчерk domashney zhizni i нравов великорусского народа в XVI i XVII stoletiyakh. [Essay on the domestic life and customs of the Great Russian people in the XVI and XVII centuries]. M: Respublika. 1992. 301 p. [in Russian].
36. Kostomarov N.I. (1996^б). Okno v Yevropu. Gospodstvo doma Romanovykh do vstupleniya na prestol Yekateriny II: sb. monogr. i issled. [Window to Europe. The rule of the house of Romanov before accession to the throne of Catherine II: Sat. monograph and research]. M: Charli. 1996. 624 p. [in Russian].

37. Kostomarov N.I. (1994c). *Raskol: Istoricheskiye monografii i issledovaniya*. [Split: Historical monographs and studies]. M: Charli. 1994. 608 p. [in Russian].
38. Kostomarov N.I. (1996a). *Russkiye inorodtsy: sb. monogr. i issled.* [Russian foreigners: Sat. monograph and research]. M: Charli. 1996. 608 p. [in Russian].
39. Kostomarov N.I. *Russkaya istoriya v zhizneopisaniyakh yeyo glavneyshikh deyateley*. [Russian history in the biographies of its main figures]. M: Eksmo. 2011. 1024 p. [in Russian].
40. Kostomarov N.I. *Russkiye nruvy. Domashnyaya zhizn' i nruvy velikorusskogo naroda: sb. monogr. i issled.* [Russian customs. Home life and customs of the Great Russian people: Sat. monograph and research]. M: Charli. 1995. 656 p. [in Russian].
41. Kostomarov N.I. *Slavyanskaya mifologiya: sb. monogr. i issled.* [Slavic mythology: Sat. monograph and research]. M: Charli. 1994. 688 p. [in Russian].
42. Kostomarov N.I. (1994b). *Smutnoye vremya Moskovskogo gosudarstva v nachale XVII stoletiya*. [Time of Troubles of the Moscow State at the beginning of the XVII century]. M: Charli. 1994. 800 p. [in Russian].
43. Kostomarov N.I. *Sobraniye sochineniy. Istoricheskiye monografii i issledovaniya*. [Collected Works. Historical monographs and studies]. SPb: Tipografiya M.M.Stasyulevicha. Kn.8, T.19. 1904. pp. 3-175. [in Russian].
44. Kostomarov N.I. (1995a). *Zemskiy sobor: sb. monogr. i issled.* [Zemsky Cathedrals: Sat. monograph and research]. M: Charli. 1995. 640 p. [in Russian].
45. Lachaeva M.Yu. *Istoriya istoricheskoy nauki Rossii (dorevolutsionnyy period)*. [History of historical science of Russia (pre-revolutionary period)]. Uchebnik. M: Prometey. 2018. 646 p. [in Russian].
46. Leontyev K.N. Vladimir Solov'yov protiv Danilevskogo. [Vladimir Solovyov against Danilevsky]. *Slavyanofil'stvo i gryadushchiye sud'by Rossii*. M: Institut russkoy tsivilizatsii. 2010. pp. 813-913. [in Russian].
47. Litvak B.G. Nikolay Ivanovich Kostomarov. Ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva. [Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov. Essay on life and work]. *Kostomarov N.I. Ocherk domashney zhizni i nruvov velikorusskogo naroda v XVI i XVII stoletiyakh*. M: Respublika. 1992. pp. 6-106. [in Russian].
48. Nechkina M.V. Vasiliiy Osipovich Klyuchevskiy: Istoriya zhizni i tvorchestva. [Vasily Osipovich Klyuchevsky: The Story of Life and Creativity]. M: Nauka. 1974. 640 p. [in Russian].
49. Nikolsky S.A., Filimonov V.P. *Russkoye mirovozzreniye: Smysly i tsennosti rossiyskoy zhizni v otechestvennoy literature i filosofii XVIII-serediny XIX stoletiya*. [Russian worldview: The meanings and values of Russian life in Russian literature and

philosophy of the XVIII-mid XIX century]. M: Progress-Traditsiya. 2008. 416 p. [in Russian].

50. Ocherki istorii istoricheskoy nauki v SSSR. [Essays on the history of historical science in the USSR]. V 5 t. Pod red. M.V.Nechkinoy. M: Izd-vo AN SSSR. 1960. T.2. [in Russian].

51. Orlov A.S., Georgieva N.G., Georgiev V.A. Istoricheskiy slovar'. [Historical dictionary]. 2-ye izd. M: Prospekt. Moskva Moskva. 2012. 592 p. [in Russian].

52. Pinchuk Yu.A. Nikolay Ivanovich Kostomarov kak istorik. [Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov as a historian]. Kiyev: Naukova dumka. 1984. 190 p. [in Russian].

53. Pivovarov Yu.S. Nikolay Danilevskiy: v russkoy kul'ture i v mirovoy nauke. [Nikolay Danilevsky: in Russian culture and in world science]. *Mir Rossii*. 1992. T.1. №1. pp. 163-212. [in Russian].

54. Platonov O.A. Russkaya tsivilizatsiya. Istoriya i ideologiya russkogo naroda. [Russian civilization. History and ideology of the Russian people]. M: Algoritm. 2010. 944 p. [in Russian].

55. Polyakov Yu.A., Scherban N.V. Istoriya i politika: suzhdeniya V.O.Klyuchevskogo. [History and politics: the judgments of V.O. Klyuchevsky]. *Rossiyskaya istoriya*. 2013. №3. pp. 137-155. [in Russian].

56. Rubinstein N.L. Russkaya istoriografiya. [Russian historiography]. M: Gospolitizdat. 1941. 659 p. [in Russian].

57. Sakharov A.M. Istoriya Rossii v trudakh S.M.Solov'yova. [History of Russia in the works of S.M. Solovyov]. *Vestnik MGU*. 1971. Ser.9. Istoriya. №3. pp. 73-87. [in Russian].

58. Shikman A.P. Deyateli otechestvennoy istorii. Biograficheskiy slovar'-spravochnik. [Figures of national history. Biographical dictionary reference]. M: AST. 1997. 896 p. [in Russian].

59. Shlyupikov M.V. Russian wood and Russian history: researchers about the role wood in the institution of the Russian state system // International Conference on advances in forest and woodland History. University of Nottingham, UK, 2-6 September 1996. Program. P. 6. ; *Shlyupikov M.V.* Wood household in Russia in period of the antiquity and the middle ages in researches of the historians // Multiple forestry from the past to present times. Symposium, organized by abject Group S 6.07. Forest History and Worked Party History in the Austrian Forest Society 2-4 May 1996, Forstliche Ausbildungsstatte Ort, Gmunden / Ostrich. Program. P. 4. ; *Shlyupikov M.V.* Russian wood and forest resources in Russian historical thought // International Conference «History and forest resources», Florence, 20-23 May, 1998. International

Union of forestry research organization Italian Academy of forestry science. Programs. P. 3.

60. Solovyov S.M. (1993). *Istoriya Rossii s drevneyshikh vremen*. [The history of Russia since ancient times]. T1. M: Nauka. 1993. [in Russian].

61. Solovyov S.M. *Sochineniya*. [Works]. V 18 knigakh. M: Golos; Kolokol-Press. 1993-1998. [in Russian].

62. Tsimbaev N.I. *Sergey Solov'yov*. [Sergey Solovyov]. M: Molodaya gvardiya. 1990. 367 p. [in Russian].

63. Tsimbaev N.I. *Slavyanofil'stvo: Iz istorii russkoy obshchestvenno-politicheskoy mysli XIX v.* [Slavophilism: from the history of Russian socio-political thought of the XIX century]. M: Izd-vo MGU. 1986. 269 p. [in Russian].

64. Vernadsky G.V. *Russkaya istoriografiya*. [Russian historiography]. M: Agraf. 2000. 448 p. [in Russian].

65. Zamlinsky V.A. *Nikolay Ivanovich Kostomarov istorik*. [Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov historian]. *Kostomarov N.I. Istoricheskiye proizvedeniya. Avtobiografiya*. Kiev: Izd-vo Kiyev.gos.un-ta. 1989. pp.652-670. [in Russian].

66. Zamlinsky V.A. *Zhizn' i tvorchestvo N.I.Kostomarova*. [Life and creativity N. And. Kostomarov]. *Voprosy istorii*. 1991. №1. pp. 234-242. [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Lupikov Mikhail Vladimirovich, candidate of historical Sciences, associate Professor of world history and international relations of the Karagandy state University. Named after E. A. Buketov, Karagandy, Republic of Kazakhstan, ShlyupikovM@mail.ru

Chlapikova Maria M., bachelor of ecology and environmental management (MSU M. V. Lomonosova), a master's student in ecology and nature management, Russian University of peoples ' friendship (RUDN University) masha.97sh@gmail.com Moscow, Russian Federation

РЕЦЕНЗИИ

Уикхем К. СРЕДНЕВЕКОВАЯ ЕВРОПА: ОТ ПАДЕНИЯ РИМА ДО РЕФОРМАЦИИ / КРИС УИКХЕМ; ПЕР. С АНГЛ. – М.: Альпина-нон-фикшн, 2019. – 536 с.

Крис Уикхем по праву считается одним из самых авторитетных британских медиевистов. Его отличают широта взглядов, открытость к дискуссии (в том числе в отношении марксизма), критический взгляд на устоявшиеся в исторической науке догмы. В этом контексте представляет значительный авторитет выход на русском языке его монографии «Средневековая Европа: От падения Рима до Реформации». Остановимся лишь на некоторых важнейших положениях этой фундаментальной работы.

Уже в первой главе своей книги К. Уикхем наносит жёсткий удар по традиционным подходам. Он считает, что многих авторов трудов о Средневековье «заботит в первую очередь происхождение нынешних государств и другие аспекты «современности» в их понимании, поэтому для них смысл средневекового периода заключен именно в результатах и итогах» (с.21.). К.Уикхем считает подобный подход в корне ошибочным: «История лишена целесообразности, историческое развитие не стремится к чему-то, а отталкивается от чего-то. Более того, с моей точки зрения, бурный период Средневековья представляет самостоятельный интерес и его не обязательно рассматривать через призму последующих событий» (с.21.). На наш взгляд, в исторической науке все жанры хороши, кроме скучного. Нет ничего ошибочного ни в изучении происхождения государств, ни в поиске причинно-следственных связей, ни в рассмотрении Средневековья в более широком историческом контексте. Не случайно К.Уикхем уточняет свою позицию: «Это отнюдь не означает, что средневековая история Европы представляет собой водоворот событий, не имеющих никакой логической связи, кроме принадлежности к произвольно выбранному тысячелетнему временному отрезку. Вовсе нет. Средние века размечены четко обозначенными переломными моментами, из которых и складывается этот исторический период» (с.21-22).

К «переломным моментам» К.Уикхем относит: падение Западной Римской империи в V в.; кризис Восточной Римской империи, столкнувшейся с подъемом ислама в VII веке; экспериментальный проект Каролингов по созданию высокодуховного государства на рубеже VII-IX вв.; распространение христианства в Северной и Восточной Европе в X в.; радикальную децентрализацию политической власти на Западе в XI в.; демографический и экономический рост с X по XIII век; восстановление политической и религиозной власти на Западе в XII-XIII вв.; закат Византии в тот же период; черную смерть и развитие государственных органов в XIV в.; вовлечение более широких слоёв населения в публичную сферу на рубеже XIV-XV вв. (с.22.). К. Уикхем полагает, что эти переломные вехи связаны между собой чередой структурных изменений, в числе которых: «упадок и последующее возрождение понятий общественной власти, переход от налогообложения в качестве основного источника государственных ресурсов к землевладению и обратно, влияние письменности и грамоты на политическую культуру, развитие во второй половине Средневековья законодательно закрепленных и четко очерченных моделей местного управления и самоопределения, под влиянием которого изменились взаимоотношения правителей и подданных» (с.22).

По мнению К. Уикхема, есть два распространенных подхода к Средневековью (*автор и в этом случае не называет конкретных имён*): «представлять людей того времени «такими же, как мы», просто живущими в технологически менее развитом мире (мечи, лошади, пергамент и никакого центрального отопления), – или показывать их бесконечно далекими от нас, носителями совершенно непостижимых ценностей и мировоззрения, часто неприемлемых для нас и требующих значительной перестройки сознания, чтобы посмотреть на происходившее с точки зрения средневековой логики и мотивов» (с.29-30). Первый подход чреват «скатыванием в банальность или морализаторство», второй – «увлеченностью на грани умиления» (с.30.). К.Уикхем пытается осторожно совместить оба вышеназванные подходы.

В главе «Рим и его западные преемники. 500-750 гг.» К. Уикхем ставит вопрос: «Почему пала Римская империя?» и даёт на него свой ответ: «Если коротко – она не пала» (с.53.). Он отмечает, что восточная часть Римской империи (*нынешние Балканы, Турция, Египет и страны Леванта*), «благополучно пережила раскол и завоевание западной части (нынешней Франции, Испании, Италии, севера Африки, Британии) иноземцами, происшедшие в V веке» (с.53.). К.Уикхем

утверждает, что Восточная империя продержалась ещё тысячу лет, пока не покорилась османам: «Те, переняв у Византии (Рима) ряд основополагающих принципов финансового и административного устройства, принялись строить собственную империю со столицей в бывшем Константинополе, ныне Стамбуле. Таким образом, в определенном смысле Римская империя просуществовала до Первой мировой войны, когда рухнуло и Османское государство» (с.53.).

Что касается Западной Римской империи, то она пала под ударом «варваров», хотя возникает резонный вопрос, насколько «варварскими» были на самом деле германские народы? К. Уикхем напоминает: «Почти все они (за исключением франков), прежде чем основать независимые королевства, какое-то время провели в римских провинциях, зачастую носили военизированную римскую одежду, а также перенимали другие римские особенности. Разные группы готов, в частности, вполне можно рассматривать как вышедшие из повиновения римские войска, в составе которых имелось достаточно неготов, в том числе, несомненно, римского происхождения» (с.59.). «Почти все предводители «варваров», – констатирует К. Уикхем, – женились на представительницах римской знати, а римские военачальники (включая Рицимера и Одоакра), нередко сами происходили из «варваров» (с.59.). Наконец, все эти правители, кроме правителей самых северных провинций, исповедовали христианство.

В то же время, по мнению К. Уикхема, при всей «романизации» варварских королевств в первое столетие их существования начались необратимые изменения. *Первая перемена* заключалась в том, что «германские народы уже не называли себя римлянами», а «римляне начинали воспринимать себя готами и франками» (с.61.), то есть «менялась самоидентификация, и звание римлянина, столетиями выступавшее надежным показателем положения и культуры, это свойство утрачивало» (с.61.). *Вторая перемена* заключалась в том, что «прежнее единство Запада, от Адрианова вала до Сахары, исчезло безвозвратно. Даже Юстиниану – а тем более никому после него – не удалось завоевать Средиземноморье целиком» (с.61.). *Третья перемена* была самой важной: «Римской империей управлял разветвленный чиновничий аппарат, финансируемый за счет развитой налоговой системы» (с.62.), однако, «когда западная часть империи начала дробиться на королевства, резко оборвалось перераспределение налоговых поступлений» (с.63.).

К.Уикхем считает, что интересы новой германской элиты не совпадали с интересами её предшественников – римских военачальников-бунтарей: «Теплались в основном за деньгами, которые давала политическая власть, а сменившим их германцам нужно было другое – владеть землей, как владела ею та самая провинциальная знать, с которой они теперь соседствовали и над которой властвовали. Это вполне римское желание имело самые неблагоприятные для Рима последствия: постепенно исчезала необходимость содержать осевшую на землю армию. Отпадала потребность в налогообложении, а поскольку сбор налогов и так вызывал трудности и неприятие, рано или поздно власти от него отказывались. Впрочем, «варварские» короли собирали налоги до тех пор, пока им это удавалось» (с.63.). Как результат, к VIII веку модели управления в новых королевствах стали намного примитивнее: «у них формировались собственные отличительные черты: во Франкском государстве – собрания, определявшие политику государства, а также эффективная и, как правило, имевшая регулярную основу военная машина; в Испании – сильная морализация верховной власти и приверженность церемониям; в Италии – тип «всепроникающего» правления, для которого характерны внимание в детали, действие на опережение и быстрая ответная реакция» (с.83-84). Все эти принципы, отмечает К. Уикхем, позже были взяты на вооружение Каролингами (с.84.).

Рассматривая кризис и реформы на Востоке (500-850/1000 гг.), К.Уикхем отмечает, что если бывшая Западная Римская империя в начале VI в. пребывала в неопределенности, то Восточная переживала подъём, особенно при Юстиниане: «По торговым путям, расчертившим все Восточное Средиземноморье и Эгейское море, в Константинополь и другие крупные города поступало вино из Газы, оливковое масло из Сирии и Анатолии, египетское зерно и папирус, египетский и сирийский лён, керамика с Кипра и островов Эгейского моря» (с.84). В основе этого товарообмена лежала «система податей, в рамках которой продовольственную и другую везли на север, в Константинополь и к военной границе на Балканах, а также на восток, к персидской границе по Евфрату» (с.85-86.). При этом величайшие богатства Византии «сосредотачивались вне её европейской территории, преимущественно в Египте и странах Леванта» (с.86.). Налоговая система Юстиниана не могла выдержать несколько войн одновременно, но «правление этого императора бесспорно демонстрирует возможности, которые целеустремленный властитель мог рассматривать и частично воплощать в жизнь» (с.87.).

Характеризуя эпоху арабских завоеваний, К.Уикхем констатирует: «За восемь лет Римская империя уступила две трети своей территории и три четверти ресурсов, а оставшуюся часть обороняла от богатого и опасного врага. Чтобы выстоять, нужно было меняться, и она менялась» (с.91.). В первую очередь пришлось организовать оборону гораздо дальше Центральной Анатолии, за Таврскими горами, создав военные округа (*фемы*) в Западной Анатолии, где войска кормились с земли, на которую были посажены в качестве компенсации за урезанное жалованье. Последним крупным посягательством на Византию стала великая осада Константинополя арабами в 717-718 гг. «К 700 году, – резюмирует К.Уикхем, – Византийская империя сильно отличалась от империи образца 600 года. Центр тяжести к этому времени сместился на запад, политическое «сердце» теперь находилось на Эгейском море, к которому имел выход Константинополь» (с.93). Подлинное владычество Византии ограничивалось восточной кромкой греческого побережья и несколькими отдельными городами на западной стороне и на Адриатике (с.93). Главенствующее положение обретали «западные области империи – ось Равенна – Рим – Неаполь, а также Сицилия и север Африки. Все они, за исключением Северной Африки, были меньше подвержены арабской угрозе» (с.94).

По мнению К. Уикхема, западная историография смотрит на арабские завоевания и на падение Западной Римской империи «через призму морализаторства, рассуждая о крахе цивилизации и имперских амбиций, а также о триумфе варварства. И в том и в другом случае это лишено смысла, но, учитывая высокое развитие Халифата, применительно к нему это бессмысленно вдвойне. Смотрели на них и сквозь ориенталистскую призму: в этот период Восточное и Южное Средиземноморье перестало быть частью той же цивилизации, что и северное побережье, и стало чужеземьем» (с.100). Это тоже ошибочный подход, но более коварный, ибо тут есть доля истины: «арабоязычная культура была действительно непроницаема для латино- и грекоязычной Европы, за исключением одной-двух точек соприкосновения – Аль-Андалуса, затем Сицилии, а позже – великих итальянских торговых городов, которым необходимо было налаживать взаимодействие с богатыми областями Средиземноморья. Кроме того, – уточняет К. Уикхем, – христианским государствам слишком легко было увидеть в мусульманах экзистенциальную угрозу – и иногда именно этим они руководствовались в своих действиях, самым драматичным примером чего служат крестовые походы» (с.100-101).

Особое внимание К.Уикхем уделяет «*каролингскому эксперименту*» (750-1000 гг.). По его словам, Франкская империя Карла Великого и Людовика Благочестивого «существенно превосходила размерами любое другое политическое образование средневековой Европы, поскольку включала в себя территории современной Франции, Германии и Нидерландов, частично захватывая северную Италию, Каталонию и Австрию» (с.111). Это, однако, не означает, что каролингские правители осознавали, к чему ведут их действия: «Свою задачу они видели в основном как нравственную, даже теологическую» (с.111.). Любой политический манёвр «получал подчеркнуто нравственно-религиозное воплощение и выражался в программных текстах» (с.129.). Говоря о *методах контроля* над империей Каролингов, К.Уикхем отмечает, что одним из таких методов было *гибкое единство*: «над каждой областью стоял граф, аристократ, зачастую присланный из других мест, который вершил правосудие и командовал войсками (а это, как мы знаем, два «кита» государственного управления. На границах создавались более военизированные провинции – марки. На местных судебных собраниях (*placita*) распространённой практикой стало избирать скабинов, представителей местной верхушки, которые вершили суд от имени графа. Правда, нововведением это не назовешь: такие представители существовали повсюду и прежде, это было, скорее, упорядочение. Графы определенно виделись проводниками королевской власти» (с.123.).

Рассматривая процесс *расширения границ христианской Европы* (500-1100 гг.), К. Уикхем отмечает: «Первой, в V-VI веках, крещение приняла Ирландия, затем пиктская часть Шотландии, Англия и центральная Германия – в VII веке, Саксония – насильно, как мы уже видели, – после завоевания Карла Великого, в VIII столетии, Болгария, Хорватия и Моравия – в IX веке, Польша, Русь (куда входили земли европейской части России и Украины) и Дания – в конце X века, Норвегия, Исландия и Венгрия – на рубеже X-XI веков, Швеция – более медленными темпами в течение XI века» (с.142). По словам К. Уикхема, пять разных территорий дают пять примеров воздействия христианизации: в *Ирландии* Церковь «быстро встроилась в децентрализованную структуру ирландских королевств и ввела дополнительный усложняющий фактор в их взаимодействие» (с.164); в *Англии* Церковь с самого начала «служила связующим звеном и во многом способствовала приобщению мерсийских, а затем западносаксонских правителей к общей западноевропейской (то есть франкской) политической и даже морально-политической парадигме» (с.164); в *Дании* политическая система

«во вкладе Церкви нуждалась мало» (с.164); в *Норвегии* Церковь «служила существенной опорой, пусть и слабому, владычеству правителей над изолированными и часть нежелающими подчиняться областями» (с.164); в *Польше* Церковь «связующего воздействия не оказывала и верховная власть дробилась» (с.164). Таким образом, заключает К. Уикхем, «общих моделей развития у нас почти не наблюдается» (с.164.), но были общие черты в развитии регионов. *Во-первых*, «каждому из этих государств христианизация прививала привычку к более систематической опоре на письменность» (с.165). *Во-вторых*, наблюдалось постепенное ослабление «крестьянской независимости во всех северных землях» (с.165.). *В-третьих*, наблюдалось постепенное сближение новых христианских государств «с франкским и постфранкским пространством Западной Европы» (с.166.).

К.Уикхем детально рассматривает *передел Западной Европы (1000-1150 гг.)*. По его словам, в XI в. политическая власть стала более локализованной и четче разграниченной: «Её проводниками, – пишет К.Уикхем, – часто выступали фигуры настолько мелкие, что каролингская знать не признала бы их равней. В утверждении своей власти сеньоры – и города – были достаточно изобретательны, присваивая права изначально незаконными способами, которые, стоило сеньору утвердиться, возводились в ранг закона. Это была новая структура власти; она сохраняла достаточную преемственность с прежней (в частности, в кодексе аристократических принципов и ценностей, которые почти не изменились), однако с этого времени практическая власть требовала знать и учитывать подробно прописанные права и поземельные отношения. Могущество королевской власти, разумеется, восстанавливали, и зачастую довольно быстро – и Рожер II на Сицилии в 1120-1140-х годах, и Генрих II в Англии в 1150-116-х, и Фридрих Барбаросса в Германии, а также (с меньшим успехом) в северной Италии с 1150-1170-х, и папы от Иннокентия II до Иннокентия III во второй половине того же века, а затем Филипп II во Франции в 1200-1210-х годах» (с.199-200). «Но, – развивает свою мысль К.Уикхем, – восстанавливая верховное могущество, и эти правители, и другие опирались на ячеистую структуру фактической власти, а не на прежний уклад и королевскую идеологию (разве что в совсем незначительной степени)» (с.199). Кроме того, публичность, унаследованная Каролингами и Оттонами от Римской империи, «исчезла почти повсюду, и ее приходилось возрождать – на разной основе» (с.200).

Говоря о *долгом экономическом подъёме*, К.Уикхем отмечает: «В промежутке с 950 по 1300 год население Европы увеличилось в три раза; чтобы накормить его, проводилась обширная расчистка земель со сведением лесов и распашкой неосультуренных пастбищ; по всему континенту появлялись новые и развивались уже существующие города, в которых товары (прежде всего металлические изделия и текстиль) производились теперь на профессиональной ремесленной основе, гораздо менее распространенной прежде. А рынок сбыта стал шире» (с.201), причём «люди и товары повсеместно перемещались на более далёкие расстояния, особенно начиная с 1150 года; многообразие товарного обмена, характерного для запада и юга Европы, постепенно распространялось и на север. По средневековым меркам это был экономический бум» (с.201). При этом К. Уикхем считает неверным мнение, что для активного товарообмена необходимы монеты: «Это не так. Почти для любой системы обмена, как сейчас, так и в прежние времена, крайне важен кредит, а кредитные соглашения, даже достаточно сложные, могут строиться и на безналичном расчете» (с.213.). По мнению К. Уикхема, демографическая экспансия также имела место, но её масштабы определить сложно (с.202).

В этот период усилился также *гнёт со стороны землевладельцев* (с.207), причём, по словам К. Уикхема, политико-административные права сеньора – право взимать плату за правосудие, право на пастбища, лесные угодья, пользование мельницей, право забирать рабочую силу для транспортировки, строительства и охраны замков, а также вводить ситуативные и иногда достаточно крупные отчисления – могли разрастаться до достаточно обременительных поборов в дополнение к ренте (с.209). При этом поборы всё чаще взимались в денежной форме (с.212). Что касается *урбанизации*, то её доля в классическом Средневековье была невелика (с.214.). Города действовали на двух разных экономических и географических уровнях. Первый уровень – простой обмен между городом и селом (с.221.). Второй уровень – дальняя торговля (с.222). Наконец, в XII-XIII веках наметилась ещё одна тенденция, которая в долгосрочной перспективе связала сельскую и городскую экономики, – это аграрная специализация (с.225.). Постепенно целые области начали специализироваться в производстве на экспорт (с.226.).

К. Уикхем отмечает *неоднозначность восстановления централизованной власти* в 1150-1300 гг. Так, по всей латинской Европе централизованная власть после сокращения вновь начала разрастаться и/или становиться более могущественной.

Среди достижений этого периода – «более широкое использование письменности, развитие представлений об отчетности, развитие законодательства, постепенное расширение возможностей решения проблем» (с.232.), но эти процессы протекали по-разному в различных странах:

– так, *Франция* даёт пример политической унификации при Филиппе II, который удвоил свои ресурсы и вчетверо увеличил территорию королевского домена (с.232-233). При Филиппе IV королевская власть упрочилась почти во всей Франции (с.233.);

– особенность *Англии* заключалась в том, что «высшая аристократия не стремилась к утверждению независимой власти на местах, а воспринимала государственное управление как обязанность и прерогативу не только королевскую, но и свою» (с.235). В XIII веке английское государственное управление продолжало совершенствоваться, но усиливалась и власть аристократии», поскольку «возрождённое королями налогообложение требовало согласия королевских собраний баронов и рыцарей (а к концу столетия и представителей городов, которые к 1230-м стали называться парламентами)» (с.235);

– у *Кастилии* отправная точка была иной: «Ни одно из крошечных королевств северной Испании начала XI века не располагало достаточно развитой инфраструктурой – даже крупнейшее из них, Леон, ставшее частью королевства Леон и Кастилия» (с.236). Однако вскоре «кастильские короли перешли, как во Франции и Англии, к делегированию управления и правосудия на местах сменяемым чиновникам» (с.237);

– *Венгрия* начала перенимать у франков инфраструктуру, превращая наследственную власть над бывшими вождями-кочевниками в нечто более организованное» (с.238);

– крепла централизованная власть и на юге Италии, где Рожер II «объединил все нормандские княжества, и папа Анаклет II признал его в 1130 году королем» (с.239).

Но почему же переход к централизованной власти не произошёл в Германии? По мнению К. Уикхема, спрашивать, почему в Германии не складывалось единое государство, неправомерно: «На самом деле усиление политической власти все же имело место, но не уровне верховной королевской. Оно шло в княжествах, графствах, небольших сеньориях, епархиях и независимых городах» (с.244.).

Таким образом, констатирует К. Уикхем, Западная Европа XII-XIII вв. двигалась «по пути усиления централизации власти на основе ячеистой структуры XI века. Право давало больше возможностей для контроля, методы коммуникации и отчетности делали этот контроль более оперативным, но ячейки, то есть местные сеньории и городские или сельские общины, в основном никуда не исчезали» (с.272).

В своём основательном труде К. Уикхем отдаёт дань популярной сегодня *гендерной тематике*. В частности, он считает, что в позднесредневековой культуре наблюдалось несколько четких тенденций: «внутренняя противоречивость возникавших у женщин возможностей, появление все большего количества свидетельств (часто в форме художественного повествования) о культурных установках и обычаях ширящегося круга социальных групп, рост внутреннего единства социальных слоев и более четкое установление общественных границ, сопровождающееся усилением тревожности и потенциальной враждебности к аутсайдерам» (с.330). Подоплекой этих тенденций служили более общие процессы: «развитие экономики, что обусловило как расширение, так и сужение возможностей для притязаний женщин на ведущие роли» (с.330); «устойчивое распространение грамотности, которое одновременно демонстрировало и обостряло растущее расслоение; а также противоречия и двойственность, связанные с укреплением централизованной и местной власти» (с.330).

К. Уикхем обозначает *три важнейшие вехи*, оказавшие существенное влияние на европейскую историю в эпоху Позднего Средневековья: пандемия чумы (1347-1352 гг.), Столетняя война между Англией и Францией (1337-1453 гг.) и Великая Папская схизма (1378-1417 гг.). Он констатирует, что к концу XV века самым богатым и могущественным государством Европы оказалась Османская империя, опиравшаяся на фискальные модели Византии и Халифата (с.368). Богатейшим государством на Западе была Франция. На третьем месте находились Англия и Кастилия. За ними следовали Венгрия, Неаполь/Сицилия, Арагон и некоторые германские города. «Должен подчеркнуть, – резюмирует К. Уикхем, – что в вышесказанном нет никакой этической оценки, исключительно структурные выводы» (с.368).

В целом, полемически заострённая работа К. Уикхема стала ценным вкладом в современную медиевистику. Широкое использование сравнительного метода позволило британскому историку выстроить оригинальную концепцию Средневековья, учитывающую как наработки различных научных школ, так и

современные тренды. Не со всеми тезисами К. Уикхема можно согласиться, но это нисколько не умаляет научной значимости и новизны его фундаментального труда, который заслуживает самого внимательного прочтения и тщательного анализа.

М.Е. Шайхутдинов

NEW SOURCE ON THE HISTORY OF JUCHID DYNASTIES

Halit Eren, Ashirbek Muminov, Selahaddin Uygur

*Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture (IRCICA), Istanbul, Organization of
Islamic Cooperation*

Abstract. The article aims to introduce into scholarly circles the new source entitled “Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar” by the Ottoman historian and bibliographer Katib Çelebi (1609–1657). His book on the world history had been preserved in a single, unique copy and was not been published until now. Among others, it contains a special section entitled “Branches of Chingizids,” which outlines the history and provides genealogies of the Juchid dynasties.

The significance of “Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar” for the study of the history of the Golden Horde, its sources, and the methods of Katib Çelebi in interpreting data from various sources are determined. The annex presents the original typed texts in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, genealogical schemes of the Juchid rulers, and photo illustrations from a unique manuscript.

Keywords. Ottoman historiography, Juchids, history of ruling, genealogy, Ottoman view on the history of Juchid rulers.

Introduction. In order to broaden the research on the history and culture of the Golden Horde, further findings of new sources has great importance. One of these little-known written works is the book “Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar fi ‘ilm at-ta’rikh wa-l-akhbar” by the medieval Ottoman encyclopedic scholar and historian Mustafa ibn ‘Abdallah al-Qunstantini, known as Katib Çelebi (1609–1657). His unique book on the world history has been preserved in a single autograph manuscript [1] and has not yet been fully published [2]. This publication aims to contribute to the scientific research with a section on the history of the Juchid rulers from this historical work [1, f. 185ᵒ-187a]. The above mentioned section provides a brief historical background on the Juchid rulers and their genealogy. Two subsections (shu’ba) are highlighted in it: 1) “Great Steppe” (ad-Dasht); 2) “Shaybekids” (Shaybekiya). Inside the Great Steppe there are three sections: a) Blue Horde (Kök Orda); b) White Horde (Aq Orda); c) “Rulers of Khorezm” (Salatin Khwarazm).

Life and Achievements of the Author

Mustafa ibn ‘Abdallah al-Qunstantini was born in Istanbul in 1017/1609. His father ‘Abdallah Efendi, a graduate of the palace school of officials (Enderun), served in the Topkapı Palace (Divan-i Humayun) in the account department for Anatolia (Anadolu Divan Muhasebeciliği Kalemi) as a “palace squire” (silahdar). When Mustafa was 14 years old in 1623, he began to serve the sultan as an assistant to his father

(şagird). However, in 1628, he lost his father and after that at the very same year his uncle passed away. In 1629, Mustafa received a commission in the Topkapı Palace, Department of Cavalry Affairs (Süvari Mukabelesi Kalemi). In 1645, he had to resign after a 20-year of service due to a conflict with his boss (Mukabele başhalifesi) related to the problems in promoting his career.

After leaving the public service, he completely devoted his life to science. He pursued his studies in science, became interested in reading books, and expanded his private library. Due to his social position and scientific activity, he became famous in society under two pseudonyms: among the 'ulama' as "Katib Çelebi", and among officials of the Sultan's Palace – "Hajji Khalifa" [3, p. 36-40].

Literary Achievements

Katib Çelebi is the author of more than 20 works. He composed works on various branches of science such as geography, literature, jurisprudence, theology, bibliography and history [4, p. 96]. These works have not yet been studied and published adequately.

The geographical views and scientific interests of Katib Çelebi are evidenced by his geographical and astronomical writings: "Cihan-numa," "Lavami' al-nur fi zulumat-i Atlas Minur," "Ilham al-muqaddas min fayd al-Aqdas" and others. His works on the history of non-Muslim peoples of Europe, compiled on the basis of translated works (from Latin and Greek): "Tarjuma-yi ta'rikh-i Frengin", "Ta'rikh-i Qunstantiniya wa-qayasira", "Irshad al-khiyara ila ta'rikh al-Yunan wa-r-Rum wa-n-nasara." Experts think that Katib Çelebi's interest in Western sources is related to an awareness of the military strength and technical supremacy of the West. Educated Ottoman Turks were well aware of the reasons behind the success of Europeans in gradually establishing control on the seas and land – which had to do with a sound knowledge of geography and the availability of technology for the production of advanced weapons [5].

Katib Çelebi was a patriot and very loyal towards his country. He believed that the condition of longevity and prosperity of the state relies on the implementation of balanced politics (siyasa). He distinguishes two types of policies: rational (siyasa 'aqliya), which is based on reason, and Shari'a (siyasa shar'iya), which is based on the laws derived from the Qur'an and Muslim tradition (Sunna). All affairs in the Islamic state are decided in line with Shari'a policy, because, as Katib Çelebi writes, it is better than a policy based only on reason, and the rulers of Islamic states that implementing Shari'a law, will be happy with the happiness of two worlds – this world and the other world. He outlines his stance regarding the Islamic sciences in his following writings: "Dustur al-'amal li-islah al-halal", "Rajm ar-rajim bi-s-sin wa-l-jim", "Sharh tafsir al-Baydawi", "Husn al-hidaya fi sharh al-risala al-muhammadiyya", "Jami' al-mutun min jall al-funun."

His caliber as an encyclopedic scholar is clearly manifested in such works as the encyclopedic dictionary "Tuhfat al-akhyar fi-l-hikam wa-l-amthal wa-l-ash'ar", "Durar-i muntashira wa ghurara-i muntashira", etc. In his encyclopedic dictionary, he collected

philosophical and literary stories, useful and entertaining information of various kinds, verses, wise words, proverbs, sayings and etc. from essays in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. The German scholar Gustav Flügel considered Katib Çelebi as one of those who influenced the formation of the ideas of the Islamic encyclopedia [6, Volume 1, p. 44].

In the Western scholarship, Katib Çelebi became famous primarily for his biographical and bibliographic work "*Kashf az-zunun 'an asami al-kutub wa-l-funun*". The German orientalist Franz Babinger (1891–1967) called him the "Greatest scholar of the Ottomans" (der größte Polyhistor der Osmanen) [7, p. 196]. Some scholars called him as "as-Suyuti of the Ottoman Turks", offering, therefore, a comparison between his talent and the unusual versatility of the Egyptian Muslim scholar Jalal ad-din as-Suyuti (1445-1505) [4, p. 96].

Katib Çelebi as a Historian

His first and voluminous work on history was "*Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar fi 'ilm at-ta'rikh wa-l-akhbar*" (other names: "*Fadhlakat at-tawarikh*", "*Ta'rikh-i kabir*", Arabic "*Fadhlaka*") composed in 1641 in Arabic. A year after the completion of its draft (musawwada), the author resumes his work, as the colophon of the manuscript indicates the date of Rabi' II 1052/July-August 1642 [1, folio 313a]. This work by Katib Çelebi was written in the genre of "world histories" (Universal History) and covers the period from the creation of the world to the events unfolded in the year mentioned above. It encompasses the history of 150 states and 1,500 rulers [7, p. 196].

His second historical work "*Taqwim at-tawarikh*" corresponds to "*Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar*" in content. It is a kind of chronological table of the author's first historical work, and resembles a re-arrangement of it. It was completed in 1648 in two months [9, volume 3, p. 86; 7, p. 196].

His next work on the history of the Ottomans from 1591 to 1655 (1000–1065 hijri) was "*Ta'rikh-i Fadhlaka*" (Other name: "*Turkish Fadhlaka*", "*Ta'rikh-i saghir*") written in Turkish [7, p. 196; 12, p. 541-542]. The fourth work of Katib Çelebi on the history of the Ottomans' sea battles "*Tuhfat al-kibar fi asfar al-bihar*" was completed in 1656.

The main goal of Katib Çelebi as a historian was to outline a general history in order to derive a lesson for modernity. In addition to his excellent proficiency in Arabic and Persian, he also mastered ancient Greek and Latin.

Katib Çelebi was engaged in a systematic historical research and conducted analyses of the reasons behind the development of human civilization and the states. He took the position of the great Arab-Muslim historian Ibn Khaldun (1332–1406) on the need to follow a critical method in the field of the science of history. Katib Çelebi believed that the goal of historical science is to discover the universal laws of the development of society and the state. Unlike Ibn Khaldun, he believed that even if the government is in the state of decline, it can be saved from destruction with the help of energetic efforts of wise rulers.

Katib Çelebi's views on history were influenced by the humoral theories of Hippocrates and Galenos – ancient medical scientists, by the socio-political concept of the medieval Muslim philosopher Abu Nasr al-Farabi and especially by the social teaching of Ibn Khaldun, who is considered to be the founder of the philosophy of history [4, c. 97].

Katib Çelebi also develops the doctrine of human society as an organic whole and provides methods for saving the Ottoman state from decline and death. Katib Çelebi's ideas on the nature of power, state and civilization aimed at developing ways to recover the Ottoman Empire from the state of decline. In this regard, modern scholars place him among the reformers of the middle Ages [5].

Manuscript of “Fadhlakat aqwal al-akhyar”

As is known, two years after the author's death, all his books were sold out. As a result, his private library was shattered [8, p. 6]. A significant part of it, along with autographs of the works by Katib Çelebi, fell into the hands of 'Izzeti Mehmed Efendi [3, p. 36-37].

The work has been preserved in a single manuscript, which entered into the Beyazıt Devlet Kütüphanesi library and received the number 10318. The manuscript is an autograph. It consists of seven flyleaf sheets with some notices [1, f. 0I, I–VI] and the text of the composition [1, f. 1b–313a]. In several places of the manuscript there are inserted pages without any pagination. In the text of the composition on Folios 2–25 there is a gap where the author was going to mention the titles of 1300 historical works.

Indeed, on the forehand of the manuscript there are marks of several owners and readers:

- Caption (Inscription): “Tarikh-i Fadhlaka”, in Arabic, a composition by Katib Çelebi [written] in his handwriting [1, f. 1a];
- “from among the books of the insignificant servant of God, Mustafa ibn Ahmad Mansuri-zada” [1, f. 1a];
- This insignificant translator of “Qamus-i ‘Asim”, took part in the joint reading (mutala’a) of this book (mudawwan) by the late Katib Çelebi “Fadhlaka-yi tamm ta’rikh” on the date 1225/1810-1811 [1, f. 1a];
- From the books of Badr’s property (tarika), left after his death [1, f. 0Ia];
- Print of the owner’s seal – Ahmad Diya’ ad-din al-Husayni, dated 1265/1848-1849 [1, f. 1a].

Work’s Structure

In the introduction, the author states that the composition would consist of an introduction (muqaddima), three chapters (asl) and a conclusion (khatima) [1, f. 2b–3a]. As conceived by the compiler, each chapter was to be divided into two parts (qism). In turn, each part had to be divided into three sections (fasl).

However, the composition itself has a slightly different structure. In fact, the composition consists of introduction, first chapter and conclusion. The redesigned book

structure is set forth in the table of contents (Fihrist), compiled by the author himself and placed on the flyleaf sheets of the manuscript [1, p. Ib–IVa].

The existing introduction has four sections (fasl). The first section sets out the table of contents of the subdivisions and subsections (Fihrist al-fusul wa-l-abwab); the second section is about the meaning of history and its subject; the third section contains listing of works compiled in the field of science of history; the fourth section is about the foundations and principles of science that a historian should bear in mind.

The main chapter (al-asl) consists of three sections (fasl):

- 1) On the prophets and pre-Islamic rulers (muluk qabl al-Islam);
- 2) On the Islamic rulers. The section consists of ten subsections covering the period from the first century of the Hijra (Muslim era) to the tenth century. In the subsection "The Seventh Century of the Hijra" (al-Qarn as-sabi'), the Chingizid dynasties were described [1, a. 178a].

A significant part of the seventh century of the Hijra was the era of the Ottoman state from its foundation until 1051/1641 [1, f. 197a–250b]. This part was published in 2009 in Ankara by "Türk Tarih Kurumu", prepared by Sayyid Muhammad al-Sayyid [2].

- 3) On the unrighteous rulers of the Islamic era comprising false prophets, invaders and rebels.

The book ends with the sub-section "Tatimma fi alqab al-muluk wa-d-duwal 'ala-l-huruf" (Final subsection in the names of possessions and states is in alphabetical order). It is the final part of the composition.

The word "Fadhlaka" in the title of the composition plays a key role in understanding the contents of the composition. As the author himself states in the book, this term is taken from the lexicon of accountants (muhasibun) and means "generalization," "deriving a general rule" (jumla) of everything that follows from the completion of accounting work with numbers [1, f. IVb, VIb].

The main source of Katib Çelebi was Abu Muhammad Mustafa Efendi ibn Hasan ibn Sinan al-Hashimi al-Jannabi's (died in 1590-1591) "al-'Aylam az-zahir fi ahwal al-awa'il wa-l-awakhir". Al-Jannabi's text was rewritten in the middle of the page in rectangular frames, word for word or in an abbreviated form. Katib Çelebi increased the number of dynasties from 82 (that were indicated by al-Jannabi) to 150 [7, p. 196]. This increase was mainly due to the excerpts from other sources, which were written down in wide glosses in the margins of the main text.

Katib Çelebi kept the languages of his sources unchanged (in Arabic, Persian and Turkish). The essence of his interventions in the texts of the sources was as follows: 1) he summarizes the information provided by preserving the informative part; 2) the Persian word "hala" ("at the present moment") is replaced by the compiler on the exact date; 3) he replaces ideological expressions from his Shiite sources, such as "ghazi" – "fighter for faith", with neutral words and phrases.

Based on its nature, this work can be classified as *ta'lif* (composition) [10, p. 410–443]. The original character is the classification by the author of materials on dynasties, the giving of serial numbers to biographies of rulers. At the beginning of his work, Katib Çelebi, as it can be seen from the “introduction” (*muqaddima*), had the intention to compose a completed new book (*tasnif*). However, he was only able to complete the purely historical part. In it, all world history is presented in the form of the accession of various dynasties, their development, decline and change. Katib Çelebi decided to confine himself to the introduction, the main part in three sections and a brief conclusion (*tatimma*). The work remained unfortunately in the draft version (*musawwada*).

What prevented Katib Çelebi from writing the analytical parts (Chapter 2 – “*Asl Thani*” and Chapter 3 – “*Asl Thalith*”) and realizing his idea completely? Firstly, it's known that Katib Çelebi responded without enthusiasm to the proposal of Shaykh al-Islam of the Ottoman Empire Zakariya-zada Yahya Efendi (1622–1623; 1625–1632; 1634–1644) to rewrite the draft of the composition (*musawwada*) into a clean copy (*bayad*) to present his book to the attention of Sultan Mehmed IV (1648–1687) [13, p. 543]. Secondly, according to some experts, Katib Çelebi decided to implement the idea of “*Fadhlaka*” in another independent work – “*Taqwim al-tawarikh*”, completed six years after the completion of the draft of “*Fadhlaka*” [14, p. 93-100]. It is known that “*Taqwim al-tawarikh*”, after its completion, was presented to the attention of Sadrazam Koca Mehmed Pasha (1648–1649) through the mediation of Shaykh al-Islam 'Abd ar-Rahim Efendi (1647–1649). As a result, both of these people played a positive role in Katib Çelebi's return in 1648 to his previous department (*Süvarî Mukabelesi*) as an official (*ikinci khalifelik*) at the Sultan's service [7, p. 195; 8, p. 2-3].

History of Chingizids

The main source of Katib Çelebi on the part of the history of Chingizids was “*al-'Aylam al-zahir fi ahwal al-awa'il wa-l-awakhir*” by Abu Muhammad Mustafa Efendi ibn Hasan ibn Sinan al-Hashimi al-Jannabi. Our studies show that these data were supplemented with the information from “*Ta'rikh-i Jahan-ara*” by Qadi Ahmad Ghaffari Qazwini (died in 1567–1568) and “*Habib as-siyar fi afraad ahbar-i-bashar*” by Ghiyath ad-din Khwandemir (1475–1536) in Arabic. For us, the Arabic translator of “*Habib as-siyar*” remains unknown.

In the introduction of the book, the author announces his plan to present the history of the Chingizid dynasties “Collection [of information] on the branches of Chingizids” (“*Majmu' shu'ab min al-Jingiziya*”), dividing them into five branches: 1) Chingizids in Qaraqorum (Ulugh Yurt); 1206–1368; 2) a branch of them in Turan; 1227–1370; 3) a branch of them in Iran (*al-'Iraq*) and Khorasan, 1256–1353; 4) a branch of them in Dasht-i Qipchaq, 1226–1502; 5) a branch of them, which is called Uzbakiya (*Shaybekiya*), in Mavarannahr, 1500–1598 [1, f. 2a]. Further, in the text of the book on the insert, which gives an extensive and detailed genealogical diagram of the Chingizid

rulers, the number of rulers for each of the branches is indicated: 1) Qaraqorum or Ulugh Yurt – six rulers; 2) Turan – from the 7th number to the 34th number; 3) Iran ('Iraq) and Khorasan – from the 35th to the 50th number; 4) Dasht-i Qipchaq – from the 51st to the 94th number; 5) Mawarannahr – from the 95th to the 104th number [1, insert folio between folios 178-179]. When presenting the history of the rulers of each dynasty in the text of the composition, they are assigned autonomous numbering, starting with one. For example, 46 Dasht-i Qipchaq rulers were given serial numbers. Here it is noteworthy to indicate that the Crimean khans (1428–1792) are represented as successors of the main line of the Juchids, rulers of the Golden Horde (1227–1502). For the rulers of the Shaybekid (Uzbek) dynasty, 15 numbers are given.

In the section "Dasht-i Qipchaq", when setting out the three branches "Kök Orda", "Aq Orda" and "Sultans of Khorezm", the internal numbering of the rulers is not affixed. It is completely absent. In the index of the book (Fihrist) compiled after its completion, of these three branches, only one branch, "Salatin Khwarazm" is indicated [1, f. IIIa].

Principles for Preparing the Original Text for Publication

The following text was typed from the manuscript and all the special characters of the author were taken into account. Genealogical tables of rulers are of independent importance. Therefore, we decided to give their photo illustrations along with the typed text. The immediate ancestors of some Juchids remained obscure to the author [Urus Khan, 1361–1375; Tuqtamish Khan, 1376–1395]. To approximate the origin of such branches, Katib Çelebi organized special subsections: "Kök Horde", "Ak Orda" and "Sultans of Khorezm".

When typing, quotes from other sources were compared with the existing editions and manuscripts [16; 17; 18].

The annex to this publication contains original typed texts in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, genealogical schemes of the Juchid rulers, as well as several photo illustrations that were taken from the unique manuscript.

Cited Sources and Literature:

1. Kâtib Çelebi. Fezleketü akvâli'l-ahyâr, Bayezid Umumi Ktp., nr. 10318. – 315 f.
خليفة حاجي، القسطنطيني الله عبد بن مصطفى، چلبى كاتب
والأخبار التاريخ علم في الأخبار أقوال فذلكة
2. Kâtib Çelebi. Fezleketü Akvâli'l-Ahyâr fî 'İlmi't-Târih ve'l-Ahbâr (Fezleketü't-Tevârîh). Târîhu mülûki Âl-i 'Osman / Edited by Sayyid Muhammad al-Sayyid. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2009. – 563 p.
3. Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. Kâtib Çelebi, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi, Cilt 25, p. 36–40 (in Turkish).
4. Nasyrov, Il'shat R. Vzgliady Katiba Chelebi (Khadzhi Khalifa) na obshchestvo i gosudarstvo [The views of Katib Çelebi (Haji Khalifa) on society and the state], in: Islam v sovremennom mire, tom 14, No. 2 (2018), p. 95–110 (in Russian).

5. Karlıga, Bekir. The Horizon of Katip Çelebi's Thought [Electronic resource] // URL: http://muslimheritage.com/article/horizon-katip-celebi%E2%80%99s-thought#sec_6 (date of the application: 11.04.2020).
6. Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopædicum a Mustafa Ben Abdallah Katib Jelebi dicto et nomine Haji Khalfa celebrato compositum... Gustavus Fluegel, Leipzig, 1835, volume I, p. 31–48.
7. Babinger, Franz. Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1927. – 477 p.
8. Müjgân Cumbur. Kâtip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri // Türk kütüphaneciler derneği bülteni, Cilt VII, Sayı 1-2, 1958, p. 1–6 (in Turkish).
9. Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir Bey. Osmanlı müellifleri. 3. Cild. Hazırlayan İsmail Özen. İstanbul Yaylacık Matbaası 1975. – 320 p. (in Turkish)
10. Khismatulin A.A. Vidy musul'manskoi nauchnoi literatury v X-XV vv.: sochineniia (tasnif) i kompiliatsii (talif) [Types of Muslim scholarly literature in the 10th-15th centuries: compositions (tasnif) and compilation (ta'lif)], in: Sbornik statei v chest' 70-letii R.R. Rakhimova – "Rakhmat-name". Ed. by M.E. Rezvan. Sankt-Peterburg: Muzei antropologii i ètnologii Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, 2008, p. 410-443 (in Russian).
11. Aycibin Zeynep. Katip Çelebi. Fezleke: Tahlil ve Metin [The Text and Analysis of Katip Çelebi's History]. PhD Diss. İstanbul: Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, 2007. – 1115 p. (in Turkish)
12. Kütükoğlu, Bekir. Fezleke, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi, XII, İstanbul 1995, p. 541-542 (in Turkish).
13. Özcan, Abdülkadir. "Fezleketü't-tevârîh", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi, XII, İstanbul 1995, p. 542-544.
14. Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, "Fezleket Ekvâl el-Ahyâr Hakkında", Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında incelemeler, Ankara 1985, p. 93-100.
15. Kâtip Çelebi, Takvimü't-tevârîh: in 2 volumes. İstanbul 1146.
16. قاضي أحمد غفاري قزويني تاريخ جهان آرا
تهران
17. غياث الدين بن همام الدين حسيني خواندمير حبيب السير في أخبار أفراد بشر
18. الدرر الكامنة في أعيان المائة الثامنة
أبو الفضل أحمد بن علي بن محمد بن أحمد بن حجر العسقلاني (المتوفى: 852هـ)
مراقبة / محمد عبد المعيد ضان
مجلس دائرة المعارف العثمانية - صيدر اباد / الهند
الطبعة: الثانية، 1392هـ / 1972م
عدد الأجزاء: 6