

**ON THE ISSUE OF SUBORDINATION OF THE GALICIAN-VOLHYNIAN PRINCES TO THE MONGOL EMPIRE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES****Vladyslav Gulevych**

M.S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukraine Archeography and Source Studies, Ukraine

gulevych\_v@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4040-817X><http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/BZFF5202>

**Abstract:** This research deals with the immediate consequences of the subordination of the most influential prince of Southern Rus', Daniel Romanovich, to the Mongol Empire at the beginning of 1246. It considers the problem of issuing symbols of Mongolian kaans' power to subordinate rulers, jarligs (yarlyks) and paitza, to the Galician and Volhynian princes (knyazes), conducting censuses of population on the conquered Galician-Volhyn lands for taxation, and introduction of taxes and duties by the Mongols in the territories, they conquered. Due to the conciseness of sources, in the Galician-Volhynian lands existence only part of the taxes and duties, known in other lands of Rus', can be confirmed. More clear conclusions can be drawn regarding the problem on introduction the Mongols' possible direct rule in Galicia, however currently known sources cannot reaffirm this assumption. In the same way, the sources do not contain information about the Horde origin of a small specific stratum of the population called "Ordyntsy" and "Kalannyie" on the territory of Galicia. The combination of known factors in the subordination of the Galician-Volhynian princes confirms the previously made assumptions about their rather specific status within the Mongol Empire.

**Keywords:** *Prince Danylo Romanovych, Volhynia, Galicia, Batu Khan, Jarlig (Yarkyk), Paitza, Taxes, Corvée, Ordyntsy, Kalannyie*

**INTRODUCTION**

The study on the history of relations between the princes of Rus' and the Mongol conquerors has, without exaggeration, a huge historiography, the analysis of which is not the task of this work. However, even despite the gigantic amount of seemingly comprehensive research on this topic, there are still many problems to solve that are very difficult, and sometimes simply impossible, due to the silence of sources. The subject of this research is determination of the immediate consequences of the Galician-Volhynian princes' subordination to the Mongol Empire in 1246.

The fact of Prince Daniel Romanovich's subordination to the power of the kaan through the "mediation" of Batu is undeniable. The author of the corresponding part of the Galician-Volhyn Chronicle (hereinafter - GVC) described this as such that the prince is now "called a serf" (холопомъ называється) [PSRL (1908): 808]. According to Ruthenian Pravda, there were three sources of servitude, limited to a certain "row" (riad) (contract): marrying a serf, selling oneself into slavery, joining the tivuns (tiuns)<sup>1</sup> [Памятники (1952): 119; Зімін (1966): 56]. Other sources for serfdom were captivity,

---

<sup>1</sup> Servants

birth from a serf, crime, etc. From the point of view of a person of the 13th century, in the case of Daniel there is only one thing: the prince was forced to “sell” himself to Batu. Probably, Daniel’s co-ruler, his brother Vasilko Romanovich, should have been in the same condition. The existence of documentary evidence of subordination by any of the Romanovichs is carefully hushed up by the GVC, but in the Mongol Empire these were *yarlyk* and *paitza*, as well as taxes and duties.

### Jarlig and Paitza

Being administrative act of the kaan/khan, jarlig comes from the Mongolian “*jarliq*” or “*jarliy*”, where the root “*jar*” means “order, promulgation” [Сундуева (2011): 37-38; Усманов (1979a): 7-8; Усманов (1979b): 218-244]. In the Ruthenian written tradition, the familiar term “*gramota*” continued to be used for some time. Only at the beginning of the 16th century we encounter a “transitional” form, when in 1304, after the arrival of Grand Prince Andrei from the Horde, the dukes and the metropolitan bishop gathered and “read the gramota, the Tsar’s jarligs” [Приселков (1950): 351].

Nor a single of the princely jarligs has survived to this day, neither a single source mentions the issuance of jarligs to princes in the 13th century; moreover, it is not even known what their text might have been. We have only one indirect allusion to the jarlig in the GVC in a not entirely clear episode describing the events during the “*Kremyanetskaya Kuremsina army*” with the participation of a certain Andrei:

«Потом же Коуремьса приде ко Креманцю . и воева . вколо Креманца . Андрѣви же на двое боудоушоу . ввогда взывающоуся корольвь есмь. ввогда же Татарьскимъ. держащоу неправдоу въ ср(д)ци . Б(ог)ъ предасть въ рouchи и(х) вномоу же рекшоу. **Батыева грамота** оу меня есть» [ПСРЛ (1908): 829].

However commenting on the fragment mentioning the “*Batu gramota*”, V. Stavisky and A. Tolochko note, “in essence, we have before us a string of episodes that are not connected by plot or logic... The impression is that we have before us a “broken” text, a mixture of episodes from different stories, mechanically staged one after another” [ГВЛ:Т (2020): 511]. Though it is important that the author of the text does not deny the very fact of the existence of gramota. Thus, the next mention of the gramota of Jochi Khan, granted to the Orthodox Church, dates back to 1267 [Русский (1987): 588-589; Памятники (1953): 467-468]. Also, the “*Tsar's gramota*” is mentioned in the agreement between prince Yaroslav Yaroslavich of Tver and Novgorod in 1270 [Грамоты (1949): 13].

Functions of *paitza*, its iconography, languages of inscriptions, metrology, etc. have quite a significant literature [Рева, Беляев (2017): 25-37; Крамаровский (2002): 212-224; Мальм (1976): 71-74; Münküev (1977): 185-215; Haneda (1936): 85-91; Лихачев (1916): 70-86; Иностранцев (1908): 0172-0179; Спицын (1909): 130-141; Mas Latrue (1870): 72-102; Банзаров (1850): 72-97], but its main purposes were still in the 19th century by Dorji Banzarov - a reward for important services and a certificate of protection [Банзаров (1850): 91].

We do not know whether Daniel and Vasilko received only jarligs, or whether *paitzas* were also added to them, but it is known that sometimes the khans issued them together.

Thus, on September 17, 1332, Uzbek Khan issued the Venetians of Tana “paitza and privilege with red seals” (baisa et privilegium cum bullis rubeis) [Diplomatarium (1880): 244; Mas Latrie (1868): 584]. Khan Berdibek in the 1240-50s gave them jarligs with paitzas (preceptum et paysanum, baissinum de auro et nostrum preceptum cum bullis tribus; comandamento e paysam; comandamento cum le bolle rosse et lo paysam) [Diplomatarium (1880): 262, 263, 312; Diplomatarium (1899): 48, 51; Mas Latrie (1870): 585, 586, 587, 594, 595], and in 1357 to Metropolitan Alexei “baisu (i.e. paitza) and a jarlig with a scarlet tamga” [Памятники (1953): 470].

When rulers submitted to the Mongols, they were given a jarlig (decree) that indicated the khan’s approval as well as their own tamgha so that the orders the local notable issued were viewed in connection with the Mongol Empire [May (2017a): 96]. It is unknown what happened in the case of the Romanovichs. If Daniel and Vasilko received jarligs or jarligs along with the paitzas, then it was not Kaan, who did not exist at that time, who issued them, but Batu, although it cannot be ruled out that it was on behalf of the central Mongolian government.

It is also known that in the office of Kaan Munke there were “scribes of every kind for Persian, Uighur, Khitayan, Tibetan, Tangut, etc., so that to whatever place a decree has to be written it may be issued in the language and script of that people” [’Ala-ad-Din ’Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997): 607]. Since Batu borrowed the palace ceremonial of the Kaans, it can be assumed that he could also organize his office on the model of the imperial one. At his headquarters there should have been educated people who could read and write in Uyghur and Arabic script [Усманов (2009): 658-660]. Thus, in April 1246, John de Plano Carpini, together with Batu’s translators, translated the papal gramota “in the letter of the Ruthenias, Saracens and the language of the Tatars” [Giovanni di Plano Carpini (1989): 311]. Guillaume de Rubruk testifies that at the headquarters of Sartak, son of Batu, there were people who knew Armenian, Turkic, Arabic and Syriac languages [Guglielmo di Rubruk (2011):76]. In the description of the royal archive in the 1570s there is an interesting mention of “old *defters* from Batu and other kings; they have no translation [and] can’t translate anyone” [Описи (1960): 32]. Unfortunately, it is now impossible to say whether these were really “*defters*” of Batu. Since none of the jarligs issued to the princes has survived to this day, the possibility of writing them in the Ruthenian language remains exclusively hypothetical and very doubtful, since the jarligs to the metropolitans of Rus', Venetians and Genoese have reached us only in translations [Григорьев (2004); Григорьев, Григорьев (2002); Приселков (1916)].

One of the signs of the subordinate status of the princes relative to Batu and his descendants was their trips to the khan's headquarters. Among the Romanovichs, the only trip of Prince Daniel to Batu at the turn of 1245-1246 is documented. However it is possible that in the case of the Romanovichs we are hostages of the main source of this period, the GVC. Thus, an entry in the Volhynian kormchaia book reports that prince Vladimir Vasilkovich of the Vladimir principality (1247/49-1288), Daniel’s nephew, personally went to Nogai in 1286: «Въ лѣто 6794... поехал г(о)с(по)дь н(а)шь к Ногоеви» “In 6794... our lord visited Nogois” [Столярова (2000): 144-145; Срезневский (1882): 147; Востоков (1842): 312]. This trip is in no way reflected in the GVC. That is, the compilers of the GVC could deliberately omit any information about the trips of one of the Romanovichs to Batu and his descendants. However, this

assumption is purely hypothetical, since in the sources of the 14th century we do not have any hints about the trips of the Galician-Volhynian princes to Sarai. But the chronicles well reflect numerous trips in the 13th-15th centuries by the princes of North-Eastern Rus', often with the aim of resolving disputes regarding seniority, not only to Batu and his descendants, but even to Karakorum. What was the reason for such a striking difference? It is likely that in 1243 Batu recognized Yaroslav Vsevolodovich of Vladimir as the senior prince of Rus' and gave him Kyiv [ПСРЛ (1927): 470], and in 1249 Ogul-Kaymysh, the regent of the Mongol Empire, approved the main city of Rus' for his son Alexander [PSRL (1927): 742]. Daniel, and the other Romanovichs, were forced to abandon Kyiv, which quickly lost its status as the political center of Rus'. At the same time, the Romanovichs gradually moved away from the princes of North-Eastern Rus', abandoned the fight for the status of the Grand Prince, being satisfied with their Volhyn, Galician and other possessions. In the middle of these domains, no conflicts between them over seniority have been recorded. All this together meant there was no need to travel to Sarai and/or Karakoram in person.

#### Taxes

One of the most important results of the Mongol subjugation of Rus' was the census, according to which taxation of the conquered population took place. The first mention of it is contained in sources under 1245, when the Mongols counted the population as a number, which began paying tribute to them: «сочташа я (i.e. population) в число и начаша на нихъ дань имати» [ПСРЛ (1851): 183; ПСРЛ (1925): 231; НПЛ (1950): 298; Серебрянский (1915): 50]. The Franciscan John of Plano Carpini also mentioned the census, noting that it was carried out by “a Saracen from the party of Kuyuk-kan (i.e. Kaan Guyuk), as they said, and Batu” [Giovanni di Plan Carpine (1989): 285]. Thomas Allsen suggested that these were two different censuses, of which 1245 was carried out on the initiative and for Batu's own purposes, and 1247 was carried out by order of the Kaan [Allsen (1981): 37-38]. But Guyuk was enthroned on August 24, 1246, and the Franciscan returned from Mongolia to Kyiv on June 9, 1247. Considering that the census requires travel from Mongolia to Rus' for the officials who carried it out, and this takes about three or more months, organizational preparation on the spot and traveling around a significant territory for its practical implementation, it is unlikely that the scribes coped with the task during the period from August 1246 to August 1247.

There is reason to assume that the census was carried out with the participation and support of the Mongolian “*darugachi* and *tanmachi*” stationed in Kyiv [The Secret History (1982): 215; The Secret History (2004): 205-206; Kozin (1941): 194]. As for the identity of the “Saracin”, the organizer of the census, he could have been the experienced Daruga of Turkestan and Transoxiana, Masud-bek [Рашид-ад-Дин (1960): 116; Воротынцев (2017): 137], who fled from Ogedei's widow, the regent of the Mongol Empire Turakin Khatun's repression to the possessions of Batu, where he was in 1242-1247. A. Gorsky suggests that the “Kyivan centurion Nongrot”, mentioned by John de Plano Carpini [Giovanni di Plan Carpine (1989): 331], came from the Congrat tribe, represented the Mongol administration and was involved in the census, like the two foreman (*desiatniks*) who accompanied the Franciscan in Batu's headquarters. Thus, the time frame for the census can be narrowed, taking into account the time it took to prepare it, to the period between the winter of 1243-1244.

The first census took place, seemingly, only in lands subordinate directly to the Mongol administration. Among these, in addition to the Kyiv principality, one should also include Chernigov, whose prince Mikhail Vsevolodovich for a long time did not dare to return to his capital city [Русина (2005b): 27-28; Толочко (2000): 166-169], Pereyaslavskoye, which generally ceased to exist as an independent administrative and political unit [Коринный (1992): 131], and Podolia.

Already during the conquest of North-Eastern Rus', the Mongols put forward a demand to the Ryazan princes: "asking them for tithes in all: both in people, and in princes, and in horses, in every tenth" [НПЛ (1950): 74, 286]. Plano Carpini also wrote that they demanded "tithes of everything, both people and things." [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 285] But they put forward a demand to give tithes simultaneously with an offer to the princes to voluntarily join the Pax Mongolica, which they refused and were killed. And the Mongols behaved much harsher with the conquered peoples.

The population of Kyiv and its territories in 1240 although were significantly reduced [Ивакин, Комар (2016): 59-72], were not destroyed completely [Довженко (1978): 79-82]. Its restoration took place quite actively [Ивакин (2003): 61-65; Высоцкий (1985): 113-114], and already in 1245-1247 Breslau, Polish and Austrian merchants traded in Kyiv, as well as Italians from Genoa, Venice and Pisa [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 332, 399]. The gradual restoration of the region allowed the Mongols to increase exploitation of its population. Thus, John de Plano Carpini described the cruel collection of tribute by the "Saracens of Guyuk", when one of three sons was taken away, and unmarried men, unmarried women and beggars were taken away, the rest were counted and imposed a heavy tribute: the skin of a white (sic!) bear, a black beaver, sable, ferret, black fox [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 285]. Of these animals, the beaver, ferret and black fox were found in the territories of Southern Rus' indicated above, but not the sable and certainly not the polar bear. That is, the Franciscan either got something wrong, or mixed up tribute from different lands of Rus'. The situation in the Chinese possessions of the Batuids can clarify the brutal collection of taxes in Rus'.

According to the distribution of Ogedei's kaan, in 1236 in Northern China the house of Batu received the Pingyang region [Храпачевский (2009): 172, 247; Qiu (2018): 29-48] and 41,320 households in it. In 1255, the scholar Hao Jing, who later became Kublai's advisor, visited the Chinese possessions of Batu, after which he submitted a description of the dire situation in the region to the kaan. The House of Batuids was the de facto ruler of the territory under its control, even living far from China. Batu divided the territory among his family members according to Mongol tradition, and it appears that each prince or princess who received his share had unlimited power there. They exploited household labor to the extreme to extract gold and silver, which were locally processed into exquisite items before being transported to the Jochi Ulus [Rong (2021): 158-160].

In other Mongol uluses on conquered lands, they also practiced literally extracting taxes, especially arrears [Рашид-ад-Дин (1946): 118-119 (340 с.); 'Ala-ad-Din 'Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997): 539]. In particular, this was due to the introduction of the *kubchur* tax (қорсұр / qūbchūr) based on the census of the settled population [Али-Заде (1945): 87-102; Morgan (1982): 127, 134; Бойматов (2018): 88-90], which was collected with significant abuses without clearly established regularity [Рашид-ад-Дин (1946): 248;

Ward (1983): 405]. Only under the kaan of Mengu was the kubchur regulated so as not to ruin the poorest payers [‘Ala-ad-Din ‘Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997): 519, 524].

It is unlikely that in Rus' the picking of men by the Mongols was connected with the construction of Sarai, as some historians suggest. Where exactly Sarai-Batu was located has not yet been established exactly, but today researchers are inclined to localize it at the site of the Krasnoyarsk settlement [Пачкалов (2002): 177; Пачкалов (2010): 300-309; Рудаков (2007): 24; Васильев (2009): 436-445; Васильев (2012): 266-270; Археология Волго-Уралья (2022): 39]. Based on the results of its excavations, it can be concluded that at the first stage of its existence between the second half of the 13th century and 1320s the city was located on an island formed by the Akhtuba, Karaulnaya and Mayachnaya rivers in a place that made it possible to control the waterways connecting the Upper and Middle Volga with the Caspian Sea, as well as the crossing across the Volga-Akhtuba floodplain. At the same time, archaeologists came to the conclusion that most likely, the main structures of this period were represented by adobe buildings, in which the traditionally settled population lived that came to the Lower Volga with the Mongols (officials, traders, artisans). It is likely that in this period there was no monumental architecture [Пигарёв (2016): 169-170]. Even in the 14th century this settlement was quite poor from an architectural point of view. Therefore, it is not for nothing that in 1255 Guillaume de Rubruk called it only a “new village” (Sarai, que est noua uilla), recently built by Batu [Guglielmo di Rubruk (2011): 288]. Thus, it is more likely that the picking of the men is related to Batu's desire to increase its military capabilities in preparation for war with Guyuk. The conflict between them [Historia (1967): 21] is confirmed by a contemporary of the events, K. de Bridra.<sup>2</sup> As for the taken away of women, they were always in demand as concubines and maidservants.

The payment of taxes by the Romanovichs and the serving of duties, the main source of this time, the GVC diligently passes over in silence. However we have some evidence of them from the chronologically close jarlig of 1267 by Khan Mengu-Timur, issued to the Orthodox Church: “dan” (tribute), “tamga”, “popluzhnoe” (plough), “yam”, “voyna” (war), “podvoda” (cart) and “korm” (feed) [Памятники (1953): 467-468].

“*Tamga*” is a commercial or customs tax introduced in China under the rule of Ögedei and subsequently extended to the entire empire. It amounted to approximately 5% of the value of the goods that the merchant transported. Its name comes from the receipt with the “tamga” stamp that the merchant received as confirmation of the tax payment specifically for this product. He could then travel throughout the empire and not pay any additional taxes on these goods, which significantly reduced the cost of doing business [May (2017a): 97; Вашари (1987): 97-103; Doerfer (1965): 554-565]. In addition to merchants, tamga was paid by the artisan population of cities [Али-Заде (1955): 55]. It was collected in the form of cash. Tamga was one of the main incomes of the khans and can be clearly seen in later sources. However, in the territory controlled by Daniel Romanovich and his brother Vasilko Romanovich, as well as their descendants, the collection of tamga is never mentioned in the sources.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is Bridra, not Bridia, that is recorded in the earlier of his two known texts. See Krawiec (2008): 160.

“*Popluzhnoe*”, obviously a tax on a certain plot of arable land, is perhaps identical to the “*kalan*”<sup>3</sup>, introduced land tax by the Mongols (about the “*xalan*” tax, see: Blake, Frye. (1949): 313, 387 nota 32), which was often paid in natural products [May (2017b): 100]. With this tax, the situation in the sources is similar to *tamga*.

The notion “tribute” is more difficult to define. Thus, in the will of Vladimir Vasilkovich (1287), distributed by the prince among the possessions, it is said, in particular, “а поборомъ и тотарьщиною к князю” [ПСРЛ (1908): 903-904; Купчинський (2004): 317]. According to V. Aristov, both mentioned taxes were of a situational nature [GVC (2020): 618-622]. However, Herbert Schurman believed that we are talking about the Mongolian taxes “*alban*” and “*qopčur/qūbchūr/qubčiri*”, that is, respectively “tribute” and “extortion”, and according to John Smith, on the contrary, “extortion” and “tribute” [Schurmann (1956): 304-389; Smith (1970): 46-85].<sup>4</sup> The question is whether *alban* and *kubchur* can be correlated with the “extortion” and “*tatarshchina*” mentioned in the will of prince Vladimir, or in the jarligs of the Orthodox Church of 1357 and 1379 “tax” and “tribute” [Памятники (1953): 469, 465], remains open, since the term “tribute” itself was known in Volhyn. Thus, prince Vladimir Vasilkovich bequeathed to his wife “the city of Kobryn” in 1287, both with people and with tribute” with the condition that “as they gave [tribute] in my presence, so should they give to my princess” [ПСРЛ (1908): 903].

In North-Eastern Rus', the Mongols handed over the collection of tribute to tax farmers, who then tried to compensate for their investments in excess at the expense of the taxed population: “вкупахуть бо ты оканьнии бесурмене дани и оѡ того велику пагубу людемъ творахуть” [ПСРЛ (1927): 476]. How Mongol tribute was collected in Volhynia and Galicia is unknown.

Regarding the regularity of payment of tribute/taxes, we have a mention only in the 14th century. Thus, the Polish king Wladislaw Loketek, in a letter to Pope John XXII dated May 21, 1323, wrote that the recently deceased Galician-Volhynian princes Andrei and Lev Yurievich paid the Tatars an “annual tribute” (*annua tributa*) [Monumenta (1913): 73].

### Obligations

“*Yam*” is a system of postal relay stations whose main function was the safe and fast delivery of messengers, envoys and materials from the provinces to the capital of Mongol Empire and in the opposite direction. *Yam* provided the travellers who had *paitza* and jarligs with means of transportation, provisions, and housing [Shim (2017): 110-112]. However, the system of pits was neither in the western nor in the eastern parts of the Jochi Ulus in the early 1250s was not installed [Shim (2014): 419-421]. Moreover, on the territory of Southern Rus' during the period of dominance of the Mongolian kaans and Horde khans, the *yam* system was not recorded in synchronous sources, and from later sources only one mention of *yam* is known in the falsified document of the late 15th and

<sup>3</sup> *Kalan* is a tribute, tax, *yasak*, and *kalanchy* is the one who collects taxes [Радлов (1899): 230]

<sup>4</sup> I take this opportunity to thank Roman Hautala (Oulu, Finland) for clarification and pointing out literature on this issue.

early 16th centuries [Lietuvos Metrika (2010): 15; Довнар-Запольский (1900): 3; Kuraszkievicz (1934): 132-133].

“Voyna” (war) is the princes' duty at the request of the Mongols to participate in their wars. The demand “въ поганьской быти воли ихъ и воевати с ними” (to be under the rule of the pagans and fight together) was presented by the Mongols to the princes at the early stage of their conquest of Rus' in 1238 [ПСРЛ (2000): 295]. The Mongols made a similar demand to the local rulers of Iran during its conquest [Рашид-ад-Дин (1946): 25]. John de Plano Carpini wrote that the Mongols demanded from the conquered peoples “that they go with them in the army against everyone whenever they (the Mongols) please” [Giovanni di Plan Carpine (1989): 285].

“Podvoda” (cart) is a transport duty that is well known from later times and consisted of providing vehicles to officials and accompanying them [Wysłouch (1936); Jarmolik (1992): 189-197]. However, during the reign of princes Daniel, his brother Vasilko and their descendants, references to the execution of carts duty by the population of the Galician-Volhynian lands were not mentioned in the sources.

“Korm” (feed) is a translation of the Mongolian word “süsün”, found in the jarligs of the Horde khans Toktamys (1393) and Timur-Kutlug (1398), the Crimean khans Haji Giray (1453), Mengli Giray (1467), Saadat Giray (1523) and Sahib Girey (1523). “Ši'üsün” or “šüsün” was a technical term of the Mongolian postal system that outlined the duties of the postal station service in relation to government envoys and traveling officials. It included food, drink and probably fodder for horses [Vásáry (1977): 51-59; Allsen (2010): 267]. But the term “korm” to denote the duties of the population for the maintenance of officials or troops has been known in Rus' since pre-Mongol times: “*и реч(ъ) Болеславъ . разведете дружину мою по городомъ . на кормъ*” [ПСРЛ (1908): 130]. It is quite obvious that the population of Galicia and Volhynia performed this duty in relation to the Mongol army during several campaigns against Lithuania, the Polish and Hungarian kingdoms in the second half of the 13th century.

The described system of taxes and duties could be fully applied only if a census was carried out. But, unlike the well-known number of censuses of North-Eastern Rus', not a single source mentions the census in the territory of Galicia and / or Volhyn for the entire time of Tatar rule over them, just as they do not mention the presence of Baskaks and / or Darugs there. Among the duties, only “war” and “korm” are confirmed in the sources. Taking this into account, the conclusion suggests itself about a certain degree of exclusive status of the Galician-Volhynian lands in the Mongol Empire in general and the Jochi Ulus in particular. Probably, Daniel, Vasilko and their descendants were given the opportunity to determine tribute at their own discretion. In this regard, a still underestimated fact is that the Galician and Volhyn lands, unlike the rest of Rus', practically remained outside the Mongol, and subsequently the Horde monetary system. There are significantly fewer finds of Mongolian kaans' coins and khans of the Jochi Ulus on the territory of the Romanovich possessions than on the lands of their eastern neighbors.

### The Problem of Galicia



Researchers have long noted that after Daniel returned from Batu, the prince seemed to lose interest in Galich, for which he had fought throughout his entire previous life, and founded a new capital for himself in Kholm. GVC stopped mentioning Galich for almost thirty years. Because of this, researchers even suggest that, firstly, the Galician and Volhynian lands were in different forms of dependence on the Mongols; secondly, the Mongolian census was carried out in Galicia; thirdly, because of this, Moutsi's demand to Daniel "give Galich" allegedly arose, and, as a result, the Galician land paid an annual tribute, and Volhyn was not included and did not pay a constant tribute; fourthly, the Galician land (or a significant part of it) generally came under the direct control of the Mongols [ГВЛ (2020): 621, 418].

A number of sources report that some principalities of Rus' were divided into "тьмы" (tumens), which researchers associate with the Mongol military decimal division into "tumens", administrative units that could mobilize a corps of 10 thousand soldiers, or had a population of 10 thousand men. Information about the existence and number of such units is brief and contradictory. The earliest mention is in the Lyubech Synodik, where they commemorate princes: "кн(я)зл СДл(е)га Романовича, Вел(икого) Кн(я)зл чер(ниговского): Леонтїл, оставившаго дванадесать темъ людей. и Прїємшаго Аггелскїй СДобразъ: Во Иноцех Василїл" [Зотов (1892): 26]. The identification of Oleg Romanovich (†after 1285), and his correlation with Leonty and Vasily has problems [Безроднов (2019): 16-34], and with this certain doubts arise regarding the twelve tumens in the Chernihiv region.

However, from later times it is known that in 1360 Khan Nauruz gave the Suzdal prince Andrei Konstantinovich "княжение великое, 15 темъ" (a great reign, 15 tumens) [ПСРЛ (1922): 68]. The situation was similar in other Mongol possessions. Thus, Hamdallah Mustafa Qazwini (1340) names a number of provinces under the rule of the Ilkhans, which were also divided into tumens: nine tumens in Persian Iraq, one in Armenia, nine in Herat and seven in Mazandaran [The geographical part of the Nuzhat-al- Qulūb (1919): 54, 100, 150, 156; Watabe (2015): 30]. In the South Caucasus, the Gurjistan vilayet was divided into eight tumens, five of which belonged to Georgians, and three were Armenians [Dashdondog (2011): 102; Бабаян (1969): 120].

Such a division into t'ma (tumens) could only occur if a population census was carried out, which corresponds to the situation in the Chernigov and Suzdal principalities and the Ilkhanate. However, the label of the Crimean Khan Mengli Giray to the Polish king and Grand Duke of Lithuania Sigismund I the Old (1507) seems to give reason to believe that there were tumen in Volhyn. He names: a) Kyiv, Smolensk, Podolsk, Kamenets, Bratslav, Sokal (Sokoletsk), Chernigov, Kursk; b) Tatar "Saraev son of Egaltai" tumen, as well as, c) "Volodimer tumen" and "Great Lutsk tumen" [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 555-558]. In group "a", obviously, a census was carried out, but we do not have any synchronous information about the census in group "c". It should be noted that Chernigov in the label appears as a single tumen, and not as a territory, divided into twelve tumens. Researchers attribute the appearance of the tumen of Yagoldai to a broad period of the late 14th - first half of the 15th centuries. [Чурсин (2021): 96-119; Горлов, Казаров (2015): 46-63; Зайцев (2014) 128-130; Хоруженко (2008): 302-311; Русина (2005а): 100-113; Kucziński (1965): 221-226]. These tumens are concentrated, albeit with inconsistent presentation, into three groups: 1) eastern (Kyiv, Chernigov,

Kursk, next to which was the tumen of Yagoldaya); 2) Podolsk (Podolia itself, Kamenets, Bratslav and Sokolets); 3) western (Vladimir and Lutsk). We are primarily interested in the third group.

Since Podolia was under the direct rule of the Mongols and bordered the Galician land, it is necessary to delineate their border at least approximately. Due to the lack of direct indications in the sources, this can only be done indirectly. Thus, in the grant from Jagiello of 1395 to Spytka of Melsztyn, the counties of Stenka and Terebovlya were named as part of Podolia, the castles of Skala and Chervonogrod are located to the west of Kamenets and are located on the left bank of the river. Streepa, and the royal act of 1403 reports that the route from Lvov to Tartary went first through Podolia, and then Kamenez: "Illis vero qui Thathariam transire voluerint per Podoliam et Camenez" [Kodeks (1879): 146]. The road from Lvov to Kamenets went through Terebovlya. Thus, the Podolsk tumen probably covered the territories to the west and northwest of Kamenets, namely: Terebovlya, Yazlovets, Chervonogrod, and also, possibly, Skala and Smotrich.

In this regard, a number of land centers in Daniel's possessions is absent in the jarlig: Kholm, Dorogichin, Belz, Przemysl, Syanok, Galich and Lvov. The time of foundation of the latter is a debatable issue [Шишка (1993a): 25-36; Шишка (1993b): 9-13; Janeczek (1994): 7-36; Книш (2006): 53-56]. The mention of it in the Tver Chronicle under 1241 [ПСРЛ (1922): 375], according to J. Knysh [Книш (2008): 130-136], is the result of an unsuccessful interpolation of an excerpt from the "List of Ruthenian Cities, Far and Near" [НПЛ (1950): 476; ПСРЛ (1910): 163; ПСРЛ (1856): 240]. Thus, the first mention of the city in 1259 contains a GVC text that is problematic in terms of the chronology of events, which describes a fire in Kholm, which was allegedly seen even in Lviv [ПСРЛ (1908): 841]. Taking into account chronological errors, it can be dated to approximately 1256 [Історія Львова (1956): 8], and it testifies to the important status of Lvov already at that time.

However, it should also be noted that in the label of Khan Haji Giray (1461) Kyiv, Lutsk, Smolensk, Podolia, Kamenets, Bratslav, Sokolets (Sokal) and Chernigov are not called tumen, Vladimir is absent altogether, and only the possession of "Szaraiewicza Jagalta" is called "tumen" [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 529-530]. Mengli Giray's jarlig (1472) contains a similar list, but with Vladimir, although all the mentioned lands are also not called tumen [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 539-540]. In the jarlig of Sahib I Girey (1541) "Lucesk with tumens...; Smolnesk with tumen; Polotsk with tumens...; Podolia with tumens...; Sokal (Sokolets) with tumens...; Braslavl with tumens...; Korske (Kursk) with tumens; Saraevich Yakgaldai with tumens; Ćhura with tumens..., Rezinsky (Ryazansky) Pereyasavl with tumens..." [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 722-723]. That is, Kyiv is again not called tumen, Vladimir is missing, Lutsk is not one tumen, but several, Polotsk was added, which was never under the rule of kaans or khans, Sokal also has tumen in the plural, the incomprehensible "Ohura" appeared along with tumen and Pereyasavl - Ryazansky with tumen.

It is noteworthy that at the time, when the Crimean khans jarligs were issued in 1461, 1472, 1507, 1541, Kyiv, Lutsk, Vladimir, Podolie, and Sokolets were part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Kholm, Dorogichin, Belz, Przemysl, Syanok, Galich and Lvov, missing from them, were still in the 14th century were part of the Poland Kingdom. It is

problematic to explain their absence in the texts of the jarligs, even though the first two have come to us in a defective Polish translation with an obvious mechanical compilation of several texts.

Taking into account the described circumstances, we can say that the sources do not give reason to believe, firstly, that Volhyn (Vladimir and Lutsk lands) was divided by the Mongols into tumen, as well as Galicia, and secondly, that the taxation of the Galician land in favor of the Mongols something different from Volhyn. In our opinion, Galich was not directly subordinate to the Mongols. This is also evidenced by the war of the Romanovichs with the Mongol ruler of the right bank of the Dnieper Kurumyshi (Kuremsa) for Bakota, located far to the southeast of Galich and which Daniel Romanovich considered his possession.

Associated with the Mongols is the still not fully explored existence in the Galician (5 villages) and Lvov (10 villages) lands of a very small population category of the “ordyntsy” and/or “kalannye”. From the acts of the 15th-16th centuries it is known that they lived under the authority of their officers with the characteristic Turkic name “vathaman” (vathamanum, vathaman, wathamano) [Akta (1887): 152-153, 156; Akta (1906): 239], i.e. ataman, in villages that belonged to the Polish king. They owned movable and immovable property, sometimes quite significant, provided carts at the request of the king, were on duty in the castle, delivered mail, in the event of the arrival of the monarch, provided four horses for his needs, grazed the royal cattle, and for this they used the land for free, but had no rights moving to another place of residence and changing duties [Vernadsky (1951): 255-264; Hejnosz (1928): 73-102; Линниченко (1894): 98-107].

According to G. Vernadsky, the term “kalannye” comes from the Turkic word “kalan”, that is, a land tax introduced by the Mongols. Researchers have suggested that the appearance of the Horde / sea otters is connected 1) with the Horde prisoners ransomed by the princes, who were settled in a certain area and obliged to perform service related to the Horde: to carry tribute, provide vehicles for this, etc.; 2) that these were “descendants of settler colonists from the lands of the Golden Horde” [Ждан (1967): 28]. Both versions are not sufficiently substantiated since all our knowledge about the Ordintsy and Kalannye comes from sources of the 15th-16th centuries in which the genesis of the existence and activities of these people is not traced.

In our opinion, it is very doubtful that the kalan was imposed by the Mongols on such a small group of the population and only in the Galician and Lviv lands. Already G. Vernadsky noted that the term “kalanniy” in the meaning of “unfree” was widely known in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania [Гістарычны слоўнік (1996): 186] in those territories where there was neither power nor taxes of the Mongol Empire and the Ulus of Jochi. Therefore, it is more reasonable to assume that this group of people was formed from among the prisoners taken by some prince from the Belarusian or Lithuanian lands and settled in the indicated areas for the purpose of “Horde service”. The duties of the Horde were not too burdensome, and they to a certain extent overlapped with those established by the Mongols, and also somewhat resembled the functions of the “Horde servants” of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, traces of which we find in the revision of the Ovruch Castle (1552). A whole category of servants is mentioned with the duty of “подводы и станции посломъ и гоньцомъ [великого князя литовского] винни давати слуги

Ордынские” (Horde servants are obliged to give carts and lodging to ambassadors and messengers [of the Grand Duke of Lithuanian]) and “слуги ордынские - слуги которые повинны при послахъ и гонцахъ господарскихъ ездити до Орды” (servants of the Horde - servants, who are obliged to travel to the Horde with the ambassadors and messengers of the Lord [i. e. the Grand Duke of Lithuanian]) [Архив (1867): 41].

And yet, the existence of atamans at the head of the Horde does not allow us to completely discard the influence of the Horde element. This, however, does not mean that people of Mongolian or Turkic origin lived under their leadership. Thus, in the Ovruch and Chernobyl districts of the Kyiv land, the atamans represented the local administration of the lower level, and in Mozyr and Lyubech they were “startsy” (elders). The presence of an ataman in a certain area indicated its subordination to the Horde administration and reflected the political border of the second half of the 13th - first half of the 14th centuries. [Русина (1998): 83-84]. We see a similar picture in Moldova, where atamans (votamans) appeared, obviously, synchronously with the Podolian, Kyiv and, not excluded, the Galician. Sources indicate that they led rural communities [Documenta (1975): 59, 80, 119, 134, 136, 218, 254, 322, 340, 360, 373, 377; Bogdan (1913a): 367; Bogdan (1913b): 70-73] first in settlements with Moldavian and Ruthenian inhabitants, and subsequently Tatar ones [Documenta (1976): 152; Costăchescu (1932): 128].

Due to the lack of sources, it is impossible to answer the question about the time of the appearance of the “ordyntsy” today. Let us pay attention to the fact that the very name “Horde” was not recorded in the sources of Galicia and Volhyn in the 13th century. The residence of the Horde in only fifteen villages of the Galician and Lvov lands testifies against their direct subordination to the Mongols and makes us think that they probably received their name no earlier than the 14th century based on the specifics of his service - servicing contacts with the Horde. It would not be superfluous to point out that categories of population similar to the Galician Ordyntsy and Kalannye with the names “Ordyntsy” and “Deluy” arose in North-Eastern Rus', with functions, still not fully understood [Горский (2018): 173 -178].

## CONCLUSION

Summarizing the results of this short study, one can state that the sources of the Galicia-Volhynian principality are diligently silent about any kind of dependence of princes from the Mongol Empire:

- possible census of the population;
- possible trips of the princes to Batu;
- the system of collection and payment of taxes in favor of the Mongol Empire;
- serving by the population of the duties established by the Mongols.

However, the sources do not suggest that:

- the Mongols conducted a census of the population in Galicia-Volhynia lands;
- that Galicia was under the direct rule of the Mongols;
- that Volhynia was divided into tumens and its taxation was somehow different from Galicia.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie* (1887). [Town and Country Documents from the times of the Republic of Poland from the so-called Bernardine Archive in Lwów] (Tom XII). Lwów: Z I związkowej drukarni we Lwowie. xiv + 408 pages
- *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie* (1906). [Town and Country Documents from the times of the Republic of Poland from the so-called Bernardine Archive in Lwów] (Tom XIX). Lwów: W drukarnia E. Winarza we Lwowie, xxxiv + 855 pages
- ‘Ala-ad-Din ‘Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997). *The History of the Word-Conqueror*. (Vol. II). Manchester: Manchester University press, UNESCO publishing, 763 pages
- Allsen, T.T. (1981). *Mongol Census Taking in Rus’, 1245-1275*. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, V, 1, March, 32-53
- Allsen, T.T. (2010). *Imperial Posts, West, East and North: A Review Article*. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, 17, 237-275
- Blake, R.P., Frye, R.N. (1949). *History of the Nation of the Archers (The Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc’ Hitherto Ascribed to Marak’ia The Monk: The Armenian Text Edited with an English Translation and Notes*. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 12, 3-4, December, 269-399.
- Bogdan I. (1913a). *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare Vol. 1. Hrisoave și cărți domnești (1457-1492)*. București: Atelierele grafice socec & Co., Societate anonimă, 518 pages
- Bogdan I. (1913b). *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare Vol. II. Hrisoave și cărți domnești (1493-1503). Tractate, acte omagiale, solii, privilegii comerciale, saluconducte, scritori, 1457-1503*. București: Atelierele grafice socec & Co., Societate anonimă, 611 pages
- Costăchescu M. (1930) *Documentele moldovenești înainte de Ștefan cel Mare*. Vol. II. Documente interne. Urice (Ispisoace), Surete, Regeste, Traduceri 1438-1456. Documente externe. Acte de împrumut, de omagiu, tractate, solii, privilegii, comerciale, salveconducte, scritori 1387-1458. Iași: «Viața Românească» S.A., xxv + 955 pages
- Dashdondog, B. (2011). *The Mongols and the Armenians (1220-1335)*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 290 pages
- *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum sive acta et diplomata res venetas graecas atque Levantis illustrantia a. 1300-1350* (1880). Venetiis: Sumptibus societatis, 388 pages
- *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum sive acta et diplomata res venetas graecas atque Levantis illustrantia a. 1351-1454* (1899). Venetiis: Sumptibus societatis, 490 pages
- *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (1975). A. Moldova. Vol. I (1384-1448) / Volum întocmit de C. Cihodaru, I. Caproșu, L. Șimanschi. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 605 pages
- *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (1976). A. Moldova. Vol. II (1449-1486) / Volum întocmit de L. Șimaneschi în G. Ignat și D. Agache. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 795 pages
- Doerfer, G. (1965). *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Unter

- besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit.* (Band II: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen: *alif bis ta*). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 671 pages
- Giovanni di Plan Carpine. (1989). *Storia dei Mongoli*. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, viii + 522 pages
  - Guglielmo di Rubruk. (2011). *Viaggio in Mongolia (Itinerarium)*. Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla Arnoldo Mondadori, 590 pages
  - Haneda, T. (1936). Une tablette du décret sacré de l'empereur Genghis. *Mémoires of Research Department of Tôyô Bunko*, 8, 85-91
  - Hejnosz, W. (1928). *Ius Ruthenicae. Przeżytki dawnego ustroju społecznego na Rusie Halickiej w XV wieku*. Lwów: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 112 pages
  - *Historia Tartarorum C. de Bridia monachi.* (1967). Berlin: Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co, 44 pages
  - Janeczek, A. (1994). Studia nad początkami Lwowa: bilans osiągnięć i potrzeb badawczych. *Rocznik Lwowski*, 7-36
  - Jarmolik, W. (1992). Obsługa komunikacyjna posłów litewskich w późnym średniowieczu. In *Miasto. Region. Społeczeństwo. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Andrzejowi Wyrobiszowi w sześćdziesiątą rocznicę Jego urodzin*. Białystok: Dział Wydawnictw Filii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego w Białymstoku, pp. 189-197
  - Krawiec, A. (2008). Drugi rękopis Historii Tartarów autorstwa C. de Bridra. *Roczniki Historyczne*, 74, 157-164
  - *Kodeks dyplomatyczny miasta Krakowa 1257-1506* (1879). T. I / Wyd. F. Piekosiński. Kraków: W drukarni «Czasu», 370 pages
  - Kołodziejczyk, D. (2011). *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania: International diplomacy on the European periphery (15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries). A study of peace treaties followed by annotated documents*. Leiden; Boston, 1135 pages
  - Kucziński, S.M. (1965). Jaholdai i Jaholdajewicze lenni ksiezeta tatarscy Litwy. In *Kucziński S.M. Studia z dziejów Europy Wschodniej X-XVII w.* Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe, pp. 221-226
  - Kuraszkiewicz, W. (1934). *Gramoty Halicko-Wołyńskie XIV-XV wieku. Studjum językowe z zasilkiem funduszu kultury narodowej*. Kraków, 173 pages
  - *Lietuvos Metrika* (2010). Knyga Nr. 22 (1547); Užrašymų knyga 22 / parengė Andrii Blanutsa, Dmytro Vashchuk, Darius Antanavičius. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 174 pages
  - *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana* (1913) T. I. Acta camerae apostolicae. Vol. I. 1207-1344 / Edidit Joannes Ptaśnik. Krakow: E pypographia Universitatis Jagellonicae, xxxvii + 502 pages
  - Mas Latrie, L. de. (1868). Privilèges commerciaux accordés a la République de Venise par les princes de Crimée et les empereurs mongols du Kiptchak. *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes. Revue d'Érudition, Consacrée spécialement à l'étude du moyen-âge*, 4, sixième série, 580-595.
  - Mas Latrie, L. de. (1870). Privilège commercial accordé en 1320 a la République de Venise par un roi de Perse, faussement attribué a un roi de Tunis. *Bibliothèque de*

- l'École des chartes*, 31, 72-102
- May T. Tamgha. (2017a). In T. May (ed.). *The Mongol empire. A historical encyclopedia* (Vol. I, pp. 96-97). Santa Barbara-Denver: ABC-CLIO
  - May T. Taxation (2017b). In T. May (ed.). *The Mongol empire. A historical encyclopedia*. (Vol. I). Santa Barbara-Denver: ABC-CLIO, pp. 99-101
  - Morgan, D.O. (1982). Who ran the Mongol empire? *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1, 124-136
  - Münküev, N.Ts. (1977). A New Mongolian P'ai-tzu from Simferopol. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, XXXI(2), 185-215
  - Schurmann, H.F. (1956). Mongolian Tributary Practices of the Thirteenth Century. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 19, 3-4, 304-389
  - Shim, H. (2014). The Postal Roads of the Great Khans in Central Asia under the Mongol-Yuan Empire. *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies*, 44, 405-469
  - Shim, H. Yam (2017). In T. May (ed.). *The Mongol empire. A historical encyclopedia* (Vol. I). Santa Barbara-Denver: ABC-CLIO, pp. 110-112
  - Smith, J.M. (1970). Mongol and Nomadic Taxation. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 30, 3-4, 46-85
  - *The geographical part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulūb* (1919). Composed by Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī in 740 (1340). Leiden: E.J. Brill, London: Luzac & Co., xix + 322 pages
  - *The Secret History of the Mongols* (1982). Done into English out of the Original Tongue and provided with an Exegetical Commentary by Francis Woodman Cleaves Volume I (translation). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University press - London, 172 pages
  - *The Secret History of the Mongols*. (2004) A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century / Translated with a historical and philological commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz. Volume one. Leiden-Boston: Brill, Qiu, Y. (2018). Independent Ruler, Indefinable Role. *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 143, October, 29-48. <https://doi.org/10.4000/remmm.10237>, 342 pages
  - Rong, F. (2021). *The Mongol empire: Fragmentation, unity, and continuity (1206-C.1300)*. A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the division of the humanities in candidacy for the degree of doctor of philosophy department of near eastern languages and civilizations. Chicago, 211 pages
  - Vásáry, I. (1977). *Susun and süsun* in Middle Turkic Texts. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, XXXI, 1, 51-59.
  - Vernadsky, G. (1951). The Royal Serfs (Servi Regales) of the 'Ruthenian Law' and Their Origin. *Speculum*, 26, 2, 255-264
  - Ward, L.J. (1983) *The Zafar-nāmah of Hamdallāh Mustaufī and the il-khān Dynasty of Iran*. A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Art. Department of Near Eastern Studies. (Vol. III). Manchester: University of Manchester, 390-674, i-ix pages
  - Watabe, R. (2015). Census-Taking and the Qubchūr Taxation System in Ilkhanid Iran: An Analysis of the Census Book from the Late 13<sup>th</sup> Century Persian Accounting Manual al-Murshid fī al-Ḥisāb. *The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko*, 73, 27-63.

- Wysłouch, S. (1936). *Posługi komunikacyjne w miastach W. Ks. Litewskiego na prawie magdeburskiem do połowy XVI w.* Wilno: Nakładem Instytutu naukowo-badawczego Europy Wschodniej, 207 pages
- Али-Заде, А.А. (1945). К истории феодальных отношений в Азербайджане. Термин «Купчур» [To the history of feudal relations in Azerbaijan. The term «Kupchur»]. *Известия Академии Наук Азербайджанской ССР*, 5, 87-102
- Али-Заде, А.К. (1955). Из истории феодальных отношений в Азербайджане в XIII-XIV вв. Термин тамга [From the history of feudal relations in Azerbaijan in 13-14 centuries. The term tamga]. *Известия Академии Наук Азербайджанской ССР*, 5, 51-63
- *Археология Волго-Уралья* (2022) [Archaeology of the Volga-Urals]. В 7 т. Т. 6. Средние века (вторая треть XIII первая половина XV вв.). Эпоха Золотой Орды (Улуса Джучи) / Институт археологии им. А.Х. Халикова АН РТ; под общ. ред. А.Г. Ситдикова; отв. ред. В.С. Баранов. Казань: Изд-во АН РТ, 676 pages
- *Архив Юго-Западной России* (1867) [Archive of South-West Russia]. Часть 4. Акты о происхождении шляхетских родов в Юго-Западной России. Киев: В типографии Е. Федорова
- Бабаян, Л. О. (1969). *Социально-экономическая и политическая история Армении в XIII-XIV веках* [Socio-economic and political history of Armenia in the 13-14 centuries]. Москва: Наука, 334 pages
- Банзаров, Д. (1850). Пайзе, или металлические дощечки с повелениями монгольских ханов [Paize, or metal plaques with the commands of the Mongol khans]. *Записки Санкт-Петербургского археологическо-нумизматического общества*, 2/1, 72-97
- Безроднов, В.С. (2019). Князья брянские, их происхождение и потомство [Princes of Bryansk, their origin and descendants]. *Генеалогический вестник*, 59, 16-34
- Бойматов, Л. (2018). Тюрко-монгольские термины в налоговой системе Ирана и Центральной Азии XIII-XIV вв. [Turkic-Mongol terms in the tax system of Iran and Central Asia in the 13-14 centuries]. In *Духовно-исторические связи народов Ирана и Дашти Кипчака*. Алматы: Издательский дом «Библиотека Олжаса», pp. 87-95
- Васильев, Д.В. (2009). К вопросу о местонахождении первой столицы Золотой Орды [To the question about the location of the first capital of the Golden Horde] *Золотоордынское наследие*, 1, 436-445
- Васильев, Д.В. (2012). О населённых пунктах в дельте Волги, которые посетил Гильом Рубрук в 1254 году [About settlements in the Volga delta visited by William of Rubruck in 1254]. *Труды Камской археолого-этнографической экспедиции*, 8, 266-270
- Воротынцев, Л.В. (2017). Кем был «Сарацин» - переписчик, упоминаемый в «Истории монгалов» Плано Карпини: к вопросу о проведении первой ордынской переписи на Руси 1245 г. [Who was «Saracen» - the scribe mentioned in Plano Carpini's «History of the Mongols»: to the question of the first Horde census in Rus in 1245]. *Золотоордынская Цивилизация*, 10, 135-139



- Вашари, И. (1987). Заметки о термине *tartanaq* в Золотой Орде [Notes on the term *tartanaq* in the Golden Horde]. *Советская тюркология*, 4, 97-103
- Востоков, А. (1842). *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского музея* [Description of Russian and Slavonic manuscripts of the Rumyantsev Museum]. Санкт-Петербург, 903 pages
- Высоцкий, С.А. (1985). *Киевские граффити XI-XVII вв.* [Kyiv graffiti of the 11-17 centuries]. Киев: Наукова думка, 209 pages
- Галицько-Волинський літопис: текстологія (2020) [The Galician-Volhynia Chronicle: textology]. Київ: Академперіодика, 929 pages
- Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы [Historical dictionary of the Belarusian language] (1996). Выпуск 15. Катъ-коречный. Мінск: Беларуская навука, 311 pages
- Горлов, А.В., Казаров А.А. (2015). О группе монет конца XIV в. из находок в курско-белгородском регионе и о времени вхождения «Яголтаевой тьмы» в состав Великого княжества Литовского [About a group of coins of the end of the XIV century from finds in the Kursk-Belgorod region and about the time of the entry of the "Yagoltay's t'ma" into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. *Средневековая нумизматика Восточной Европы*, 5, 46-63
- Горский, А.А. (2014). Утверждение власти Монгольской империи над Русью: региональные особенности [Assertion of the Mongol Empire's power over Rus: regional peculiarities]. *Исторический вестник*, 10(157), 58-79
- Горский, А.А. (2018). Московские «ордынцы» и «делюи» [Moscow's «ordyntsi» and «deliui»]. In *«Вертоград многоцветный»: Сборник к 80-летию Бориса Николаевича Флори*. Москва: Индрик, pp. 173-178
- Грамоты Великого Новгорода и Пскова (1949) [Diplomas of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov]. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 205 pages
- Григорьев, А.П., Григорьев, В.П. (2002). *Коллекция золотоордынских документов XIV века из Венеции: Источниковедческое исследование* [A Collection of Golden Horde Documents of the 14 Century from Venice: A Source Study]. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петербур. ун-та, 276 pages
- Григорьев, А.П. (2004). *Сборник ханских ярлыков русским митрополитам: Источниковедческий анализ золотоордынских документов* [Collection of khan's jarliqs to Russian metropolitans: Source analysis of Golden Horde documents]. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петербур. ун-та, 279 pages
- Довженок, В.О. (1978). Среднее Поднепровье после татаро-монгольского нашествия [Middle Podneprovie after the Tatar-Mongol invasion]. In *Древняя Русь и славяне*. Москва: Наука, pp. 76-82
- Довнар-Запольский, М.В. (1900). *Акты Литовско-Русского государства* [Acts of the Lithuanian-Russian State]. Выпуск 1 (1390-1529). Москва, 44 pages
- Ждан, М.Б. (1967). До питання про залежність Галицько-Волинської Русі від Золотої Орди [To the question of the Dependence of Galicia-Volhynia Rus on the Golden Horde]. *Український історик*, 1-2(13-14), 23-37
- Зайцев, И. (2014). Татарские политические образования на территории Великого княжества Литовского (Яголдаева «тьма») [Tatar political entities on

the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Jagoldai's «t'ma»)]. In *История татар с древнейших времен* (Т. IV). Казань, pp. 128-130

- Зімін, О.О. (1966). Устав про холопів - пам'ятка з історії холопства в Київській Русі [The Charter on Serfs - a monument to the history of serfdom in Kyivan Rus]. *Український історичний журнал*, 7, 48-60
- Зотов, Р.В. (1892). *О черниговских князьях по Любецкому синодику и о Черниговском княжестве в татарское время* [About Chernigov Princes according to the Lubech Synodicum and about the Chernigov principality in the Tatar period]. Санкт-Петербург, 328 pages
- Храпачевский Р.П. (2009). *Золотая Орда в источниках* [Golden Horde in sources]. (Т. 3). Москва: ППП «Типография «Наука», 336 pages
- Ивакин, Г.Ю. (2003). Историческое развитие Южной Руси и Батыево нашествие [Historical development of Southern Rus and the Batu invasion]. In *Русь в XIII веке: Древности темного времени*. Москва, pp. 59-65
- Ивакин, Г.Ю., Комар, А.В. (2016). После катастрофы: Киев в 1241 г. [After the catastrophe: Kyiv in 1241]. *Stratum plus*, 5, 59-72.
- Иностранцев, К. (1908). К вопросу о «басме» [To the question of «basma»]. *Записки Восточного отделения императорского Русского археологического общества*, 18, 0172-0179
- Історія Львова. Короткий нарис (1956). [History of Lviv. A short essay]. Львів: Видавництво Львівського університету, 304 pages
- Книш, Я. (2006). Заснування міста [The founding of the city]. In *Історія Львова: у трьох томах* (Т. 1: 1256-1772). Львів, pp. 53-56
- Книш, Я. (2008). Звістка про Львів у Тверському літописі під 6743 (1241) р. [Information about Lviv in the Tver Chronicle under 6743 (1241)]. *Княжа доба: історія і культура*, 2, 130-136
- Козин, С.А. (1941). *Сокровенное сказание. Монгольская хроника 1240 г. под названием Monggol-un nigica tobciyan. Юань чао би ши* [Secret History. Mongol chronicle of 1240 entitled *Monggol-un nigica tobciyan*. Yuan chao bi shi]. (Том I). Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 619 pages
- Коринный, Н.Н. (1992). *Переяславская земля, X - первая половина XIII века* [Pereyaslav land, 10 - first half of 13 century]. Киев: Наукова думка, 312 pages
- Крамаровский, М.Г. (2002). Символы власти у ранних монголов. Золотоордынские пайцзы как феномен официальной культуры [Symbols of power in the early Mongols. Golden Horde paizas as a phenomenon of official culture]. *Туркологический сборник 2001*, 212-224
- Купчинський, О. (2004). *Акти та документи Галицько-Волинського князівства XIII - першої половини XIV століть. Дослідження. Тексти* [Acts and Documents of the Galicia-Volhynia Principality of the 13 - first half of the 14 centuries. A study. Texts]. Львів: Наукове товариство імені Шевченка у Львові, 1285 pages
- Линниченко, И.А. (1894). *Черты из истории сословий в Юго-Западной (Галицкой) Руси XIV-XV в.* [Features from the history of classes in South-Western (Galician) Rus' in the 14th-15th centuries]. Москва, 250 pages
- Лихачев, Н.П. (1916). Басма золотоордынских ханов [Basma of the Golden Horde

- khans]. In *1885-1915. Сборник статей в честь графини Прасковьи Сергеевны Уваровой*. Москва, pp. 70-86
- Мальм, В.А. (1976). Пайцза из Симферопольского клада [Paizsa from the Simferopol hoard]. In *Средневековая Русь*. Москва: Наука, pp. 71-74
  - *Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов* (1950). [Novgorod First Chronicle of the Old and New Edition]. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 642 pages
  - *Описи царского архива XVI в. и архива Посольского приказа 1614 г.* (1960). [Inventories of the tsar's archive of the 16 century and the archive of the Bureau of Ambassadors]. Москва: Издательство Восточной литературы, 193 pages
  - Памятники русского права [Monuments of Russian law]. (1952). (Выпуск первый). Москва: Государственное издательство юридической литературы, xvi + 287 pages
  - *Памятники русского права* [Monuments of Russian law]. (1955). (Выпуск третий). Москва: Государственное издательство юридической литературы, 527 pages
  - Пачкалов, А.В. (2002). О местоположении Сарая (первой столицы Золотой Орды) [On the location of Sarai (the first capital of the Golden Horde)] // *Археология та Етнологія Східної Європи*, 3, 177
  - Пачкалов, А.В. (2010). К вопросу об имени золотоордынского города, находившегося на месте Красноярского городища в дельте Волги [To the question about the name of the Golden Hord city located on the site of the Krasnoyarsk ancient settlement in the Volga delta]. *Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства*, 2, 300-309
  - Пигарёв, Е.М. (2016) Красноярское городище и его округа [Krasnoyarsk ancient settlement and its districts]. *Поволжская археология*, 2(16), 164-181
  - ПСРЛ (1927). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Изд. 2-е. Т. 1: Лаврентьевская летопись. Вып. 2: Суздальская летопись по Лаврентьевскому списку). Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 289-488 col.
  - ПСРЛ (1908). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Изд. 2-е. Т. 2: Ипатьевская летопись). Санкт-Петербург, xvi pages + 938 col. + 87 + iv pages
  - ПСРЛ (1851). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 5. VI: Псковские и Софийские летописи). Санкт-Петербург, vi + 277 pages
  - ПСРЛ (1925). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 5. Издание второе: Софийская первая летопись. Выпуск первый). Ленинград: Издательство Российской Академии Наук, ii + 240 pages
  - ПСРЛ (2000) *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 6. Вып. 1: Софийская первая летопись старшего извода). Москва: Языки русской культуры, viii + 312 pages
  - ПСРЛ (1856). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 7. VII: Летопись по Воскресенскому списку). Санкт-Петербург, x + 345 pages

- ПСРЛ (1922). Полное собрание русских летописей [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Изд. 2-е. Т. 15. Вып. 1: Рогожский летописец). Петроград. xviii pages + 186 col.
- ПСРЛ (1910). Полное собрание русских летописей [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 23: Ермолинская летопись). Санкт-Петербург, v + 239 pages
- Приселков, М.Д. (1916). *Ханские ярлыки русским митрополитам* [Khan's jarliqs to Russian metropolitans]. Петроград, viii + 116 pages
- Приселков, М.Д. (1950). *Троицкая летопись. Реконструкция текста* [Troitskaia Chronicle. Reconstruction of the text]. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР. 514 pages
- Радлов, В.В. (1899). *Опыт словаря тюркских наречий* [Experience of a dictionary of Turkic adverbs]. (Том 2. Часть 1). Санкт-Петербург, 1052 col.
- Рашид-ад-Дин. (1960). *Сборник летописей* [A collection of chronicles]. (Том II). Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 253 pages
- Рашид-ад-Дин. (1946). *Сборник летописей* [A collection of chronicles]. (Том III). Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 340 pages
- Рева, Р.Ю., Беляев, В.А. (2017). Две серебряные золотоордынские пайцзы с уйгуро-монгольскими надписями [Two silver Golden Horde paizsa with Uigur-Mongol inscriptions]. *Золотоордынская цивилизация*, 10, 25-37.
- Рудаков, В.Г. (2007). *Селитренное городище: хронология и топография* [Selitrennoye ancient settlement: chronology and topography]. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Москва.
- Русина, О. (1998). *Сіверська земля у складі Великого князівства Литовського* [Siveria land as part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. Київ: Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М.С. Грушевського, 243 page
- Русина, О. (2005a). До історії Київської землі у XIV-XV ст.: Яголдай, Яголдайовичі, Яголдайова «тьма» [To the History of the Kyivan Land in the 14-15 centuries: Yagoldai, Yagoldaiovich, Yagoldai's "t'ma"]. In *Русина О. Студії з історії Київської землі*. Київ: НАН України, Інститут історії України, pp. 100-113
- Русина, О. (2005b) До питання про київських князів татарської доби [To the question of Kyivan princes of the Tatar era]. In *Русина О. Студії з історії Києва та Київської землі*. Київ: НАНУ, Інститут історії України, pp. 9-37
- *Русский феодальный архив XIV - первой трети XVI века* (1987). [Russian feudal archive of the 14 - first third of the 16 century]. (Т. III). Москва: Институт истории СССР АН СССР.
- Серебрянский, Н.И. (1915). *Древнерусские княжеские жития. (Обзор редакций и тексты). Texts* [Old Russian princely hagiographies. (Review of editions and texts). Texts]. Петроград, ii + 186 pages
- Спицын, А.А. (1909). Татарские байсы [Tatar's paizes]. *Известия императорской Археологической Комиссии*, 29, 130-141
- Срезневский, И.И. (1882). *Древние памятники русского письма и языка (X-XIV веков). Общее повременное обозрение* [Ancient monuments of Russian writing and

language (10-14 centuries). General Contemporary Review]. Санкт-Петербург: Типография императорской Академии Наук, iv + 390 col.

- Столярова, Л.В. (2000). *Свод записей писцов, художников и переплетчиков древнерусских пергаменных кодексов XI-XIV вв.* [A collection of records of scribes, artists and bookbinders of Old Russian parchment codices of the 11-14 centuries.]. Москва: Наука, 543 pages
- Сундуева, Е.В. (2011). *Звуки и образы: фоносемантическое исследование лексем с корневыми согласными (r/m) в монгольских языках: функции, семантика и поэтика: Монография* [Sounds and Images: A Phonosemantic Study of Lexemes with Root Consonants (r/m) in Mongolian Languages: Functions, Semantics and Poetics: A Monograph]. Улан-Удэ: Издательство БНЦ СО РАН, 344 pages
- Толочко, О. (2000). Записки з історичної топографії домонгольського Києва. V. В якому «Острові» жив Михайло Всеволодович 1242 року? [Notes on the historical topography of pre-Mongol Kyiv. V. In which «Island» did Mikhailo Vsevolodovich live in 1242?]. *Київська старовина*, 6, 166-169.
- Усманов, М.А. (1979a). *Жалованные акты Джучиева улуса XIV-XVI вв.* [Granted acts of Ulus of Jochi 14-15 centuries.]. Казань: Издательство Казанского университета. 318 pages
- Усманов, М.А. (1979b). Термин «ярлык» и вопросы классификации актов ханства Джучиева Улуса [The term «jarlik» and issues of classification of acts of the khanate of Ulus of Jochi]. *Актовое источниковедение: сб. статей*. Москва: Наука, pp. 218-244
- Усманов, М.А. (2009). Делопроизводство и канцелярская культура [Records management and clerical culture]. In *История татар с древнейших времен*. Т. III. Казань: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ, pp. 658-667
- Хоруженко, О.И. (2008). Метрические росписи польским дорогам и локализация Еголдаева городища [Metrical descriptions of steppe roads and localization of the Yegoldai's settlement]. *Вестник РГГУ*. № 4/08. Серия «Исторические науки», pp. 302-311
- Чурсин, Д.И. (2021). «Еголдаева тьма» и ее волости по данным исторических источников [«Yegoldai's t'ma» and its districts according to historical sources]. *История. Общество. Политика*, 2(18), 96-119
- Шишка, О. (1993a). Історія Княжого Львова. Історико-бібліографічний огляд [The History of Princely Lviv. A historical and bibliographical review]. In *Вузівська бібліотека: історія, теорія, досвід роботи*. Львів, pp. 25-36
- Шишка, О. (1993b). Історіографія Старого Львова [Historiography of Old Lviv]. *Євшан-зілля*, 7, 9-13.