

The Idea of the Holy War in the Orthodox World (On Russian Chronicles from the Twelfth–Sixteenth Century)

The divided parts of the former Roman Empire had different destinies, and the ways of Christian political thought diverged appropriately. The same could be said about the attitude towards war and peace, a question which cannot be solved definitely. A Christian faced the necessity of reconciling reality with the norms of a moral command, imposing the refusal to murder, and reality.

In Western tradition, the idea of the war, envisaged as martyrdom, is known from the end of the ninth century. Since the time of St. Augustine, only defensive war had been considered to be just, while holy war was regarded as defensive in all cases¹. The followers of the Augustinian doctrine taught that wars were conducted probably under divine command; a cult of the military hero was developed and pacifism lost its following. In the middle of the ninth century, the Church, in the person of Pope Leo IV (847–885), proclaimed that those who perished in a battle waged for the protection of the Church would receive heavenly reward. Several years later, Pope John VIII (872–882) equated the victims of the holy war with martyrs, whose previous sins would be forgiven if they fell in combat with pure and sincere hearts. Nicholas I (858–867) reinforced this conception by declaring that soldiers should not take up weapons against anyone, with the exception of the infidels².

At the beginning of the Arabian conquest of Spain, when the Western Christian world confronted a direct Moslem threat, the papacy actively supported those who would battle against the Arabs by granting their struggle the character of a holy war. Indulgences were received by all warriors defending the Cross in Spain. Subsequently, the popes conducted holy wars as commanders. In his famous speech, given at Clermont before the First Crusade, Pope Urban II called for consolidation in order to return the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Land to the Christians³. The papal appeal called for the poor and rich to forget former conflicts and to join a righteous war

¹ M. Canard, *Byzance et les musulmans du Proche Orient — Variorum*, London 1973, pp. 610–615.

² Catholic political thought included another tendency, whose adepts opposed the conduct of wars. This question was considered in particular in France, where the participants of a number of clergy councils, meeting from the end of the ninth century, aspired to prove that the Church should guarantee peace for its faithful. However, this issue concerned primarily war among the Christians. The great council held at Narbonne in 1054 established that a Christian should not wage war against another Christian. The first quarter of the eleventh century witnessed the establishment of the Truce of God, forbidding military hostilities; nevertheless, this idea remained in the sphere of unrealised proposals. See: S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades by*, vol. 1, Cambridge 1957, pp. 84–87.

³ D. Munro has devoted a special article to this speech given at Clermont, see: D. C. Munro, *The speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095*, "American Historical Review" 11(1906), pp. 231–242.

under God's command. Urban II asserted that all fatalities were assured salvation and absolution from sins⁴. The idea of a struggle for the Cross reconciled the Biblical ideal of mercy and the reality of the period.

In Byzantium, the use of the conception of the holy war as an element of political and military ideology appeared only in particular instances. The Byzantine emperors, intent on recovering lost territories, inherited the Roman notion of the validity of all war against the barbarians; therefore, the idea of holy war was not regarded as necessary. During the seventh century, Byzantium confronted Islam, whose adherents observed a completely different comprehension of war, which the Christians found difficult to understand. The latter considered the Cross to be predominantly a form of protection, and not a weapon. The idea that fallen warriors would go to Heaven was thought to be a prejudice (Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Nicetas Choniates). The Muslim vision of the holy nature of war appeared to be a sacrilege, and, according to Byzantine beliefs, demonstrated the moral imperfection of the Moslems — an argument employed in a polemic. For a long time (prior to John of Damascus), Islam was considered to be a heresy, and not a new religion. Later, in the second half of the ninth century and at the beginning of the eleventh century, Byzantium arrived at the idea of a peaceful co-existence of two religions⁵. The Church protected its position consistently. In a search for an ideological basis for anti-Moslem campaigns, Emperor Nicephorus Phocas turned to the idea of martyrdom, which he tried to apply in the struggle against the infidels, an approach opposed by the Church. In *De velitatione bellica* Phocas named his army “the soldiers of Christ”, who sacrificed their lives to serve the holy emperors and to revenge Christians. On behalf of the patriarch Polyevctus, Phocas promised all warriors battling for the faith that they would go to Heaven. Even forcible conversion to Christianity was practised. “The Soldiers of God” fought fiercely. Nevertheless, the ideology propagated by Phocas was not included into Byzantine practice, and was actively opposed by the Church. Patriarch Polyevctus, horrified by Phocas' efforts⁶, directed against the emperor the celebrated canon of Vasily the Great, which recommended that all those who kill the enemy during wartime hostilities be deprived of Communion for three years⁷. At the time of Phocas' successors, the thesis about the holy character of war disappeared from the political arsenal of Byzantine

⁴ The papal speech makes no mention about the conversion of infidels to Christianity. Assorted historical works claim that, originally, the Crusades did not propound a clear idea of conversion. B. Z. Kedar (*Crusade and Mission: European Approach towards the Muslims*, Princeton 1985, pp. 62–64, 73) asserts that such a conception became common among the Crusaders no earlier than the middle of the twelfth century. Certain researchers came to the conclusion that conversion took place already in the course of the first Crusades; evidence provided by chronicles contains a reflection of this theme. See: S. I. Luchitskaya, *Ideiya obrashcheniya inovertsev v khronikakh piervogo krestovogo pokhoda*, Odessa 1997, pp. 121–143, Moscow 1998, pp. 121–143.

⁵ It is expressed, in particular, in the letters of Nicholas the Mystic to the emir of Krit. See: A. Ducellier, *L'Église Byzantine. Entre Pouvoir et Esprit (313 — 1204)*, Paris 1990, pp. 217, 218, 226–230, 236–238.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 235.

⁷ The advice given by Vasily applied also to civil war. At the time of Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus penance was imposed on a priest from Heculea of Cappadocia, who killed the Saracens that attacked him in a church. See: M. Canard, *Byzance et les musulmans*, p. 120.

rulers, but intolerance *vis a vis* the Moslems remained⁸. On the eve of the Crusades, the idea of the holy war was unpopular in Byzantium⁹. On the other hand, it is necessary to note that not all historians share this opinion. Representatives of another point of view include the Greek researcher Athina Kolia-Dermitzak, who came to the conclusion that the holy war was very much present in Byzantine tradition. She also indicated a series of wars, waged by Byzantine emperors, who stressed the holy character of the strife. The cited historian considers such campaigns to be a form of a holy war, on a par with the Crusades and the Jihad. While characterising Byzantine military ideology, she emphasised that it shared certain common features with other forms of holy wars: first, their purpose was to protect and expand Christianity (at the same time, it is specified that this expansion concerned the territory of the former Roman Empire, and aimed at recovering lost regions); second, the wars were conducted under divine “commandment”: representatives of the Church were present in the army and supported morale by means of religious services — the prevailing belief claimed that Christians were the chosen people of God. At the same time, the aforementioned researcher recognised a number of traits which distinguished the Byzantine ideology of the holy war. First of all, the Crusades were proclaimed by the Church, while in Byzantium holy war was associated more with the emperor, and the idea of the remission of the warriors’ sins and the subsequent assurance of heavenly reward (i. e. the idea of martyrdom) were, for all practical purposes, absent. In certain cases, salvation was promised, but by the Emperor and not by the Church.

It is well known that the formation of the centralised Muscovite state was accompanied by the appearance of a theory demonstrating the continuity of sovereign authority inherited from Byzantine emperors, and launching the idea of Moscow conceived as a third Rome. The purpose of this study is to find out whether it is possible to speak about a true continuum between the rulers of Moscow and Byzantine emperors in the domain of military and political ideology. Thus, it seems necessary to examine the earlier period, when Rus’ faced also the threat of foreign non-Christian conquerors. Naturally, it is impossible to investigate all cases of such conflicts in a single article. Therefore, it appears most expedient to examine the most marked moments in the history of contacts between Rus’ and the nomadic world, during a period spanning the twelfth–sixteenth century. The twelfth century witnessed military campaigns conducted by Russian princes against the Polovtsy, presented as a conflict between Christians and the “infidels”. Those campaigns became the starting point of our research. In a study on the further evolution of the idea of religious war we consider it impossible to ignore such an important milestone in Russian history as the battle of Kulikovo Field (1380). Finally, special attention is paid to the Kazan campaign of Ivan IV. During this reign, the power of Russian sovereign rulers reached its apogee, followed by the gradual decline of imperial authority, crowned by the events of the so-called Time of Troubles (*Smutnoye vremya*).

⁸ A. Ducellier, *L’Église Byzantine*, p. 235.

⁹ See: Αθηνά Κόλλια–Δερμιτζακη. Ο βυζαντινός «ιερός πόλεμος». Η έννοια και η προβολή του θρησκευτικού πολέμου στο Βυζάντιο, Αθήναι 1991 (summary in English, pp. 394–408).

We understand the holy war to be conducted in the name of various interests, with the religious justification of the protection or expansion of the faith. The victims of such war were, as a rule, proclaimed martyrs in the service of the faith. Consequently, we turned to sources, which reflect official ideology concerning campaigns against non-Christians, namely, to Russian chronicles. We are interested, first of all, in the following questions: what were the categories in which the forthcoming war and its participants were considered, and whether an element of martyrology in the service of the Christian faith was evident; what was the role of divine intervention in the course of events, and what was the position of the Church?

Vladimir Monomakh's campaigns against the Polovtsy

Some historians have attempted to compare the campaigns conducted by Vladimir Monomakh to the Crusades¹⁰. We shall try to examine this question by considering the account found in *Povest' vremennykh let* (Tale of Bygone Years), or the Primary Chronicle¹¹. Of the two extant editions (the earliest edition was not preserved), the first was written by Ihumen (Abbot) Silvestr of the Kiev-Pecherskiy Vydubitskiy monastery; it is not available directly, but is presented in *Laurent'evskaya Chronicle. Ipat'evskaya Chronicle*, an annal *svod* of southern origin, compiled not earlier than the beginning of the fourteenth century, together with other chronicles, contains the text of the third edition of the Primary Chronicle.

We were interested predominantly in the text of *Laurent'evskaya Chronicle*, written in the tradition of the Suzdal-Nizhniy Novgorod annals, and the closest to the time of Monomakh. The chronicle was copied in 1377 by the monk Lavrentiy at the request of Dmitriy Konstantinovich, Grand Prince of Suzdal and Nizhniy Novgorod; use was made of the *vetkhiy letopisets* (Ancient Chronicle), which dates back to the end of 1305.

The Polovtsy confronted Rus' in the middle of the eleventh century. Those nomads, whose main goal was to capture the Russian population (*polon*), threatened the territory of southern Russia by frequent raids. Due to domestic instability — long-lasting conflicts between the sons and grandsons of Yaroslav the Wise — it was difficult to find sufficient forces to repulse the assault. The annals frequently repeated an appeal for unity in order to protect Russian lands from permanent menace. By way of example, when the Polovtsy attacked the town of Torchesk after the death of Prince Vsevolod Yaroslavich (1093),

¹⁰ See: D. Bagaley, *Istoriya Severskoy zemly do pol. XV stoletiya*, Kiev 1882, pp. 180–181. His opponent, I. U. Budovnich, proves that the resemblance of the Crusades and the campaign of 1111 is rather formal. See: I. U. Budovnich, *Vladimir Monomakh i ego voyennaya doktrina*, "Istoricheskiye zapiski", no. 2, Moscow 1947, p. 46. See also: A. V. Chernetsov, *Predstavleniye russkikh knizhnikov XVI v. o vlasti russkikh knyaziy i vizantiyskikh imperatorov. Rimsko-konstantinopolskoye nasledstvo na Rusi: ideya vlasti i politicheskaya praktika*, Moscow 1995, p. 269.

¹¹ For a detailed characteristic of the copies and the variants see, for example: D. S. Likhachev, *Arkhographicheskiy obzor spiskov "Povesti vremennykh let"* (in: *Povest' vremennykh let*, ed. V. P. Adrianov-Peretz, vol. 2, Moscow 1950, pp. 148–181. See also: A. A. Shakhmatov, *Obozreniye russkikh letopisnikh svodov XIV–XVI vv.*, Leningrad 1938; M. D. Priselkov, *Laurentevskaya letopis (istoriya teksta)*, "Ucheniye zapiski Leningradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta", no. 32, Ser. istoricheskikh nauk, 2nd ed., Leningrad 1939; M. D. Priselkov, *Istoriya rukopisey Laurentevskoy letopisi i ee izdaniy*, "Ucheniye zapiski Gosudarstvennogo Pedagogicheskogo Instituta im. Gertsena" 19(1939); V. L. Komarovich, *Laurentevskaya letopis*, "Istoria russkoy literatury", vol. 1, part 1, Institut Literaturi Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow-Leningrad 1945, pp. 90–96.

certain *smyslenye muzhi* shamed the quarrelling princes: *pochto vy raspriya imate mezhi soboyu a poganii gubyat' zemlyu Rus'skuyu!* ("Why do you engage in conflicts at a time when pagans are ruining Russian land!")¹². The idea of putting an end to permanent internecine wars in order to gain forces for resisting foreign enemies was repeated at a convention of Russian princes, held at Lubech (1097): *Pochto gubim russkuyu zemlyu, sami na sya kotoru (usobitsu) deyushche, a Polovtsy zemlyu nashyu nesut' rozno*¹³. The campaign against the Polovtsy, waged in 1103 and 1111, was connected primarily with the necessity to protect Russia from further raids, i. e. the direct activity of the participants of those events was endowed with an extra-religious nature. At a council of princes, convened at Dolobsk and preceding the Russian campaign, Vladimir explained to the participants that it was necessary to advance against the "pagans"; otherwise, the Polovtsy would attack peaceful inhabitants (a peasant, preparing to plough, is killed by a *Polovchin* arrow, his horse is taken, and, in the village, his wife and children are captured, and property — looted)¹⁴. The campaign of 1103, victorious for the Russian forces, led to the death of some of the Polovtsy princes. The captured Prince Beldyuz' (this is the variant of his name given in the text of *Lavrent'evskaya Chronicle*; it differs in other sources) offered a large ransom for himself. Vladimir refused, declaring that blood must fall on Beldyuz's head (*budi krov' tvoya na glave tvoey*), since the Polovtsy repeatedly broke the previously pledged oath (*rotu*) by continuing their raids against Rus'¹⁵.

Considering the reasons for the Polovtsy attacks, the chronicler sees them as evidence of divine intention: God's wrath against the Christians for their sins and deviation from His laws, now punished severely; divine attention was considered testimony of love for the Christians¹⁶. The chronicler asserts that all Christians, penalised by the Polovtsy invasion, would find deliverance from tortures by seeking refuge in Heaven, where God would show mercy to souls who suffered on Earth, since He never punishes twice¹⁷. Further, we come across the declaration that Christians are destined to enter Heaven by following a path of numerous sorrows¹⁸. Martyrdom is no longer associated with a struggle against the Polovtsy, but with a recognition of the invasion as divine punishment.

How are the Polovtsy characterised in the chronicle? Prior to the above mentioned conception of invasion as a divine punishment, the chronicler noted that assault of this

¹² *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey* (cited as: PSRL), vol. 1, part 1, Leningrad 1926, no. 219.

¹³ *Ibidem*, no. 256–257.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, no. 277. The speech given by Vladimir at the convention held in Dolobsk is recorded also in a description of the campaign of 1111, included in the text of the *Ipat'evskaya* copy of the Primary Chronicle, PSRL, vol. 2, Moscow 1962, no. 265.

¹⁵ PSRL, vol. 1, Leningrad 1926, no. 279. The year 1101 actually signified the signing of a certain peace treaty accompanied by an exchange of hostages between the Russian princes and the Polovtsy near Sakov, upon the initiative of the Polovtsy, *ibidem*, no. 275.

¹⁶ *Da nikto nie derznet skazat' chto nienavidimy my bogom*, *ibidem*, no. 222–224. Subsequently, we encounter a "classification" of the reasons for various wars. Internal wars were considered the result of devilish intervention, intent on producing discord among the Christians, while external invasions were regarded as divine penalty, *ibidem*, no. 257.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, no. 224.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, no. 233.

variety should not be considered evidence of the fact that the *poganye* won the favour of God (*ne yako miluya ikh, no nas kazha*). On the contrary, the Polovtsy are presented as subjected to satanic trials (they are prepared for eternal fire by the Devil himself), albeit, simultaneously, they are depicted as an instrument of God. While listing the cruelties of the Polovtsy, the chronicler mentioned that they set fire to churches, plundered icons, and condemned *our law*¹⁹. The Polovtsy are called the godless sons of Ishmael (*bezbozhnye syny Izmailovy*), sent to mete punishment upon the Christians²⁰. The question of a struggle against them is thus transferred to another dimension — the sphere of divine predestination²¹.

Constant domestic conflicts and the plunder of Rus' in the course of the Polovtsy raids prompted the Russian princes to solve the urgent question of organised repulse. Such a campaign was carried out in 1111. Its description²² may be found in a continuation of the Primary Chronicle, contained in *Ipat'evskaya Chronicle*.

The idea of a campaign is presented by the chronicler as the result of divine inspiration experienced by Monomakh. It is for this purpose that the account of a dream with an angel, seen as a fiery pillar²³ in the *Pecherskiy monastyr* (the monastery of the Caves) of Kiev, was included into the Chronicle under the preceding year (1110). Emphasis was laid on the fact that the following year the same angel led the Russians into battle against the Polovtsy — *inoplemenniki* (foreigners) and *supostaty* (enemies)²⁴. The accompanying copious record argued that angels accompany all creatures, including pagans, in order to realise God's will, sometimes in a manner detrimental for the Christians. For instance, the Polovtsy invasion is explained by referring to God's order to punish the Christians, given to an angel (*polovtsy bo byakhu vodimi anelom po povelenyu bozhyu*). The chronicler maintains that thanks to angelic intercession God showed mercy to the Christians and helped the Russians in their strife against pagan forces (*na poganiya*)²⁵.

The expedition against the Polovtsy town of Sharukan' was led by Vladimir himself, who ordered that the *tropari* and *kondaki* (religious songs) of the True Cross and a canon

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, no. 233. The chronicler mentioned that he was present (*my po kel'yjam pochivali posle zautreni*).

²⁰ The chronicler reflected on the common origin of the Polovtsy, Torki and Pechengi, i. e. those nomads against whom the Russian princes were compelled to fight, from the Biblical Ishmael, who gave life to all Saracens, *ibidem*, no. 234.

²¹ It is probable (but not substantiated by direct reference) that the Polovtsy invasion was considered by Rus' as evidence of the forthcoming Last Judgment. While describing the origin of the Polovtsy the chronicler referred to the Bishop Methodiy Patarskiy, the presumed author of *Revelation*, which mentions the coming of Doomsday in 7000.

²² This description differs considerably from one of a series of campaigns against the Polovtsy, carried out by the Russian princes, for example, the campaign which *Laurent'evskaya Chronicle* mentions in only one phrase under 1110, *ibidem*, no. 283. The campaign of 1103 is described in more detail, when, according to the chronicler, God proposed the very idea of a campaign, to the Russian princes: *Bog bo vlosbi v serdise knyazem Ruskim [...] i snyatasya dumati na Dolob'ske*, *ibidem*, no. 277.

²³ This issue is recorded also in *Laurent'evskaya Chronicle*, which includes the text of the *Laurent'evskaya* version of the Primary Chronicle. See: PSRL, vol. 1, no. 284–285.

²⁴ PSRL, vol. 2, no. 260–261.

²⁵ PSRL, vol. 2, no. 262–264. For a description of the battle, see: *ibidem*, no. 266–268. The conception of the angels, with reference to Epiphany, is developed in the chronicle also further on, *ibidem*, no. 271–273.

to Our Lady be chanted in front of the troops. Moreover, the chronicler provides a divine explanation for the successful development of events: in the course of the battle, God turned His anger against the foreigners (*inoplemenniki*), who succumbed to the Christian onslaught. When the Polovtsy attacked the Russian troops (*rati*) once again, God sent an invisible angel to assist the Christian forces in defeating the enemy. The chronicle includes testimony provided by the Polovtsy captives, *kolodniki*, as an additional measure to persuade the readers. The answers given by the captives to the question why they discontinued resisting the Russian *rat'* and retreated, mentioned that *drugie* (i. e. a force other than the Russian warriors) preceded the Russian army and overwhelmed the opponent by means of terrible weapons. These were the angels whom God admonished to help the Christians²⁶.

Religious distinctions between the Russians ("Christians") and the Polovtsy (*poganye*) are evident in annals describing the campaign of 1111; its successful outcome is presented as the result of divine decisions. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to acknowledge the campaigns against the Polovtsy as holy war, for, despite the fact that the chronicle regards the combat in religious categories, the necessity of conducting a struggle against foes is proven by political, purely secular reasons, and not by religious arguments. Objectively speaking, the defensive character of the war against the Polovtsy entitled the chronicler to present it as a just endeavour.

There is no direct indication in the chronicle that the Russian campaign was considered to be a Crusade. Nonetheless, it is possible to determine the attitude towards the idea of the Crusades in Rus' during the twelfth–thirteenth century. *Galitsko-volynskiy svod*, a compilation made in the Galich and Volyn' principality, regarded as one of the sources of *Ipat'evskaya Chronicle*, contains an account of the Third Crusade (1190)²⁷. The description in question concerns the expedition led by the German Emperor (*tsesar*) against the enemies of the Holy Sepulchre, which God permitted to be conquered by foreign nations (*inoplemenniki*) as punishment for the sins committed by the Christians²⁸. The most interesting for us is the attitude of the chronicler towards the very fact of the campaign. He approved the undertaking of the "German Caesar" against "the sons of Hagar" for the purpose of liberating the Holy Sepulchre, described divine intervention in the course of the events (the campaign began in accordance with divine will, proclaimed by an angel), and even characterized the Christian warriors (*nemtsev*, "Germans", i. e. foreigners) as martyrs for the faith. The chronicler recounts posthumous miracles: three days after the Crusaders perished, angels carried their bodies away. Witnessing such a miraculous event, the remaining warriors declared their intention to suffer for Christ. A more recent account by a chronicler from Novgorod, dealing with

²⁶ *Ibidem*, no. 268–269. The Archangel Michael is described as the main member of the heavenly hierarchy of angels, who struggled against the Devil for the body of Moses, *opolchalsya* against the Persian prince in the name of freedom, etc.

²⁷ PSRL., vol. 2, no. 667–668.

²⁸ It is interesting to note that while writing about sin the chronicler generalises the issue and extends this theory to all Christians, including Russians (*zane eispolnisya zlobnashikk vsya zemlyai si vsya navedye na ny grekb radinashikk*).

the capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders (*friazi*), shows that at the beginning of the thirteenth century Rus' was familiar with the course of the Crusades, and testifies to the absence of negative attitudes toward such military campaigns. The very capture and plunder of Constantinople was considered to be the result of the "depravity" of the imperial army, tempted by the riches of the Byzantine capital. Moreover, the armed men acted in defiance of the wishes of the Pope and the Emperor, who had in mind only Byzantine interests, i. e. to enthrone a ruler supported by the people. Emphasis is placed on the fact that the Pope ordered the army "to return" his candidate to Rome, should his policy fail²⁹.

During the twelfth century and at the beginning of the thirteenth century, ancient Rus' appears to have been receptive to the idea of martyrdom in the service of God, but lacked the opportunity to extend it to itself.

The battle of Kulikovo Field. Confrontation with "non-believers"

The repulse of the Polovtsy resulted in short-lived stability along the southern borders of Russia. In the first half of the thirteenth century, Rus', torn by conflicting principalities, was conquered by the Tartars, and became a long-term vassal of the Golden Horde. Not until the end of the fourteenth century did the Russian princes manage to gather sufficient forces to compel the Tartars to withdraw. In the second half of the fourteenth century, the Golden Horde succumbed to disintegration, which weakened much of its military potential. The battle of Kulikovo Field was one of most important military conflicts involving mediaeval Rus'. Numerous variants of its description exist in the sources and literature.

According to contemporary research, the text of *Rogozhskiy letopisets* contains the most ancient version of the preserved annalistic descriptions of the battle. A similar description, from a more recent period, is to be found in *Simeonouskaya Chronicle*. This version of *letopisnaya povest'* (the account included in the text of the chronicle) refers to a compilation from 1409, which, in turn, was preceded by other sources presenting more details of the events³⁰. The text of *Rogozhskiy letopisets* stresses the religious differences between the Russians and the Tartars: this was a war between the Christians and the Tartars, who were considered to be the representatives of the pagan nation of Ishmael (*poganiy rod izmailteski*), headed by the *bezbozhny* (God-less) Mamay. Nevertheless, an explanation of the reasons for the Mamay invasion offers no indications that he aimed at a persecution of Christianity. The chronicler³¹ considers the prime goal of the invasion to be punishment of the Russian prince for killing and capturing Tartars

²⁹ *Novgorodskaya pervaya letopis*, Leningrad 1950, pp. 46–49.

³⁰ Different opinions have been presented by historians concerning the dating of the version in question and its concurrence with other *Letopisnaya povest'* sources. See a brief bibliographic review by V. A. Kuchkin for the edition of *Pamyatniki kulikovskogo tsikla*, Sankt Petersburg 1998, pp. 11–15.

³¹ The khans renewed raids against Russian territory during the 1370s, when the period of constant internecine war amidst the Horde came to an end. In 1377, the battle against the army of Tsarevich Arab-Shakh Horde on the river Pyana resulted in disgrace for the Russian princes. A year later, the Tartars burned down Nizhniy Novgorod. However, a subsequent Tartar invasion was repulsed on the river Vozha (the right tributary of the Oka). Already this defeat, in the opinion of the chronicler, led to the revenge of Mamay. For details of the collisions between the Russians and the Tartars during the 1370s see: *Kulikovskaya bitva 1380* (in:) *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, ed. M. N. Tikhomirov, R. F. Rzhiga, L. A. Dmitriev, Moscow 1959, pp. 342–344.

on the river Vozha³². The foremost intention was to seize (*plenit*) Russian land. Consequently, the main task of Prince Dmitriy Ivanovich was to defend his patrimony (*svoeya otchiny*) against Tartar attacks (*khot'a boroniti svoeya otchiny i za sv'atye tserkvi i za pravoslavnuyu veru khristsianskuyu*). Mention is made of the fact that God supported the Prince of Muscovy, and it that it was He who repelled the Tartars by employing invisible forces which compelled the enemy to flee. A description of the outcome of the battle lacks all mention of the triumph of the Orthodox faith over the infidels. Prince Dmitriy defeated the Tartars, primarily conceived as his enemies (*vragi svoya*), not simply because they were the foes of Christianity. After the victory, he thanked God and praised the warriors, who “ventured to fight for the Christian faith” (*derznusha po Boze za veru krist'an'skuyu*). Finally, there is no note of heavenly reward for heroic deeds.

A later variant of the description of events from the middle of the fifteenth century is included in the so-called *Letopisnaya povest'*, an account of the victory at Kulikovo Field, recorded in the First Sophian Chronicle and the Fourth Novgorod Chronicle³³. A characteristic of Mamay, found in *Letopisnaya povest'*, discloses a certain contradiction: on the one hand, the actual, “earthly” plans, i. e. revenge for the defeat on the river Vozha, and the Russian prince's refusal to agree to a tribute greater than the one paid previously to Dzhani-bek, Mamay's predecessor³⁴. On the other hand, *Letopisnaya povest'* contains a detail not recorded in the earlier *Rogozhskiy letopisets*: the true intentions of the “old villain” (*staryy zlodey*) Mamay, to cite the chronicler from the middle of the fifteenth, were to burn down Christian churches, to shed Christian blood, to destroy “laws” (*pogubit' zakony*), and to capture Christians, i. e. to incur harm predominantly upon the Christian religion.

The chronicler describes Mamay as a prince of the Horde, a person cherishing a high opinion of himself, a peer of the tsar, and, at the same time, a pagan³⁵. The origin of the Tartars is traced from the biblical Ishmael (as in the case of the Polovtsy in earlier chronicles); the same holds true for the accentuated contrast between the *poganiye*

³² PSRL, vol. 15, 1st. ed., Moscow 1965, no. 139–142. No religious motivation for the raid is proposed also in *Zadonschchina* (The [Tale of] the Battle beyond the Don). This poetic work originates in the 1380s, immediately after the victory at Kulikovo Field. Its author places emphasis on the fact that the Tartars captured the *voichina*, the patrimony of the Russian princes, *khot'ya nastupati na Russkuyu zeml'u*, and for this reason the princes intended to shed their blood *za zeml'u ruskuyu i za veru krest'jan'skuyu*, and to take revenge for the insult. The saints Boris and Gleb ask for God's mercy for the prince and his just cause (*Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, Moscow 1959, pp. 10–13). On dating the document see: V. F. Rzhiga, *Slovo Sofniya Ryazantsa o Kulikovskoy bitve (Zadonschchina) kak literaturniy pamyatnik 80kh XIV v.* (in:) *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, p. 397. See also: V. A. Kuchkin, *Pobeda na Kulikovom pole. Voprosy istorii*, Moscow 1980, no. 8, p. 6.

³³ *Letopisnaya povest'* was included in the Novgorod–Sophia compilation created, according to different data, in 1448 or the 1430s. It is traced back to the metropolitan compilation made in 1423. See: V. A. Kuchkin, *Pobeda na Kulikovom pole*, p. 6.

³⁴ On the change of the rate of the tribute, see: V. D. Grekov, A. Yu. Yakubovskaya, *Zolotaya Orda i yey padenie*, Moscow–Leningrad 1950, p. 263–264.

³⁵ The chronicle indicates that the Russians considered the Tartars to be followers of a separate faith. While describing their further destiny, the chronicler wrote that after Mamay's disgraceful struggle against Tokhtamysh, the army of the former swore an oath to Tokhtamysh according to the tradition of their faith (*dasha yemu pravdu po svoey vere*), *Povesti o Kulikovoy bitve*, p. 39.

and the Christians (*vzdvizayetsa na krest'any inmalteski rod*). A later epithet was *sodomlyane* (the inhabitants of Hell)³⁶.

Prince Dmitriy is pictured as a pious and Christ-loving ruler, facing the difficult task of protecting his land (*boroniti svoeyaya otchiny*) against the huge Tartar army (*rat'*), and for this purpose capable of amassing the Russian princes. From the very beginning of the world, there never was such a host of Russian princes as in the time of this ruler, adds the chronicler. The struggle for the independence of Rus' is closely connected with the protection of Orthodoxy, "the true Christian faith", from the non-believer Mamay. Dmitriy appealed to his brother Vladimir, the Russian princes, and the voivodes to repulse Mamay for the sake of their faith, holy churches, old men and babes, and Christians in general³⁷.

Letopisnaya povest' repeatedly emphasises that it was not Prince Dmitriy Ivanovich who instigated the war — on the contrary, he did not want to shed blood; the fault lay with Mamay and his ally, Prince Oleg of Ryazan³⁸, who broke a divine interdiction to enter alien territory (*v chuzh predel prestupati*), and intended to ruin the land and destroy all Christianity³⁹. The prince prayed to God, entreating Him to interfere in the course of the battle, and to protect the Christian faith and churches by punishing the instigators (*pogubit' zachinajushchikh rati*). A victory, the prince believed, would prove the truth of the Orthodox faith to the pagans⁴⁰.

Letopisnaya povest' maintains that the struggle for the sake of the faith was regarded as martyrdom; yet it does not present it as an idea which had already assumed shape. Participants in the battle of Kulikovo Field are not proclaimed to be martyrs. At the height of the battle, certain *nebyvaltsy* (possibly, the recruits) could not resist fear of horrible death and began to flee, forgetful of the words with which the "martyrs" addressed each other: *Bratie, poterpim malo; zima yara, no ray sladok, i strasten mech no slavno venchanie* (Brothers, let us suffer a little, winter is violent, but heaven is sweet, the sword is terrible, but achieving the crown is glorious)⁴¹. At the same time, the text

³⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 36–37.

³⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 30–31.

³⁸ Prince Oleg of Ryazan is characterised in the chronicle as *pobornik bezsermenskiy, Istiviy sotonshchik*, and the excluded son of God, who destroyed his soul. His envoy to Mamay and Jagailo (Jagiello), Prince of Lithuania, is called the forerunner of Antichrist (*Povesti o Kulikovoy bitve*, p. 30). Obviously, this approach was connected with the general tendency of the account, since the main condition for a successful victory over the Tartars was the unity of the Russian princes. The conforming policy of Oleg of Ryazan contributed to such unity. The chronicler, who supported the idea of the unification of the Russian princes, faced by the Tartar threat, explained the invasion as punishment for Christian sins, in the belief that the intention of divine providence is to prompt the Christians to refuse internal struggle (*bratoriienavideniya*), as well as greed, injustice (*niepravednyz sudov*) and violence (*ibidem*, p. 38). On the idea of the unification of the Russian princes, recorded in the monuments devoted to the battle at Kulikovo Field, see: N. S. Borisov, *Vozdeystvie Kulikovskoy bitvi na russkuyu kulturu kontsa XIV–XV vv.* (in: *Kulikovskaya bitva v istorii i kulture nashey Rodini (materiali yubileynoy nauchnoy konferentsi)*, Moscow 1983, pp. 125–126.

³⁹ *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, pp. 33–34.

⁴⁰ *Da postyd'atsa i posramiatsa i poznayut, yako ty yesi yedin vyshniy po usei zemli, ibidem*, p. 31. Divine intervention thus aims at punishing the Tartars for their refusal to recognise the God of the Christians. *Otvрати, gospodi, litse svoeye ot niz i pokazhi im vsya zlaya naposledok, yako rod razvrashchen est' i nest' very v nikh woyeya [...] proley na nikh gnev tvoj [...] na yazyki, nie znayishchaya tebye, gospodi, i imeni tvojego svyatago nie prizvasha.*

presents a notion of death on the battlefield as a tragedy better to be avoided, and not as conscious martyrdom for the sake of the faith; this conception is reflected in a motif of the Russian women, weeping, in the manner of Rachel, over the death of their sons, who set off to defend their native land. Each mourner spoke to herself: *Une by nam bylo ashche by sya yeste ne rodili [...] pochto bykhom povinni pagube vashey* (It would be better for us if you has not been born [...] is it our fault that you are doomed?)⁴².

The notion of the assailants who attacked the Russians in their capacity as the instrument of God is accompanied by divine intervention, supporting Christian sinners, possible due to divine love for the people — “God is not totally angry with us” (*ne do konca prognevaetsa na ny*)⁴³. The chronicle indicated direct divine intervention in the course of the battle (God helped the Russians, just as He once assisted Yaroslav in overcoming Svyatopolk). Certain that the Christians ventured into battle for the sake of the faith, fearless, and proving that they were great warriors, God sent them angels and a regiment (*polk*) of holy martyrs, the holy warriors Georgiy, Dmitriy, the saints Boris and Gleb, and the Archangel Michael, commander of the heavenly host (*rat'*). Two voivodes of the Russian army saw a “thrice-shining regiment” (*tresolmechnyj polk*) and burning arrows (*plamennye strely*); the Tartars succumbed to a fear of God, and were killed by weapons brandished by the Christians⁴⁴. God also directed the actions of the prince in the course of the battle⁴⁵.

A description of the battle of Kulikovo Field, later than the *Letopisnaya povest'*, is found in the so-called *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche* (A Tale of the Battle with Mamay), a very popular text — today, there are approximately 150 copies and 10 versions available (subsequently, one of the versions was included into the Nikon Chronicle). According to recent data, it was composed at the end of the fifteenth century. Researchers indicate the unreliability of a number of the facts contained therein, and “the great influence of the ecclesiastical point of view” (*silnejshiy nalet tserkovnosti*) upon the proposed information⁴⁶. From the chronological point of view, the basic version of the *Tale* — the *Osnovnaya redaktsiya* — is closest to the original text⁴⁷. The aim of the Tartars was the complete extermination of Christians (Mamay *vsemu khristianstvu khoshchet pokorenu ot nego byti yako by sya ne slavilo gospodne imya v ludekh yego* — he wants to conquer all Christians so that God’s name would not glorified by His people), as well as the possession of all the riches of Russian lands. The Mamay invasion is viewed as a consequence of devilish witchcraft, permitted by God as a result of Christian sins (it was the Devil who taught Mamay how to destroy the Christian faith). The chronicler cites numerous epithets condemning Mamay, connected with his religious

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, p. 36.

⁴² *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, p. 33.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 38.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 36.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

⁴⁶ For information on dating *Skazaniye* see: V. A. Kuchkin, *Pobeda*, p. 7.

⁴⁷ L. A. Dmitriev, *K literaturnoy istorii Skazaniya o Mamaevom poboishche* (in:) *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, pp. 416–420.

unscrupulousness. Mamay is characterised as an adept of the pagan beliefs of the (ancient) Greeks (*ellin syi veroyu*), an “idolater” (*idolozhrets*) and an “iconoclast” (*ikonoborets*)⁴⁸. The chronicler considers the threat to be especially awesome, since Prince Oleg of Ryazan and Olgerd, Prince of Lithuania, both with claims as regards Russian territories, sought to benefit from Mamay’s invasion for their own purposes, i. e. to divide Dmitriy’s principality⁴⁹.

At the same time, *Skazanie*, just as *Letopisnaya povest’*, accentuates that God was not totally angry (*nie do konca prognevalsya*) with the Christians, who may expect divine help. The basic condition for enjoying this support is obedience to the divine will, for God resists the proud and offers his grace to the humble (*gospod’ gordym protivitsa, a smirennym blagodat’ daet*). Here we come across an idea, proposed in fragments present in *Letopisnaya povest’* (where it was connected with the tribute paid to Dzhanipek) — only after meeting all the Tartar conditions, was it possible to repulse the non-believers with divine help. The conception in question is uttered by Metropolitan Kiprian, who advises the prince to send rich gifts to the “non-pious” Mamay in order to appease him⁵⁰. Such an act would also persuade him to reject plans of plundering Russian lands. If not, then God would interfere, and offer support to the prince.

The chronicler does not continue this theme of gifts, and turns to an appeal made by the prince to join a struggle against “the sons of Hagar”. Special attention, much greater than in *Letopisnaya povest’*, is paid to the motif of martyrdom. Prince Dmitriy, addressing the Russian princes on the eve of the battle, brings to mind Vladimir, who baptised Rus’ and saved the Christian faith by struggling for its sake. In a comparison of Vladimir to the great holy martyr St. Eustachius, Dmitriy maintains that a person suffering for the sake of the holy faith will be ranked among prominent holy martyrs⁵¹. He expresses his own willingness to suffer and even to die for the faith. This speech was approved by the army, which unanimously praised the prince for the fulfilment of the evangelic law (*ashche kto postrazhet, imeni moego radi, to v budushchiy vek storitseyu vsprimet zhivot vechniy*). The warriors also declared that they were prepared to perish (*slozhit’ svoi golovy*) together with the prince⁵². The theme of martyrdom is developed further in the teaching of Sergiy of Radonezh, addressed to the prince. *Letopisnaya povest’* makes only brief mention⁵³, but *Skazaniye* describes this episode in

⁴⁸ *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, p. 43.

⁴⁹ To convince the readers, the chronicler included into the text the correspondence between Oleg of Ryazan, Mamay and Olgerd, *ibidem*, p. 45–47. The author of *Skazaniye* erroneously mentioned Olgerd (instead of Jagiello) as the head of Lithuanian army in 1380.

⁵⁰ Some researchers claim that the conversation between Dmitriy and Metropolitan Kiprian, mentioned in the *Chronicle*, could not take place, since at the time of the Battle at Kulikovo Field the metropolitan was in Kiev. See: L. A. Dmitriev, *op. cit.*, p. 422. *Skazaniye* records two conversations between Dmitriy and the metropolitan — after he had learned of the Mamay invasion and the rumours of Oleg of Ryazan and Olgerd joining him, *ibidem*, p. 48–49.

⁵¹ St. Eustachius was condemned to an excruciating death by Roman emperors for his adherence to Christianity. See: *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, p. 280.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 50. *Skazaniye* describes the appearance of the Christ-loving host with sacred images on the banners before the battle, *ibidem*, p. 62.

⁵³ *Letopisnaya povest’* mentions the letter (*gramota*), containing the blessing and sent by Sergiy to Prince

detail⁵⁴, including an account of the journey made by Dmitriy Ivanovich to Radonezh. According to this version, Sergiy claimed that “nowadays” crowns were prepared for a multitude of warriors, but Providence decreed that the prince was to carry his crown of victory later; now, the elder “secretly” informed the prince that he was to win a victory over his foes (*supostaty*). Sergiy blessed Dmitriy, whose Christ-loving host set off for battle, joined by two monks — Peresvet and Oslyabya — from his own “regiment” (*iz svoego polka*)⁵⁵, armed with an “imperishable weapon” — crosses, sewed onto their clothes (*skhimy*). Having realised the aim of divine predestination, the two sons of Olgerd also offered support to the Russian prince. According to the text, they renounced their father for the sake of the true faith (*Gospod’ posla nas k tebe na tvoyu pomoshch*), and joined Dmitriy, together with their regiment, thus performing a truly moral feat⁵⁶.

The preparation of the martyrs’ crowns, promised to the warriors by Sergiy, is mentioned repeatedly. For instance, the prince addressed the warriors, ready for the battle and inspired by the promise of the award, by enjoining the gathered men to “earn” the crowns of victory offered by Christ (*uvenchatsa pobednyini vencami ot Khrista*), and to be ready to die for the sake of the holy faith. Such a death, the prince claimed, is not demise as such, but denotes eternal life. Finally, the *Tale* contains the evidence of a certain *samovidets* (eyewitness), who, in the heat of the battle, saw a cloud with hands outstretched above the Russian army, casting crowns onto the heads of the Christians⁵⁷.

Death for the sake of Christ is contrasted with the fiery tortures destined for Prince Oleg of Ryazan, an apostate from Christianity. On learning that Sergiy blessed Dmitriy Ivanovich, and having realised that he had committed treachery and that Mamay sought to destroy (*poprat’*) divine law, Oleg grew aware of the fact that his support for Mamay would be punished not only by the loss of his own principality, but also by the tortures of Hell. Thus, he decided to refrain from joining Mamay until the moment when the outcome of the battle would become clear (*komu ikh gospod’ pomozhet tomu i az prilozhusya* — I will join that army to which God gives His support)⁵⁸.

At the same time, *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche* depicts a real image of death, faced by all the warriors (*vsem obshchaya chasha pit’*)⁵⁹. The sons of Olgerd also stated that the result of the battle would prove successful for those Christians who shall be saved, otherwise all would be lost (*ashche pobiem, to vsi spasemsya, ashche li umrem, to vsi obshchuyu smert’ primem ot knyazey i do prostykh ludey*)⁶⁰. Obviously, this means

Dmitriy on the eve of the battle, *ibidem*, p. 33.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 51–52.

⁵⁵ *Letopisnaya povest’* mentions only Peresvet, a boyar from Bryansk, among the lost warriors, and nothing is said about his relation to Sergiy, *ibidem*, p. 37.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 58–60.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 62, 66–67, 70. The soldiers dissuaded the prince from his idea to take part in the battle, hoping that he would survive and write down the names of the fatalities in the books of councils (*soborniye knigi*) (*ibidem*, p. 67). When the prince inspected the field after the battle, he enjoined the fallen princes to ask for God’s mercy for the souls of those alive (*ibidem*, pp. 74, 75).

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 58.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 64.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 61.

that the warriors could be canonised as martyrs only in the case of a victorious confrontation with Mamay.

Skazaniye devotes much attention to a description of dreams portraying divinely revealed Christian victory: a thunderstorm breaking out above the Tartar army the night before the battle, summer lighting (*zarnitsa*) seen above the Russian camp, the warrior-robber Kotsibey's dream of the saints Boris and Gleb, who vanquished all the Tartars with their swords, and a cloud brimming with crowns, descending onto the heads of the Christians⁶¹. The Russian prince is compared to Emperor Constantine, who owed his victory against pagans to the Holy Cross⁶².

When the direct threat to Russian lands passed, Mamay, unable to lead a new army, specially gathered against Rus', was supplanted by a new khan, Tokhtamysh⁶³. *Letopisnaya povest'* mentions the arrival of his envoy, who announced to the Russian princes the enthronement of Tokhtamysh and his victory over their common enemy, namely, Mamay. The episode of the rich gifts sent to the Horde by the princes⁶⁴ is omitted in *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche*.

Throughout the fifteenth century, the attitude to events at Kulikovo Field underwent a number of changes. Earliest sources emphasised mainly the task of defending Russian lands against the Tartars, without a single word about a war for the faith. *Letopisnaya povest'*, a document from the middle of the fifteenth century, preserved the same understanding of the battle, although the idea of equating warriors battling for the faith with martyrs began to take shape (though not expressed consistently). Finally, at the end of the fifteenth century, the battle of Kulikovo Field was viewed in the context of a holy struggle waged by the Christians for their faith, anticipating heavenly reward, and regarded as martyrs.

Ivan the Terrible and the campaign against Kazan in 1552

A century after the victory of 1380, Rus' finally ended its dependence on the Tartars. At the same time, the victory at Kulikovo Field became one of the significant factors, which stimulated the concentration of Russian lands around Moscow. The growing authority of the Muscovite rulers was accompanied by an aspiration on the part of the official Russian historiography of the time to emphasise the continuity of the authority of the Moscow sovereign, starting with the rulers of Kiev and Vladimir. In the middle of the fifteenth century, the state of Muscovy assumed a new role in the world due to the Turkish capture of Constantinople, the spiritual centre of Orthodox Christianity (1453). The fall of the Byzantine Empire enabled Moscow to put forward a claim to the rank of a global Christian power. The ensuing theory demonstrated the spiritual, and, hence, the political continuum of Moscow, envisaged as the heir of Rome and

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 64–75, 72, 74.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 63.

⁶³ For a detailed description of the circumstances of Mamay's death, see: V. D. Grekov, A. Yu. Yakubovskiy, *op. cit.*, pp. 295–335.

⁶⁴ *Povesti o Kulikovskoy bitve*, p. 40.

Byzantium⁶⁵. The clergy played an active role in the propagation of this idea. Since the fifteenth century, sources produced by a circle of the influential clergy characterised the ruler as a “pastor”, whom God designated to be a shepherd of the Christian “flock”⁶⁶. In the middle of the sixteenth century, thanks to the efforts of such representatives of the Orthodox Church, and primarily to Metropolitan Makariy, at a time when other Orthodox countries were occupied by the “infidels”, the chronicles shaped an image of Russia as a Christian empire, which was not only compelled to preserve the pure Orthodox faith, but also to liberate Christians from the *poganye* and to return them to the true Christian Church⁶⁷. A speech given by Metropolitan Makariy during the enthronement of Ivan IV Vasil’evich⁶⁸ proclaimed that his mission was to subdue all the “barbarian” nations (*pokori yemu vsya varvarskaya yazyki*). The Kazan campaign was carried out in accordance with this very idea. The expedition, which continued the tradition of a struggle against the “infidels”, actually marked the transformation of a policy pursued first by a centralised national state and then by a Christian empire⁶⁹.

While selecting the examined sources we were interested in finding material that would reflect a view closest in time to the Kazan campaign of 1552, i. e. one which was corrected minimally by different editors, but, at the same, time presented the position of Moscow officials. In order to discover such a source, we decided to examine the text of *Letopisets nachala tsarstva tsarya i velikogo knyazya Ivana Vasil’evicha vseya Rusii* (Chronicle of the Beginning of the Rule of Ivan Vasil’evich, Tsar and Grand Prince of All Russia). A later version of this monument⁷⁰ was included into the text of the Nikon

⁶⁵ For a description of this theory, see: I. Krillov, *Tretiy Rim. Oberk istoricheskogo razvitya idieynovo messianizma*, Moscow 1914.

⁶⁶ This motif is reflected, for example, in the famous message by Vassian Rylo, Archbishop of Rostov, addressed to Ivan II, from the Second Sofia Chronicle: *Ty zbe, ubo, gosudar’u [...] yako pastur’ istinnyy, potsbisya izbavit’ vruchennoye tebye slovesnoye stado Khrystovikh ovec ot gyadushchago nyne volka*, PSRL, vol. 6, pp. 225–226.

⁶⁷ See: J. Pelensky, *Russia and Kazan. Conquest and Imperial Ideology (1438–1560s)*, Paris 1974, p. 204. For a characteristic of the attitude of Russia to the fall of Byzantium and the ensuing conclusions made in Moscow see: N. F. Kapterev, *Kharakter odnosbeniy Rosii k pravoslavnomu Vostoku v XVI i XVII stoletuyakh*, Publ. Sergev Posad 1914, pp. 4–25.

⁶⁸ This speech is included in *Letopisets nachala tsarstva*, PSRL, vol. 29, Moscow 1965, p. 50. Historical literature proves that the Makariy speech was a translation of a speech given by the Byzantine patriarch during the Emperor’s coronation: I. Shevchenko, *Muscovy’s Conquest of Kazan. Two views reconciled*, “Slavic Review” XXVI/4 (1967), p. 542, no. 1.

⁶⁹ The German researcher R. Frötschner believes that at the same time the distinctions between offensive and defensive war were made in Moscow. For his arguments see: R. Frötschner, *Das Bild des Krieges im Moskauer Reich im 16. Jahrhundert* (in: R. Frötschner, M. Osterrieder, *Das Bild des Krieges im Moskauer Reich und Polen–Litauen im 16. Jahrhundert*, Osteuropa–Institut München, Mitteilungen, no. 8, September 1995, p. 127.

⁷⁰ For a detailed characteristic of this text see: N. F. Lavrov, *Zametki o Nikonuskoy letopisi. Letopis zanyatiy arkhieograficheskoy kmissii Leningrad*, 1 (XXXIV), 1927, pp. 55–90. The authorship of *Letopisets* is not precisely established, due to the absence of direct indications in the text of the document. Lavrov believed that its appearance was connected with the activity of Metropolitan Makariy (later on, O. I. Podobedova also pointed out that the general tendency of *Letopisets* was linked with Makariy’s endeavours. See: O. I. Podobedova, *Miniatiuri russkikh istoricheskikh rukopisey*, Moscow 1965, pp. 128–129). Lavrov’s point of view was disputed, albeit not quite convincingly, by A. A. Zimin, who associated the origin of *Letopisets* with the tsar’s office (*kantseljariya*), at the beginning of 1500 headed by A. Adashev. Zimin rightly considered *Letopisets* to be a document reflecting the official political ideas of the 1540s and the beginning of 1550s. See: A. A. Zimin, *I. Peresvetov i ego sovremenniki*, Moscow 1958, pp. 29–41.

Chronicle. We used a copy of the early version of the *Letopisiets*, found in the Kirillov monastery⁷¹.

It is not our intention to propose a detailed characterisation of literature devoted to the Kazan campaign. The only works of interest to us dealt with the religious justification of the campaign. They include the publication by the German researcher Richard Frötschner⁷² on the image of war in sixteenth-century Russia; the author examined Muscovite military ideology and military consciousness in ancient Rus' under Ivan IV and his successors. The other work is a monograph by J. Pelensky, dealing with relations between Moscow and the Kazan khanate within the framework of an analysis of Muscovite imperial ideology. The author in question examined in detail the legal, historical and religious arguments for the annexation of Kazan.

We are interested in the question whether the idea of holy war was used in the campaign of 1552, and whether new ideas were produced by sixteenth-century political thought.

An account concerning the Kazan campaigns of Ivan the Terrible preserves the motif of a just war, which appeared already in twelfth-century sources, thus becoming traditional, i. e. the defence of Christian land against the *poganye*, who, as a rule, broke oaths given to the Christians. The Tartars are frequently called “the perjurers” (*klyatvo-prestupniki*), as in the chronicles about the Kazan campaigns of 1548 and 1550. According to the *Letopisiets*, while promising to submit to the Russian ruler the Kazan Tartars *lozh tvor'ashe* (lied).

Having broken their oaths, the Tartars captured the Christians and desecrated churches. This accusation, which was to show that the actions of the Tartars were directed against the Christian faith and the Church, had been formulated already in the middle of the fifteenth century. The same conception was stressed in a passage of *Letopisiets*, which preceded a description of the campaign of 1552. This is a detailed portrayal of the misfortunes of the Christians, caused by the “Kazan Saracens” (an epithet possibly connected with reminiscences about Western campaigns) — the author lists torture of the captured Christians, the shedding of innocent Christian blood, and the defiling of churches. In the tsar's prayer, recorded in the chronicle, the Tartars are depicted predominantly as foes of the Holy Cross, whose aim was to desecrate its name (beyond their comprehension — *yegozhe ne mogut znati*) and to defile churches⁷³. At the same time, the idea recorded in *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche*, concerning a link between the attacks of the infidels and devilish intrigues, is echoed in the *Letopisiets*, which includes an extensive message from Metropolitan Makariy to Murom, where the tsar stayed on his way to Kazan (13 July). The metropolitan outlined the Tartar threat to the Orthodox Church within the global context of the struggle between God and Satan. Makariy pointed out that the predecessors of Ivan IV were closely associated with the Orthodox Church, whose arch-foe, the Devil, was becoming increasingly irate.

⁷¹ It originates from 1553–1555, and was inserted into a compilation from the second half of the sixteenth century, from the monastery of Kirillov–Belozersk. See: PSRL, vol. 29, Moscow 1965, pp. 3–4; A. A. Zimin, *I. Peresvetov i ego souremenniki*, p. 39.

⁷² R. Frötschner, *Das Bild des Krieges*, pp. 12–85.

⁷³ PSRL, vol. 29, pp. 71–72.

It was due to his crafty designs that infidel rulers, the khans of Crimea and Kazan, attacked the Russian Christian state⁷⁴. The metropolitan concluded that in the future the Tartars would be condemned to Hell (*ikb zhe poslednyaya zrit vo dno adovo idezhe imut nasledovati ogn' negasimiy i t'mu kromeshnujyu*). Moreover, he informed the tsar that all the clergymen prayed to God to show His mercy to the Christ-loving host, so that it would stand firmly against foes and non-believers (*supostat, bezbozhnykh Kazanskikh Tatar*) as well as traitors and apostates (*izmenniki i otstupniki*), who befoul the holy churches. Makariy encouraged the warriors to pursue their struggle for the “holy faith of the Greek creed” (*grecheskogo zakona*). The indicated alliance between the Kazan Tartars and the Devil allowed the imperial army, acting on behalf of God, to expect divine support. This is evident not only in the statements made by the metropolitan and in his prayers, enjoining God to help the Christians and send the Archangel Michael, the *vojevoda* (head) of the heavenly host⁷⁵; it is also specified by official state symbolism on the banners, which accompanied the army setting off to battle. According to the chronicle, the unfurled banners preceded the troops and bore the sacred image of the Holy Face, while the life-giving Cross was carried high. It is stressed that this was the cross brandished formerly by Dmitriy Donsky in battle against Mamay. Before the battle, all the boyars and voivodes dismounted and intoned hymns (*na izkhozbeniye ratnym*)⁷⁶. The indication of divine assistance rendered to the battling Christians is repeated frequently in the *Letopisets*. God constantly helped the Orthodox Christians in their struggle and protected them; therefore, their losses were minimal⁷⁷. God assisted the Christians also in the course of the decisive attack⁷⁸. When the Tartar army began to retreat from Kazan, the archangel aided the Christians. According to the chronicle, from this very moment, “resorting to the help of the Almighty” (*i uzbe s pomochiyu usesilnago gospoda*) and the saints, including Archangel Michael, the Christians vanquished the Tartars, captured Ediger-Mahmed, the Kazan khan, and the city of Kazan, took Tartar captives⁷⁹, and seized the banners of the Tartar army⁸⁰.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 87. An account of another connection between the heavenly and the earthly struggle is contrasted, for example, with a twelfth-century record, which connected internal struggle mainly with devilish intrigues.

⁷⁵ Makariy cited examples from the Bible to prove the intervention of heavenly forces in the earthly struggle — the help rendered by Archangel Michael to Abraham in his confrontation against Hodolgomor, the King of Sodom, divine assistance provided in the course of the siege of Jericho, when, according to divine order, the town walls collapsed. Makariy applied the authority of the saints, not only Biblical, but also Russian, including Alexander Nevsky, canonised by the council in 1547. R. Frötschner remarks that the famous icon *Blagoslovenno voinstvo nebesnogo tsarya* (known also as *Ecclesia militans*) depicts the Archangel Michael, while the vanquished are shown wearing martyrs' crowns. See: R. Frötschner, *Das Bild des Krieges*, pp. 24–25.

⁷⁶ PSRL, vol. 29, p. 95. Great attention is devoted, particularly in the epistles of Metropolitan Makariy, to the inner purity of the soldiers of the Christ-loving host. In his message addressed to Sviyazhsk, dated 21 May 1552, Makariy condemned the shaving of beards, adultery and the sin of sodomy; in other words, he supported the strengthening of the martial spirit and military discipline. He also appealed to the warriors to observe the Gospel, the apostolic laws and the sacred laws of the Holy Fathers, to pray zealously and to dispense alms, *ibidem*, pp. 77–78.

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 96–98, 100, 102, *passim*.

⁷⁸ *Bogu zhe pomagayushchu pravoslavnym, poverkh khorom kbodiyashchim krestiyanom i sverkhu pobivayushche totar*, *ibidem*, p. 107.

⁷⁹ *V polon zhe povele tsar' imati zbeny i deti malye, a ratnykh za ikb izmeny izbiti usekh*.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 108.

As long as in the struggle against the Tartars the army acted on behalf of God, and wished to protect the holy Christian faith, participation in such a war was considered martyrdom. This motif is to be found already in *Skazaniye o Mamayevom poboishche*, from the end of the fifteenth century. The *Letopisets* elaborates the idea of martyrdom. In a speech given by the tsar on the eve of the campaign, and addressed to Tsarina Anastasiya, death in the forthcoming military conflict is regarded as suffering for Christ and as leading to eternal life. The tsar maintained that while venturing to confront “the impious barbarians” (*niechestiviye varvary*) he wished to suffer for the sake of the Orthodox faith to the “last breath” (*do poslednego izdykhaniya*), because, he believed, such suffering would be rewarded by eternal heavenly joy; the warriors would join God, the angels and all righteous men (*beskonechnaya radost' i veseliye, jezbe u gospoda svoeyego byti i s angely predstoyati i so vseimi pravednymi veselitisya*). Moreover, the tsar recalled worthy examples of former sufferers for Christ, holy martyrs, the Apostles, and earlier tsars⁸¹; such a worthy death is perceived as good. An address of the tsar to his regiment, contained in *Letopisets*, contrasts the death of a Christian and that of a pagan — the Christians, who are unanimously ready to suffer for the sake of Christ, for their faith, and for their Christian brothers tormented in captivity by the God-less citizens of Kazan (*bezbozhnykh Kazantsov*), are crowned in Heaven (*venchayutsa nebesnym vencom*); “the sons of Hagar” have no God and cannot expect heavenly reward (*ani bo boga nie imeyit ni vozdayaniya chayut*). The tsar echoed an idea which he formulated earlier — the suffering of pious warriors for the sake of the faith does not signify death, but eternal life (*zhivot*). The soldiers answer that they would die willingly for the tsar⁸².

The idea of martyrdom is expounded in messages by Metropolitan Makariy. In a speech given in 1550, concerning the previous campaign, he blessed the army setting off from Vladimir and appealed that the warriors forget their quarrels, support firmly the Christian community, and seek divine reward (*podvizatisya Khristova radi stada i svoeyego radi venchaniya ot mzdovozdatel'a Boga*)⁸³. A more detailed explanation was given by Makariy in the aforementioned epistle to Murom⁸⁴. Here, the metropolitan extended the idea of posthumous repayment to all members of the Christ-loving host: he announced that soldiers who shed their blood for the faith would be martyrs, and that their suffering would redeem all sins committed after baptism; in Heaven, they would be honoured by God. Those who perish will be baptised as martyrs (*vospriimut vtoroye muchenicheskoe kreshcheniye*); spilt blood would redeem their sins, and wounds incurred by swords or spears would be rewarded on par with martyrs and angels (*mechnoye usecheniye i kopeynoye probodeniye*). The metropolitan also predicted rewards for all Orthodox Christians — members of the council pleaded to God that all

⁸¹ *Ibidem*, p. 79.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 82. *Dolzhny esmya vsi yedinodushno pomreti zh bezbozhnymi simi Agaryany*. While describing the “spiritual joy” of the warriors prior to the battle the chronicler explained it by referring to their pious intentions — *izbrav lutshe smert', nezbe zhiivot tlennoi, khotyashim venchatisya za Khrista, i okhrabriushesya vse blagodatiyu syyatogo dukha*.

⁸³ PSRL, vol. 29, p. 58.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 86–90.

Christians, who suffer for the faith, could appear at the Last Judgment, uncondemned by God, enjoying a status equal with that of the saints and righteous men, worthy of the heavenly kingdom. Reference is made to the authority of the Gospel (*preterpevyi do kontsa toi spasen budet*)⁸⁵.

As was mentioned, the idea of martyrdom connected with the struggle for the faith was expressed already by the author of *Skazaniye o Mamayevom poboishche* at the end of the fifteenth century. In the middle of the sixteenth century, *Letopisets nachala tsarstva* gave rise, in the sphere of military ideology, to certain new ideas associated with the propagation of holy war. Those innovations are linked closely with the concept of Moscow as the Third Rome, with claims, made by the Muscovite state, to play the role of an Orthodox world power. Such a role implied, as we have remarked, the performance of certain duties toward the Orthodox Christians. While examining the ideology proclaimed in the organisation of the Kazan campaign, we see how those duties were defined.

The description of the Kazan events attaches an important role to the liberation of Christians from Tartar captivity. In the *Letopisets* this idea is linked with the necessity to bring the flock of Christ, “ravaged” (*raskhishchennogo*) by “impious wolves”⁸⁶, under the rule of the Moscow tsar, called “king, pastor, leader (*vozhd*) and ruler”. He is predestined by the heavens to liberate the Christian nation, *khristianskiy rod*, from its foes (*na veky ot bezsermenstva*)⁸⁷. This aim — to set the Christians free from Kazan servitude by resorting to divine support (*prinesti izbavu bednomy krestiyanstvu ot raboty kazanskiye*) — was associated with the building of the town of Sviyazhsk, or Ivangorod, where the river Sviyaga flows into the Volga⁸⁸. Thus, it gave not only a political⁸⁹, but,

⁸⁵ Pertinent literature compared the Makariy epistle to that by Vasiliy III to Vassian Rylo, Archbishop of Rostov. Makariy “lacked originality” in his address to Murom. See: J. Pelensky, *op. cit.*, pp. 198–199. The promise made by Makariy that all the warriors battling against Kazan would attain the status of martyrs was not an original idea of the metropolitan. Vassian, whose main purpose was to convince the prince about the necessity of defending his fatherland against *besemenstva*, cited the example of Prince Dmitriy Donsky, whose warriors attained redemption for their sins by shedding their blood (in the case of the wounded), or earned the crowns of martyrs for the sake of the faith: *ventsy muchenicheskimi pochteni bysba. Ventsy nietlenniye*, the imperishable crowns, were intended by Vassian also for warriors battling for Ivan III. See: PSRL, vol. 6, Moscow 1953, pp. 223–232. The address to Ugra is the main theme of the article: I. M. Kudryavtsev, “*Poslaniye na Ugru*” *Vassiyana Rilo kak pamyatnik publitsistiki XV v.*, „Trudi Otdela Drevnerusskoy Literaturi”, vol. 6, 1951. One of the early collections of exemplary letters (*formularniki*, from the beginning of the sixteenth century), composed in the metropolitan office, used to draw up official documents, contains a message from the metropolitan (Fillip) to the Grand Prince (Ivan III), readying his army against Kazan (1467): *A chto este, synove, po svoemu velikomu praotechstvu i otchestvu poshli protivu bezbozhnykh agaryan na Kazan' s svoim bratom, so knyazem imyarek za svyatiya bozhia tserkvi i za vse pravoslavnoye khristyan'stvo, i blagoslovlyayu vas, svoikh detey, chtoby este po velikomu vashemu smotreniyu stoyali s bozhieyu pomoshiyu tvrdo protivu bezbozhnykh... A komu, synove, luchitsa na tom velikom dele i krov' svoya proliti, i veruyu Khristu, moemu vladytse, yako tii, kak i prezhnii drevnii pobedimii Khristovi muchenitsi, mucheniya vencem venchayutsa prolitiem svoeya krovi za svyatiya bozhia tserkvi i za pravoslavnoe khrestianstvo*. See: *Russkiy arkhiv XIV–pervoy treti XVI v.*, Moscow 1986, no. 8, p. 180.

⁸⁶ *Da ne raskhityat bezbozhnii voltsi poruchennykh ti ovets*, PSRL, vol. 29, p. 60.

⁸⁷ PSRL, vol. 29, p. 63.

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 60. The heading of a description of the foundation of Sviyazhsk mentions the “miracles” performed by God with the help of the tsar, liberating Orthodox Christianity *ot bezsermenskago plneniya i raboty ot bezbozhnykh Kazanskikh Totar*, *ibidem*, p. 59.

⁸⁹ Special attention is paid to the episode of returning the captives from Kazan. When at the request of the noble Tartars, the tsar enthroned Shah–Ali in Kazan, the latter pledged to liberate the captives, 60 000 of whom

primarily, as sacral meaning to the emancipation of Christians, and is considered proof of the tsar's concern for Christianity as a whole as well as evidence of divine help, supporting his cause. The *Letopisets* proposes a direct parallel between the liberation of the Kazan captives by the Russian tsar and the exodus of the Jews, led by Moses: Kazan is compared to Egypt, the captives — to the nation of Israel, and the tsar is equated with Moses⁹⁰. The chronicler repeatedly lay emphasis on the aspiration of the tsar to liberate the captives.

At the same time, according to *Letopisets*, the task of the tsar in the Kazan campaign was not limited to liberation. The actions against Kazan focused also on the liquidation of pagan faith, and the expansion of the true faith amidst the “pagan Saracens”, on lands previously occupied by them. A very important factor is the chronicler's reason for the necessity of the total liquidation of the pagan faith and the divine predestination of the tsar (*Bog bo vložhi v serdce yego, khot'a pomilovati rod krestianskii i izbaviti ot napaseniya varvarskogo i svoboditi rod krestianskii na veky ot bezsermenstva* — Since God enclosed the idea into His heart, willing to show His mercy to the Christian nation, to save it from the aggression of infidels, and to deliver the Christians from their foes for ever)⁹¹. A description of the foundation of Sviyazhsk accentuates that God indicated the site of the erection, and predestined that here the beliefs of infidels would be replaced by the Orthodox faith⁹². In May 1551, *Letopisets* recorded, the site of the foundation of Sviyazhsk was consecrated, religious services were performed, and a procession circumvented the spot where the town fortifications were to be erected⁹³. Miracles are connected with the foundation of the town — the chronicle mentions that many years before the building of Sviyazhsk the Tartars and the Christian captives heard the pealing of bells and the singing of invisible singers (*po yushche vo mnogo glasov*) from a mountain, where Sviyazhsk was erected. They also saw monks (*chernoriztsy*). The building of Sviyazhsk,

returned home. However, it appeared that not all the men, originally captured in the course of Tartar raids carried out due to Christian sins, were set free (*za umnozhenie grekhov nashikh i nestoyeniye*), at a time when the tsar was under age, *ibidem*, pp. 66–68.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 66. On this episode, see: I. E. Zabeelin, *Domashniy bit russkikh tsarey*, Moscow 1895, p. 156. See also: A. A. Zimin, *I. Peresvetov*, p. 34.

⁹¹ PSRL, vol. 29, p. 63.

⁹² *Da prosiyaet blagodat' bozhiya spasitelnaya na meste skverne, ibidem*, pp. 58–59.

⁹³ *Ibidem*, p. 61. The foundation of Sviyazhsk was associated with a peaceful expansion of the “true faith”, described by Makariy as “luminous bloodless victory” (*svetlaya bes krovi pobeda*). An argument for such an appraisal was found in the subjection to Muscovy of the inhabitants of the so-called Mountain country (*Gornaya strana*), a territory on the Kazan bank of the Volga, in the summer of 1551 (*Gornie zbe lyudi videv to, czto gorod tsarya pravoslavnogo stal v ikh zemle, i nachasha [...] biti chelom, chtoby [...] gosudar'v [...] velel by im byti u Sviyazhskogo grada*). The further perjuries of the Tartars (who dethroned Shah-Ali, supported by Moscow, and recognised the tsarevich /prince/ of Nogai, Ediger-Mahmet, as khan) were explained to the Christ-loving host by the metropolitan as a consequence of the sins committed by those Christians who did not observe their faith firmly and broke divine laws. To reinforce piety among the warriors, the metropolitan advised the tsar to consecrate the holy relics in the cathedral with holy water (“to sprinkle”), and to send them to Sviyazhsk, as well as “to consecrate” the town by means of a religious procession (*krestnym obkhozheniem i vodami svyatymi*). Furthermore, the metropolitan sent an address to Sviyazhsk concerning the town's foundation as an act of the realisation of divine will, and adjoining the warriors to be pure, both spiritually and physically, *ibidem*, pp. 61–63.

which was ascribed such great importance, should become the basis for subsequent actions against Kazan⁹⁴.

The conception of Sviyazhsk as a place radiating Orthodoxy is developed in the description of Kazan after its capture. Kazan is considered to be a city, which God granted to the pious. The Orthodox tsar (*bogodarovannaya otchina*, a patrimony granted by God) was given the title of victor of the “barbarians” — “the poor Christians are liberated for ever and the unrighteous place is consecrated by God’s grace” (*bedniye krestiane svobozhdayutsa na veky i nechestivoye mesto blagodatuyu osvuyashchayetsa*). Kazan, similarly to Sviyazhsk, is called “a dark place”, where, as it is said in the *Letopisets*, the light of the true faith became kindled, and the Christians joyfully saw in the abomination of Kazan (*v merzosti Kazanskoy*) the life-giving Cross and the Orthodox tsar. The former position of Kazan — “a dark place”, “desolated abomination” (*zapustennoi merzosti*), the stronghold of the impious Mohammed and his flatterers, a place where innocent Christian blood was shed and impious rulers reigned — is contrasted with the contemporary situation, prevailed by the righteous Sun of the true faith and the life-giving Cross; previous rulers — *inoplemenny rod s tsar’mi ikh* (the people of other nations, together with their kings) — died without ever living according to divine will⁹⁵. The triumph of “the life-giving Cross” was reinforced by the consecration of Kazan. A religious procession circumvented the city walls and consecrated the town in the name of the Trinity, the Blessed Virgin and miracle-workers. The tsar, who participated in those events, laid the foundation of the Cathedral of the Annunciation⁹⁶.

The speech addressed by the tsar to Metropolitan Makariy and the holy council presented plans for further undertakings as regards Kazan — the reinforcement of the true faith (*blagoveriye*) and the conversion of the inhabitants of Kazan to Christianity (*k istinnomu zakonu krestianskomu*), so that they would praise the Holy Trinity together with all the Orthodox Christians.

In his answer, Metropolitan Makariy emphasised the continuity of the traditional struggle against the infidels, initiated by the Roman emperors and crowned with the victory of Ivan IV over the Tartars. He compared this particular tsar to Emperor Constantine, equal to the Apostles, to whom God granted victory over his foes due to the Cross (*krestom pobedu na vragi darova*), to Prince Vladimir, who baptised Rus’ and, similarly to the contemporary tsar, defeated other nations (*inoplemennykh*), to Dmitriy Donsky, who vanquished the “barbarians”, and to Alexander Nevsky, a victor over the “Latins”. The capture of Kazan was portrayed by the metropolitan as a triumph and final stage of the struggle waged by “Christians” against infidels and “barbarians”. Through the pious Russian tsar, Makariy claimed, God destroyed “the dragon devouring” the Orthodox Christians, and granted “victory over the enemies of His Cross”⁹⁷.

⁹⁴ *Postaviti emu* [the tsar – I. M.] *grad Kazanskogo dlya dela i tesnotu bi uchiniti Kazanskoi zemle*, *ibidem*, p. 59.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 109, 113.

⁹⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 110, 112.

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 114.

The tsar's willingness to convert the infidels to true Christian law achieved a further expansion of Christian faith amidst the inhabitants of the annexed territory.

The Nikon Chronicle contains an account concerning the baptism of Utemysh–girey, the young Khan of Kazan and son of Safa–Girey. A similar request of baptism was formulated by Yadigar–Mehmet. Asked if he wished to be baptised under compulsion (*nie ot nuzhdy li*), he assured that he did so of his own will (*s ljubov'u*), and cursed the “deceitful” (*lzhiviy*) Mohammed⁹⁸. The request was satisfied, and the newly baptised khan was given the name Simon.

An archbishopric was founded in the newly acquired territory. In May 1555, instructions were given to Guriy, the first archbishop of Sviyazhsk and Kazan, and to voivode Shuyskiy, who was ordered to help the archbishop in promoting his authority. The instructions prove that Moscow directed its efforts at a further expansion of the Christian faith among the local population of Kazan, especially undesirable persons. The *prigovor*, a document about the decision to invest Guriy, describes his route in detail and recommends future actions. On his way to Sviyazhsk, the archbishop was to consecrate (*kropit'* – “to sprinkle”) the Orthodox churches, asking God to show His mercy to the Orthodox tsar, tsarina, their “noble–born children”, the Christ–loving host and all Christians. Furthermore, the document defines the range of the archbishop's authority: the right to participate in both secular and religious affairs, to act as the adviser of the voivode and the governor in all state issues, with the exception of crime, and to file complaints in Moscow concerning local authorities.

The archbishop was recommended to treat the newly–baptised Tartars as barbarians — to aim at mutual familiarity, so that the Tartars, witnessing such a kind attitude, would become inclined to accept true Christian faith (*porevnovali khristianskomu pravednomu zakony*) and “become enlightened by holy baptism”. The Tartars are characterised as “straying sheep”, a flock which God had obtained by the blood of his own (Son), and the archbishop was entrusted with the task of shepherding them successfully (*v razum privesti i upasti*). Naturally, *Nakaznaya pamyat'* — the instructions given to the archbishop — do not contain a direct order to baptise the Tartars by force. “Those Tartars who show willingness to become converted, but not by force, should be baptised by his [the archbishop's] order”⁹⁹. At the same time, the text in question elaborates the manner, which made it possible to convert almost every Tartar by using the coordinated efforts of both religious and secular authorities. It was prescribed that the archbishop offer refuge from the voivodes for Tartars sentenced to death, and to convert them to Christianity if such escapees would refuse to return to the voivode. Moreover, it was recommended that in those case when the guilt of a Tartar was not grave, and the voivode merely wished to threaten him with the death penalty (*pokhotyat [...] ostrastiti kazniyu*), such a threat should remained unrealised — the voivode should inform the

⁹⁸ PSRL, vol. 13 (first half), 1904, p. 229.

⁹⁹ See: *Akti ob otpuske v Kazan'*, presented to Archbishop Guriy (in: *Akti, sobranniye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiyskoy imperii Arkheograficheskoy ekspeditsiyey Akademii Nauk*, vol. 1, Sankt Petersburg 1836, no. 241, pp. 257–261. This document emphasised repeatedly that the Tartars were baptised under compulsion, and recommended to baptise them *lyubovyu [...] a strakbom ikh ko kreshcheniyu nikak ne privoditi*, *ibidem*, p. 260.

archbishop about the event (even without the Tartar's consent); ultimately, the archbishop should offer his protection and conduct baptism "by love".

In his research devoted to sixteenth-century Russia M. N. Tikhomirov argued that conversion of this variety did not take place on such a large scale as was the case later, a thesis evidenced by Russian addresses to the Turkish sultan (who interfered in the situation of the Tartars in Russia, similarly to Russian officials, interested in the situation of the Christians in Turkey). The addresses in question maintained that Islam was not forbidden and persecuted in Russia, and that mosques remained open in Kasimov. In the city of Kazan, all foundations of mosques were prohibited, and the Tartars were permitted to live only in a separate location (*sloboda*), outside the town fortifications.

Those measures did not mean that Moscow aimed to convert all the Tartars. At the time of the war in Livonia, the Tartar princes (*murzy*) still retained their privileges and commanded special Tartar troops. New mosques continued being erected in Kazan after its seizure, but by the end of the sixteenth century they were demolished, and Kazan became a Russian town¹⁰⁰.

An examination of the Russian chronicles has led us to the following conclusion: the ideology expressed in the account about the Kazan campaign developed traditional motifs — the protection of Russian lands, *otchina*, from non-Christian invaders, who intended to destroy the Christian faith, and the connection between this struggle and the idea of martyrdom for the faith. Moreover, this ideology appealed to new conceptions associated with a theory, which stressed the new role of Muscovy as the only Orthodox power in the world responsible for the preservation of the pure Orthodox faith. As we observed, the Moscow government interpreted this claim more elaborately. Not only was the Orthodox population liberated from Kazan rule, but an attempt was made to expand the Orthodox faith so that it would encompass the "oppressors" and the territory inhabited by them. The idea that "God forbade to enter alien territory" (*v chuzh predel prestupati*) was replaced by the messianic notion of an expansion of the true Orthodox faith beyond the limits of Muscovy.

¹⁰⁰ M. N. Tikhomirov, *Rossiya v XVI stoletii*, Moscow 1962, pp. 487–488.