

DOI: 10.18454/RULB.4.13

Асадов З.В. оглу

Бакинский славянский университет

БРАЧНАЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ КАК ФАКТОР НЕЙТРАЛИЗАЦИИ ОППОЗИЦИИ «СВОИ – ЧУЖИЕ» (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ДРЕВНЕРУССКИХ ПАМЯТНИКОВ ПИСЬМЕННОСТИ)

Аннотация

Всемирная история знает немало случаев использования брачной дипломатии в целях налаживания отношений с соседними странами, прихода к власти, борьбы против общего врага и т.д. Не исключение и история Древней Руси. Брачная дипломатия на Руси была надежным залогом мирного сосуществования двух ранее враждебных народов, была простым методом налаживания мирных отношений с враждебной стороной. В настоящей статье речь пойдет о русско-тюркских отношениях на фоне развития бинарной оппозиции «свои – чужие» (вплоть до ее нейтрализации и появления новой социально-психологической категории «чужой среди своих») применительно к истории Древней Руси (см. подробнее: 1, 51-54).

Ключевые слова: брачная дипломатия, древнерусский, концепт, свой, чужой.

Asadov Z.V. oglu

Baku Slavic University

MARRIAGE DIPLOMACY AS A NEUTRALIZING FACTOR IN THE OPPOSITION, "FRIENDS- STRANGERS" (BASED ON THE WRITING ARTIFACTS OF ANCIENT RUS)

Abstract

There are numerous examples of how marriage has been used to establish diplomatic relations with neighboring countries, to come to power, to oppose a common enemy etc. in the world history. The history of Ancient Rus is no exception. Marriage diplomacy in Rus was a reliable guarantee of peaceful coexistence of two previously hostile nations; it was a simple method of establishing peaceful relations with a hostile party. This article focuses on the Rus-Turkish relations against the background of a binary opposition "friends - strangers" (up to the time when it was neutralized and a new socio-psychological category of "stranger among us" has emerged) with respect to the history of Ancient Rus (see. more: 1, 51-54).

Keywords: marriage diplomacy, old Russian, concept, local, stranger.

"Scrap a Russian — and you will find a Tartar underneath..."

(N.S. Borisov)

There are numerous examples of how marriage has been used to establish diplomatic relations with neighboring countries, to come to power, to oppose a common enemy etc. in the world history. The history of Ancient Rus is no exception. Marriage diplomacy in Rus was a reliable guarantee of peaceful coexistence of two previously hostile nations; it was a simple method of establishing peaceful relations with a hostile party. This article focuses on the Rus-Turkish relations against the background of a binary opposition "friends — strangers" (up to the time when it was neutralized and a new socio-psychological category of "stranger among us" has emerged) with respect to the history of Ancient Rus (see. more: 1, 51-54).

Mentions of the first marriages of Rus princes with Turkish women or representatives of other ethnic cultures in the chronicles refer to the initial period of Rus history. For example, according to the Galicia-Volyn chronicle of Ipatiev list of the XIII century the son of Volyn prince Danylo was married to the daughter of the Polovtsian Khan Tegako “В лѣтѣ .ѿ хъ в. [6602 (1094)] Сотвори миръ Стѣполкъ с Половци. и поя собѣ жену дщерь Тугорканю. кнѣзъ Полѣвцаго” (11, 158; 12, 216). Examples of marriage collusions between the Rus and Turkic people are well represented in ancient chronicles. Chronicles recorded examples of marriages of Kyiv, Novhorod, Chernihiv, Galicia-Volyn, Vladimir, Smolensk and Moscow princes with the representatives of Polovtsians and Genghisians. Example: “и по Ржестѣ створихом миръ с А[е]пою. и поимъ оу него дщерь” (12, 175); “[6671 (1163)] Том же лѣтѣ приведе Ростиславъ Белуковну. кнѣзъ Половецкого дщерь. ис Половецъ. за снѣ своего за Рюрика. того же лѣтѣ и миръ взд с Половци» (12, 521-522); “[6625 (1117)] в се же лѣто поя Володимѣрь за Андрѣя внуку. Тугѣртканову” (12, 285); “[6695 (1187)] Тогда же приде Володимѣрь ис Половѣць. с Коньчаконною. и створи свабоу Игорьъ снѣ своему. и вѣнча его и с дѣтлатьемъ” (12, 659); “Тогоже лѣта (1206). на зиму. великии кнѣзь Всеволодъ. в жени снѣ своего Ярослава. и приведоша за него Югевѣну Кончаковича” (10, 294); “Тою же зимы (1257) приеха Глѣбъ Василкович. ис Кану земли ѿ цѣрлѣ ѿ жени снѣ в Вордѣ” (10, 330); “В лѣтѣ .ѿ . ѿтѣ . лѣ . [6810 (1302)] Сженисл кнѣзь Костянтинъ въ Сѣрдѣ оу Кутлукорткы. а Федоръ оу Вельбласмыша Михаиловича” (13, 369) and many other. Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich had many wives as well. Among his six wives the chronicler mentions the Circassian queen: “Лета 7092-го престависа царь и великий князь Иван Васильевич всеа Руси месяца марта в 19 день, с середины на четверг, за пять часов до вечера; а жил 54 лета... А

жен было у него шесть: 1. царица Анастасия Романовна; 2. черкассково царица Марья; 3. Сабакиных; 4. Васильчиковых; 5. Колтовских; 6. Нагих” (15, 194).

There are other examples, for instance, the marriage of Prince Volodymyr Monomakh of Kyiv with the Polovtsian Princess Efimiia (year 1126); the marriage of Novhorod Prince Yuri Danilovich with Konchaka, originally from Genghisians (year 1317); Prince Oleh of Chernihiv and the daughter of the Polovtsian Khan Osoluka (XII century); Pereyaslav Prince Andriy the Good and the daughter of the Polovtsian Khan Tugorkhan (year 1117); Galician prince Volodymyr and the Polovtsian Princess Svoboda Konchakovna (XI century); Smolensk Prince Fiodor Rostislavich the Black and Anna, the daughter of the Tatar Khan Meng-Timur (XIII century); the second marriage of Moscow Prince Ivan IV with the Kabardinian Maria Temriukovna (see.: 4, 284-287). Even the sons and grandsons of the Rostov Prince Vasilko executed by the Tartars in 1238 were tightly bound by the marriage with women of Tartar origin. So, as you can see, matrimonial alliances with the Turks were widespread in Russia (see.: 2, 27-30).

Interestingly, marriage diplomacy was so widespread in Ancient Rus and became such a successful policy of the Rus princes that two Rus princes of them married the daughters of the Polovtsian brothers the same year: Yurii Dolgorukiy got married to the daughter of Aep Osen – Anne and Sviatoslav II of Kyiv to the daughter of Aep Girgen. Example: “томъж лѣтѣ [6615 (1107)]. мѣца. тогоже. иде Володимѣрь. и Дѣдѣ. и Сѣлѣ. къ Аепѣ. и [ко] другому Аепѣ. и створиша миръ. и поя Володимѣрь за Юргл. Аепину дщерь. Сѣсенеу внуку. а Сѣлѣ поя за снѣ. Аепину дщерь. Гиргенеу внуку. мѣца генварѣ. вѣ. днѣ [а февралѣ. е. трясеса земля. пред зорями в ноцѣ]” (11, 197-198; 12, 258). It is no coincidence that the chronicler sometimes spoke of Polovtsians as of relatives of the prince, for example in the Ipatiev Chronicle it is written that Prince Sviatoslav sent messengers not to the Polovtsians, but to his "kinfolks" to ask for help. Example: “[6655 (1147)] в то же верема. посла. Стѣславъ в Половѣць к оумъ своимъ. и приде ихъ к нему. в борзѣ т” (13, 329). Or: “[6655 (1147)] Стѣславъ же пришедъ ста оу Нериньска. и тогда придоша к нему сли ис Половецъ. ѿ оувѣ его. съ Василемъ Половциномъ” (13, 341).

Gradually marriage diplomacy has become one of the factors that accelerated the process of neutralizing the causes of hostility towards the "stranger" and eventually led to the emergence of the social category of "friendly stranger" in the ancient society. The category of "friendly stranger" included the representatives of the "foreign" (speaking another language and non-Christian) community (in this case, the Turkic tribes) member of which, for different reasons, became relatives with the Rus (in particular, with the Rus princes) or with the employees of the Rus princes. "Friendly

strangers" were known to the Ancient Rus community since the days of the Polovtsian invasion in the XVII century: «и вдасть Мстиславъ слагъ Володимеръ Половчину именемъ Кунуи. и вдавъкъму пѣшьицѣ и постави и на правѣмъ крилѣ. и заведѣ Кунуи пѣшьицѣ напѣ слагъ Володимеръ» (11, 167); «Тогожѣ лѣтъ (1229). Побѣди Пургаса Пурешевъ снѣ. с Половци . и изби Мордву всю и Русь Пургасову. а Пургасъ едѣ в малѣ оутечѣ» (10, 313); «Тои же зимѣ (6953 [1445]) князь великии Василии наслѣ Тотарѣ два царевица на литовскыи города, на Вязму и на Брянскѣ, и на иныи города безѣвѣстно, и много потратиша, и въ полонѣ сведоша и пожьгоша, мало и не до Смоленска» (10, 423) and others. By the way, although Polovtsian Prince Tugorkan was a father-in-law of Svyatopolk, he attacked Pereyaslavl, where he died (example: “[6604 (1096)] того же мѣа приде Тугорканъ тестъ Стѣполчѣ къ Переяславию. мѣа мая. въ лѣ. и ста школо города...” (12, 222; 11, 162), but Sviatopolk did not leave his body at the battlefield – he brought it to Kyiv and buried at the Berestovo cemetery: “...наоутрея же налѣзоша Тугоркана мртѣ. и взѣ и Стѣполчѣ аки ста своего и врага и привезъше Киеву. и погребоша и на Берестовомъ на могылѣ межи путемъ” (12, 222). N.S. Borisov wrote about this in the following passage: "This whole militaristic matrimonial story looks pretty strange and leaves us with a number of unanswered questions... But one this is clear. Real Rus relations with the nomads, before the arrival of the Tatars and in the days of the Golden Horde, could not be placed into the traditional didactic scheme of "struggle against the external enemy" or "struggle for independence." In real life everything was much more complicated. The political theatre has a stage and the backstage. And it is there, behind the scenes, that heroes and villains talk to each other peacefully ..." (4, 284).

A.A. Zimin said that the Grand Duke of Moscow Vasily III married prince Kuidakul (Peter in Holy baptism), his brother the Khan of Kazan Mohammed Amin to his sister Evdokia, gave him his own domain. Example: “Того ж(е) лета (7014) кр(е)стил великим кн(я)зь Василей Иванович, ц(а)рь и з(о)с(у)д(а)рь всея Руси, [с] своимъ отц(е)мъ Симономъ митрополитомъ всея Руси ц(а)ря неч(е)стиваго Алехавѣ с(ы)на и матери менишчына с(ы)на казанскому Магмедю Мину дву братьѣ дети на Петрову память митрополита чудотворца всея Руси, наречен быс(т)ь во с(вя)томъ крещенимъ кн(я)зь Петръ; и дасть за него кн(я)зь велики Василей Иванович того ж(е) лета сестру свою кн(я)зьну великую Овдотью, и два города дасть ему в отчину: Клин город, 2. Городен(ь), 55 сел около Москвы на приездъ” (14, 212).

"It is believed that as Vasili had no children of his own at the moment he intended to bequeath the throne not to one of his siblings, but to Prince Peter (i.e. Tatar Kuidakule — Z.A.)" (7, 99). In other words, "friendly strangers" who gradually settled in Rus, accepted the orthodox religion and probably married Rus girls, thus, to some extent, pushed the "natives" away from governing the state. It is no coincidence that the Grand Duke Ivan made Tatar king Shig-Alley the head of the city council of Kazan after a campaign against it and the capture of the city: «И казанцы стали бить челом на всей воле царской и стал просити на Казань царя Шиг—Алея. И царь и великий князь Иван послал на Казань царя Шиг—Алея (15, 186). Кстати, что дед небезызвестного православного святого и игумена Пафнутия Боровского был по происхождению тюрком». By the way, that the grandfather of the notorious orthodox saint and abbot Paphnutius Borowski was a Turk by origin. The Life of Paphnutius states that Prince Vasiliy Serpukhov had Turks and Tartars in the public service, one of them “азарянина новокрещена, еще злонравна не отложиша варварьскии обычаи”, was even sent to Prince Paphnutius (6, 17). There also were Kasimov Tatars, the descendants of the Tatar Khan Kasim who was at one time sheltered and given land ownership by Basil the Dark. Example: “В лѣт(о) 6[9]76. Кн(я)зь велики Иван Васил(ь)евич послал пот Казан(ь) царевиц(а) Каусыма, да с

нимъ кн(я)зь Ивана Юрьевич(а), да Ивана Васил(ь)евича Стригу и двор великоз(о) кн(я)зя” (10, 188). Or: “Приехал служити к великому князю царевиц Муртоза, сын казанского царя Мустофы, и дал ему князь великий Новгородок на Оце съ многыми волостями” (14, 279). Later "friendly strangers" became members of personal guard of Prince Ivan III and the tsar's messengers. Example: “Того же лета (6918) князь Данило Борисовичъ Нижнего Новаграда приведе к себе царевицѣ Талыча и посла с ним изгоном к Володимерю боярина своего Семена Карамышева...” (15, 154); “В лета 6933 февраля в 27 день, в 3 час ноци преставися благоверный и христолюбивый и великий князь Василей Дмитриевич. И митрополит Фотий той же ноци посла по князя Юрья, брата его, в Звенигород своего боярина Акинфа Аслебатева” (15, 163) and others.

Marriage diplomacy has become a factor that managed to overcome the language barrier between the Rus people and the Turks and built intercultural communication between these ethnoses. Judging by the correspondence between Tsar Ivan III and the Crimean Khan Mengli-Giray, the text of which is full of words of Turkish origin (see.: 9, 241), the Moscow tsar, Ivan III, understood "Tatar". Based on the research of Rus hagiographical texts B.M. Kloss claims that in the time of Moscow princes many Rus traders could easily trade with Tatar merchants speaking their language and understanding "the Polovtsians" (see.: 8, 443-448). By the way, there were special trade yards, a sort of a palace for Horde Khans, merchants and traders at the court of Tsar Ivan III. Example: “Въ лѣто 7050-го (1542). Септември 12 приидоша къ великому князю на Москву послы Нагайские отъ Кошюмъ-мырзы асанъ-Суеа богатырь съ товарищи да отъ Уразъ-мырзы Баутерекъ съ товарищи, и били челомъ великому князю, чтобы князь великии былъ съ ними въ крѣпкоу дружбѣ. И велѣлъ ихъ князь великии поставити за рѣкою Москвою на Нагайскомъ дворѣ и велѣлъ имъ торговати” (13, 140).

It might seem incredible, but the Rus written culture could dedicate whole written artifacts to the so-called "friendly strangers". Thus, the whole story "The Tale of Peter, Prince of Horde" was written in the honour of the nephew of the Mongol-Tatar Khan Berke, known in the Rostov principality under the Christian name of Peter. This story shows the unseen side of the relationship, not only between the "natives" and "the strangers", but also between the Orthodox Church and the authorities of the Golden Horde (see.: 5, 401-407). According to the estimates of V.O. Kliuchevskiy about "17 percent of Rus noble families were of Tatar or oriental" in the XVII century (quoted 4, 290). It is suffice to mention another study conducted by N.A. Baskakov considering more than 300 Rus noble families of Turkish origin (3). According to N.S. Borisov "... calculation of "pros" and "cons" in the Rus-Horde relations cannot be reduced to the famous phrase of one of the Chekhov characters: "There are only losses!" No, there are also "antiosses". Their thorough and objective calculation is one of the tasks for future generations of historians" (4, 300).

The representation of "friendly strangers" in the Rus writing shows that the gradual neutralisation of "friends" and "friendly strangers" proceeded not only against the military-political background, but also along with the formation of marital relations with the Turks. Over time, the "strangers" were included in Ancient Rus society, they served Rus princes, married Rus girls and even accepted the orthodox faith, owned land and gradually became an important part of the Rus state and society. This process of the perception of "foreign" as native in the history of Rus was not only the expansion of ethnic and cultural borders, deepening economic and trade relations and political processes, but also a way to enhance family ties with foreigners. As a result, the neutralisation of the category of "strangers" in the binary opposition and its gradual entry into the scope of "friends" took place. In other words, the ancient world view of Ruthenians is an example of social and social stratification of society at the stage of historical transition when "foreign" becomes "native".

References

1. Асадов З.В. “Чужие” на глазах у древнерусских летописцев // Жизнь языка в культуре и социуме – 4. Москва, 2014. С. 51-54.
2. Асадов З.В. «Чужие» в письменной культуре Древней Руси (к оценочной характеристике тюркских племен) // Международная научно-практическая конференция «Актуальные вопросы русской филологии в поликультурном пространстве». Atatürk Üniversitesi, Турция, Измир. 11-13.11.2013. с. 27-30.
3. Баскаков Н.А. Русские фамилии тюркского происхождения. М.: Наука, 1979. 279 с.

4. Борисов Н.С. Повседневная жизнь средневековой Руси накануне конца света. М.: Молодая гвардия, 2004. 530 с.
5. Быков А.В., Кузьмина О.В. Эпоха Куликовской битвы. М.: Вече, 2004. 480 с.
6. Жития святых в древнерусской письменности. Вып. 1. Тексты. Исследования. Материалы / Отв. ред. и сост. М.С. Крутова. М., 2002. 482 с.
7. Зимин А.А. Россия на пороге нового времени. Очерки политической истории России первой трети XVI в. М., 1972. 452 с.
8. Клосс Б.М. Избранные труды. Т. 1. Житие Сергия Радонежского. М., 1998.
9. Назаров И.И. Тюрко-татарские элементы в языке древних памятников русской письменности // Ученые записки Казанского гос. пед. Инст-та. Вып. 15. Казань, 1958. С. 238-251.
10. Новгородская I летопись младшего извода по Комиссионному списку. М.-Л.: АН СССР, 1950. 520 с.
11. Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 1. Лаврентьевская летопись. Изд. 2-е. Л.: АН СССР, 1926-1928.
12. Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 2. Ипатьевская летопись. СПб., 1908. 762 с.
13. Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 12. Никоновская летопись. Спб., 1901. 480 с.
14. Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 27. Никаноровская летопись. М.-Л.: АН СССР, 1962.
15. Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 34. Пискаревская летопись. М., 1978. С. 31-220.