

An Offprint from:

OXFORD  
SLAVONIC PAPERS

*Edited by*

G. S. SMITH    J. NAUGHTON

*and*

C. M. MACROBERT

*General Editor*

NEW SERIES  
VOLUME XXXIII

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

2000

## Early *Pomest'e* Grants as a Historical Source

By DONALD OSTROWSKI

ПОМЕСТ'Е is a prominent type of landholding in the history of Russia, but its own early history is little known or understood. This has been due in part to the scarcity of source evidence and in part to the tendency of historians to speculate in the absence of that evidence. Nonetheless, an unstudied body of source evidence exists in the form of grand-princely *pomest'e* grants. Indeed, we have more such grants than was thought because a number of them had been misclassified as judicial immunities by the editors who published them. These early *pomest'e* grants provide a significantly different picture of the initial development of *pomest'e* from that represented in the historiography thus far.

A brief survey of that historiography may help to place the nature of this evidence within context. Klyuchevsky provides the standard description of the *pomest'e* system. He claims *pomest'e* arose from household service to the grand prince and describes it as a combination of that household service and military service. He states that the system was not formalized until the decree of 20 September 1555, which designated the measure of service according to amount of land held. Until that time, *pomest'e*, in his view, was a purely 'feeding' (кормление) type of position with no specific duties or administrative functions on the part of the *pomeshchik* other than to serve 'in a place' (по мѣстѣ).<sup>1</sup>

Rozhkov, Platonov, and Blum all share a rather sanguinary view of the *pomeshchik* in regard to his estate. For them, the crisis of the second half of the sixteenth century was brought on largely by the increase in *pomest'e* land tenure.<sup>2</sup> According to Blum, the *pomeshchik* was 'a harsher landlord than the wealthy proprietor or the communal authority he replaced'.<sup>3</sup> The assumption underlying this view is that *pomeshchiki* suffered from a shortage of cash during a time of rising prices. They could not mortgage their holdings since they were not the owners. Blum goes on to say that, from their holdings, they had to

support their families, themselves, supply their own armour, horses, and weapons, as well as equip additional cavalymen depending on the size of their holding. Since their estates could not be inherited by their sons, they did not put any effort into improving them. Thus the *pomeshchik* tended to think of his *pomest'e* and its inhabitants as 'objects to be plundered', in Blum's words, and wanted to extort from them as much as possible.<sup>4</sup> Rozhkov also points to the frequent turnover of *pomest'e* estates as leading to economic disruption.<sup>5</sup> Both Blum and Platonov connect *pomest'e* with the Oprichnina, in which they see merely an intensification of these exploitative practices. As evidence for this connection, they cite Taube and Kruze's statement about the plundering by some *pomeshchiki* of their estates within the Oprichnina.<sup>6</sup>

Makovsky goes further to assert that 'the development [. . .] of the *pomest'e* system represented a new stage in the development of feudalism, which brought about the establishment of serfdom in its cruellest form'.<sup>7</sup> During the first eighty years of the *pomest'e* system, according to Makovsky, that is from the 1480s to 1560s, 'the *pomeshchiki* were government officials and received from the *pomest'e* feeding income (корм-доходы), set by *d'yaki*'.<sup>8</sup> As a result of this arrangement, the *pomeshchik* did not have much interaction with the estate he held. From the time of the Oprichnina on, the *pomeshchiki*, with the backing of the tsar, exploited the peasantry more and more. This treatment resulted in mass flight of the peasantry. In Makovsky's view, it was only when *pomest'e* later became a hereditary institution that the predatory behaviour of *pomeshchiki* was alleviated somewhat.<sup>9</sup> Thus he sees the rapacity of the *pomeshchiki* towards their estates as being responsible for serfdom. Yet, as Blum has pointed out, this argument does not explain why peasants fled from *votchiny* and urban areas too.<sup>10</sup>

El'yashevich and Zimin discuss various aspects of *pomest'e* landholding in the late fifteenth to the early sixteenth centuries, but neither of them describes any responsibilities or accountability of the *pomeshchik* toward his holding.<sup>11</sup> Nor does Veselovsky see any

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 156.

<sup>5</sup> N. A. Rozhkov, *Sel'skoe khozyaistvo Moskovskoi Rusi v XVI veke* (Moscow, 1899), 447-8.

<sup>6</sup> 'Poslanie Ioganna Taube i Elerta Kruze', ed. Yu. V. Got'e, *Russkii istoricheskii zhurnal*, viii (1922), 36.

<sup>7</sup> D. P. Makovsky, *Razvitie tovarno-denezhnykh otnoshenii v sel'skom khozyaistve russkogo gosudarstva v XVI veke* (Smolensk, 1963), 492.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 492.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 493.

<sup>10</sup> Blum, *Lord and Peasant* (n. 3), 157.

<sup>11</sup> V. B. El'yashevich, *Istoriya prava pozemel'noi sobstvennosti v Rossii*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1948), i: *Yuridicheskii stroi pozemel'nykh otnoshenii v XIII-XVI vv.*; A. A. Zimin, 'Iz istorii pomestnogo zemlevladieniya na Rusi', *Voprosy istorii*, 1959, no. 11, pp. 130-42.

<sup>1</sup> V. [O.] Klyuchevsky, *Kurs russkoi istorii*, 5 vols. (Moscow, 1937), ii. 235-42.

<sup>2</sup> S. F. Platonov, *Smutnoe vremya* (Prague, 1924), 40-1.

<sup>3</sup> Jerome Blum, *Lord and Peasant in Russia: From the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1964), 155.

functions that one can consider administrative for the *pomeshchik* other than collecting his due. Veselovsky writes that 'we do not find in the sources a single, generalized description of the rights and duties of the *pomeshchik*'.<sup>12</sup> He goes on to state that 'the oldest *pomest'e* grants foresee the right of the *pomeshchik* to take for his own discretion from the peasants any amount of land and to establish his own household on it'.<sup>13</sup> In support of this statement, Veselovsky also cites evidence from the Novgorod *Pistovye knigi* from 1498 showing the amount of land that seven *pomeshchiki* set aside from their estate for their own household use.<sup>14</sup> But we cannot consider this to be administration of the *pomest'e* as such. Rather, these are instances in which land was separated from the *pomest'e* for the maintenance of the *pomeshchik's* own personal household. This evidence is significant, however, in showing that at least some and perhaps the majority of *pomeshchiki* lived on their estates. We also have indirect evidence to this effect from Ermolay-Erazm, who, in the mid sixteenth century, recommended that *pomeshchiki* be required to live in towns rather than among their peasantry so as to be able to mobilize more quickly.<sup>15</sup> It is unlikely he would have recommended that the *pomeshchiki* should be made to live in towns if they already normally resided there. If *pomeshchiki* resided on their estates, then the likelihood is that the term *po meste* refers to a physical place where the recipient of the grant is supposed to serve rather than to a social position or rank as in *mestnichestvo*.

Smith places *pomest'e* administration within the context of five types of landholding and their administration: (1) court lands, which he sees arranged as *puti* each governed by a magnate, who was sometimes a boyar, along with subordinate officials, who were often slaves; (2) 'black' lands, which were administered by the prince's high-ranking officials, namely *namestniki* and *volosteli*; (3) *votchiny*, which were not subject to the prince's administration except for certain very serious crimes, in particular murder and robbery; (4) *pomest'ya*, the administration of which was not as complex as *votchina* administration because of the elimination, among other things, of the peasant commune; (5) ecclesiastical lands, in which it was the Church's right to administer justice by ecclesiastical law.<sup>16</sup> Smith comes to the conclusion that 'the tsar's officials left the internal control of

<sup>12</sup> S. B. Veselovsky, *Feodal'noe zemlevladenie v severo-vostochnoi Rusi* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1947), 306.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 309.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>15</sup> Ermolay-Erazm, 'Blagokhotyashchim tsarem pravitel'nitsa', in: V. F. Rzhiga, 'Literaturnaya deyatel'nost' Ermolaya-Erazma', *Letopis' zanyatii Arkhograficheskoi komisii za 1923-1925 gg.*, xxxiii (1926), 197.

<sup>16</sup> R. E. F. Smith, *Peasant Farming in Muscovy* (Cambridge, 1977), 100-2. One should point out that, although the Church could and did claim the right to judge according to ecclesiastical law, chancery officials often decided cases on ecclesiastical lands according to secular law.

estates held by service to the estate-holders; their registers of such estates were not checked by reference to the bound peasants working such land. Such would have been the case especially in a captured, non-Slav area such as Kazan', where there was no tradition of former peasant black lands'.<sup>17</sup> Smith does not, however, provide a specific description of what the duties of the *pomeshchiki* were.

Kobrin argues that the same social group that had *votchiny* also held *pomest'ya*, with the implication that they administered them the same way. He sees only three differences between these two forms of landholding in the first half of the sixteenth century: a *votchina* could be sold, mortgaged, or given away, whereas a *pomest'e* could not.<sup>18</sup> Thus, according to Kobrin, *pomest'e* estates, like *votchina* estates, were inheritable from the beginning.<sup>19</sup> Abramovich looked at the evidence concerning the *pomeshchik* Ivan Zlobin Bazarov, and concluded that, by the end of the sixteenth century, at least one *pomeshchik* in the Novgorod *pyatiny* was actively engaged in managing his estates.<sup>20</sup> Martin has concluded, from her study of the Novokshcheny family mainly in the *Vodskaya pyatina*, that some sixteenth-century *pomeshchiki* may have had a hand in deciding what crops to plant on their holdings during the course of the sixteenth century.<sup>21</sup>

Official decrees and law codes of the time provide us limited information about the duties of *pomeshchiki*. The Decree of 1555 establishes the service requirements of *pomeshchiki* and *votchinniki* according to the size of their holding, but does not discuss administration of the estate.<sup>22</sup> The *Sudebniki* of 1497, 1550, and 1589 provide no information about administrative responsibilities of the *pomeshchiki*, but the *Ulozhenie* of 1649 does. Article 9:12 of the *Ulozhenie* tells us that *pomeshchiki* were responsible for collecting tolls, ferry fees, and bridge fees (but does not explicitly tell us what happened to that money), and for keeping the bridges, corduroy roads, and dams in repair. Article 9:14 indicates that *pomeshchiki* were also responsible for constructing new roads near old ones if those old roads were flooded or ploughed up. Article 9:15 has the corollary that if the new roads were worse than the old ones, then the old roads were to be restored. Article 10:230 declares that *pomeshchiki* were

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>18</sup> V. B. Kobrin, 'Stanovlenie pomestnoi sistemy', *Istoricheskie zapiski*, cv (1980), 180, and revised version in: idem, *Vlast' i sobstvennost' v srednevekovoi Rossii (XV-XVI vv.)* (Moscow, 1985), 134.

<sup>19</sup> Kobrin, 'Stanovlenie' (n. 18), 151-2; idem, *Vlast'* (n. 18), 92-3.

<sup>20</sup> G. V. Abramovich, 'Novgorodskoe pomest'e v gody ekonomicheskogo krizisa poslednei treti XVI v.', *Materialy po istorii sel'skogo khozyaistva i krest'yanstva*, viii (1974), 5-26.

<sup>21</sup> Janet Martin, 'The Novokshcheny of Novgorod: Assimilation in the 16th Century', *Central Asian Survey*, ix (1990), 13-38.

<sup>22</sup> *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei (PSRL)*, 40 vols. (St Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, and Moscow, 1843-1995), xiii. 267-9.

responsible for maintaining fences between villages (села) and hamlets (деревни). Article 10:234 says *pomeshchiki* were responsible for maintaining boundary markers and landmarks. Finally, article 11:6 makes it clear that *pomeshchiki* were responsible for collecting the Sovereign's levy (Государевые поборы).<sup>23</sup>

So it is apparent that, by the middle of the seventeenth century, those who held a *pomest'e* had certain administrative responsibilities in regard to that holding. They did not just 'feed' off the holding and leave other aspects of administration to state officials. But the question is: do we find other and earlier evidence of such or similar responsibilities for the holder of a *pomest'e*? For an answer to this question, I turned to the *pomest'e* grants themselves.

In order to isolate a sample, I first limited my examination to grand-princely documents, as they would be the most likely to provide evidence for state policy towards *pomeshchiki*. Then I had to identify which documents were *pomest'e* grants. I found four types of grand-princely documents that are similar in structure and formulation: (i) those that identify themselves as *kormlenie* grants; (ii) those that identify themselves as *votchina* grants; (iii) those that identify themselves as *pomest'e* grants; and (iv) those that do not provide internal evidence concerning what kind of grant they are. I included eight documents from this last category in my sample with all documents in the third category. Two of these non-self-identifying (category iv) grants date from the 1480s, which seems to have been before the term *pomest'e* came into use for this type of grant. The other six non-self-identifying grants date from the period 1511–24, which might indicate a chancery practice of that time of leaving out the term 'в поместье' from such documents since they may have been simply understood to apply only to *pomest'e*. I did not include in my sample another type of document which deals with *pomest'e* landholding but which is different in formulation from the four types and is not a grant. This type of document seems to be issued following the granting of the *pomest'e* to explain the area included and the duties of the peasants more explicitly (see, for example, the commentary to 1503.1.23 below). Such documents may be a fruitful source for further study.

I was able to identify thirty-six *pomest'e* grant documents from the period 1482 to 1554. Overall, nine of the documents are from the reign of Ivan III, including five that he and his son Vasily III granted jointly. Thirteen grants are from the reign of Vasily III, and fourteen grants are from the reign of Ivan IV (seven from before he was crowned tsar, and seven from after). From these documents, I was able to derive a formula for *pomest'e* grants set out in Table 1.

<sup>23</sup> *Sobornoe ulozhenie 1649 goda. Tekst. Kommentarii*, comp. L. I. Ivina, ed. A. G. Man'kov et al. (Leningrad, 1987), 29–30, 57, 65.

Table 1. *Components of pomest'e grants*

A.	Се яз {title and name}
	1. княз великий Иван Василевич всеа Руси
	2. княз великий Иван Василевич всеа Руси и сынъ мой княз великий Василей Иванович всеа Руси
	3. княз великий Василей Иванович всеа Руси
	4. великий государь Василей, Божією милостію государь всеа Русій
	5. великий царь и государь и великий князь Иван Василевич всеа Руси
	6. царь и великий князь Иван Василевич всеа Руси
B.	пожаловал есми/пожаловали есмя
C.	{to whom}
D.	в своей отчинъ
E.	{where}
F.	{what}
G.	{former owner/ <i>pomeshchik</i> }
H.	в помъстье
I.	revenue/tax collection
	d. з доходомъ з денежнымъ и с хлѣбнымъ [и с мѣлкимъ доходомъ] [по стринъ]
	(a) со всѣмъ доходомъ [. . .]
	(b) с оброкомъ з денежнымъ и с хлѣбнымъ
	p. потягло (long and short variants)
J.	оприч {
	моей великого князя [нашие великих князей и]
	[обежные] дани
	ухожьев борѣтных
K.	date
	1. Писан на Москвѣ лѣта {year, month, day}
	2. А дана грамота лѣта {year, month, day}

Words within curly brackets {} are appropriately filled in within each gramota  
Words within square brackets [] are optional

The *pomest'e* documents in my sample are fairly consistent in following this formula. In addition, twenty-five of these grants have a judicial grant within them (indicated below by the letters 'jg'). Because of the presence of this type of grant within the *pomest'e* grant, twenty-one of the documents in my sample were classified as judicial immunity grants ('жалованная несудимая грамота') by their respective editors when published. It is clear, instead, when one analyses their structure that these are *pomest'e* grants with a judicial grant attached. In the remainder of this article, I shall identify the documents of my sample (with an indication of the *pomest'e* grant components each document has), provide a brief

commentary concerning any unusual aspects of them where necessary, then analyse the documents as a body and provide some general conclusions.

1482.7.27. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Mitya and Ereney Trusov Vorobin, a grant in the *Vodskaya pyatina* and in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>24</sup> A1, B, C, D, E, F, Id, J, K.

This document and the next do not have the phrase 'в помѣстьѣ' (component H) or any internal indication that they are *pomest'e* grants. Both El'yashevich and Zimin classified it as a *pomest'e* grant, El'yashevich without explanation and Zimin because of its similarity in form to other such grants.<sup>25</sup> Since drawing such a conclusion only on that basis may be risky, I tried to confirm through means other than internal form alone whether the grant in question was for a *pomest'e*. The Novgorod *pistsovye knigi* (cadastral surveys) provide evidence that Mitya and Ereney Trusov received the particular village and settlement mentioned in the grant as *pomest'e*.<sup>26</sup> Therefore we may consider this the earliest extant *pomest'e* grant, certainly the earliest of my sample.

The earliest use of the term *pyatina* in regard to Novgorod administrative districts that I have been able to find occurs in this grant. The absence of an earlier use of this term lends support to the hypothesis of Khodakovsky that it was Ivan III who organized the major part of the Novgorod land into *pyatiny* after Moscow took over Novgorod in 1472.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> D. Ya. Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material. Novootkrytye dokumenty pomestno-votchinnnykh uchrezhdenii Moskovskogo gosudarstva XV-XVII stoletii*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1905-9), i. 3, no. 63a. Ereney Trusov was the Muscovite ambassador to Rome in 1527; see *PSRL* (n. 22), xiii. 45.

<sup>25</sup> El'yashevich, *Istoriya prava* (n. 11), i. 374 n. 24; Zimin, 'Iz istorii' (n. 11), 140-1. The earliest use of the term *pomest'e* is in a chronicle entry for 1484 (6992). See *PSRL* (n. 22), vi. 236; viii. 215; xii. 215-16; xxv. 330; *Ioasafovskaya letopis'*, ed. A. A. Zimin (Moscow, 1957), 124; *Ustyuzhskii letopisnyi svod (Arkhangelogorodskii letopisets)*, ed. K. N. Serbina (Moscow, 1950), 95; *Pskovskie letopisi*, 2 vols., ed. A. N. Nasonov (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941, 1955) ii. 64. The chronicle account states that those who had their lands in Novgorod confiscated were given *pomest'ya* around Moscow, but only later, in 1489, is mention made of the granting of *pomest'ya* to their Muscovite replacements in Novgorod.

<sup>26</sup> *Novgorodskie pistsovye knigi (NPK)*, 6 vols. (St Petersburg, 1859-1910), iii, col. 25.

<sup>27</sup> [M. P. Pogodin], 'Istoricheskaya sistema Khodakovskogo', *Russkii istoricheskii sbornik*, i/3 (1838), 100 n.; [idem], 'Donesenie o pervykh uspekakh puteshestviya v Rossii Zoriyana Doluga-Khodakovskogo iz Moskvyy 13-go lipta 1822', *Russkii istoricheskii sbornik*, vii (1844), 18-19, where the earliest attestations of the term *pyatina* as an administrative area of Great Novgorod are from 1490 (in the papers of the Khutynskii Monastery) and 1504 (in a state gramota), *ibid.* 18 n\*. Khodakovsky's view is supported by K. A. Nevolin, 'O pyatinakh i pogostakh novgorodskikh v XVI veke', *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva*, viii (1853), 45, whose earliest evidence for the term *pyatina* is from the *Pistsovye knigi* of the second half of the 1490s, *ibid.* 52. See also *Slovar' russkogo yazyka XI-XVII vv.* (Moscow, 1975- ), xxi, s.v. *pyatina*, where the earliest date for this sense of the word is 1500. **None of these publications cites the document under discussion here.**

1488.3. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Mikita Shenurin and Yury Shenurin and to Mikita's son Ostash, a grant in Galich.<sup>28</sup> A1, B, C, E, F, Id, K, jg.

The gramota of March 1488, like that of 27 July 1482, does not have the phrase 'в помѣстьѣ' (component H). Nor does it indicate the former holder (component G). Nonetheless, we may consider this an early *pomest'e* grant because in it the grand prince indicates that the recipients will keep the land 'as long as they serve [. . .] me and my sons' (доколь служить [. . .] мнѣ и моимъ дѣтямъ). My understanding of this stipulation is that it makes clear the grant is not for a limited duration as *kormlenie* grants are (see 1511.2.25a below, where the distinction is explicitly made). *Votchina* grants worked the same way, i.e. of undefined duration, with the *votchina* being taken away from its holder when he left grand-princely service.

Here we also have the earliest formula for a judicial grant within a *pomest'e* gramota. That is, the grand prince decrees that the *namestniki* and *volosteli* and their *tiuny* are not to sit in judgement over the people of this *pomest'e* 'except for murder and robbery with material evidence (разбой съ поличнымъ)'.<sup>29</sup> Otherwise, the *pomeshchik* 'or whoever he designates' is 'to administer and judge' (въдаеть и судить) these people. Furthermore, if there is a mixed trial (судъ смѣсной) involving people of the *pomest'e* with people of the town or *volost'*, then the grand prince's *namestniki*, *volosteli*, and their *tiuny* are to sit in judgement together with the *pomeshchik* or his representative, and they are to split the court fees. The final component of this judicial grant states that if anyone lodges a complaint against the *pomeshchik*, then the grand prince or 'a designated boyar' (бояринъ введеной) will judge the matter.

It may be of some interest that a similar formula appears in a judicial grant given on 13 February 1509, by the Dmitrov prince, Yury Ivanovich (younger brother of Vasily III) to Grigory Semenov Nelidov, as well as to his sons Gridits, Vasyuk, Ivan, and Mikhail. Similarly to the judicial grants in my sample, it states that Prince Yury's *namestniki*, *volosteli*, and their *tiuny* are not to sit in judgement over the people of the village of Klimovsk, but it also adds that these officials are not to take *korm* nor demand duties of the villagers. This

<sup>28</sup> P. I. Ivanov, 'Dela po mestnichestvu', *Russkii istoricheskii sbornik*, v (1842), 15-16. The grant itself, without the surrounding document of 1576, was also published in *Akty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Severo-Vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV-nachala XVI v. (ASEI)*, 3 vols., ed. L. V. Cherepnin (Moscow, 1964), iii. 263-4, no. 243. See also Kobrin, 'Stanovlenie' (n. 18), 152-3 and *idem*, *Vlast'* (n. 18), 93-4, where he discusses this document.

<sup>29</sup> This last phrase is translated as 'red-handed robbery' by Marc D. Zlotnik, 'Immunity Charters and the Centralization of the Muscovite State' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1976), 117.

prohibition applies to the *pravedchiki* and *dovodchiki* as well.<sup>30</sup> Otherwise the same three components of the judicial grant found in my sample are also found here and any complaints against the recipient are to be decided by Prince Yury or his designated boyar (in the place of Grand Prince Vasily or his designated boyar). The fact that the *namestniki*, *volosteli*, etc., are here prohibited from taking *korm* or demanding duties of the villagers, while there is no such stipulation in the judicial grants within *pomest'e* grants, may be significant. It strongly suggests that the *namestniki*, *volosteli*, etc., could take *korm* or demand duties from people on a *pomest'e* unless they were explicitly prohibited from doing so in the gramota. But it is still also possible that they could not take *korm* or demand duties from people on a *pomest'e* because collection of dues and exaction of duties were explicitly reserved for the *pomeshchik* unless otherwise stipulated. One could argue that those responsibilities were implied in the phrase 'в поместье', which appears in twenty-seven of my documents.

Thus the three components of the judicial grant found in my sample are: (1) recipient decides judicial cases except in specified types of cases; (2) mixed cases are decided by recipient and government officials (the *namestniki*, *volosteli*, and their *tiuny*) together; and (3) complaints against the recipient are decided by the issuer of the grant or by whomever the issuer designates. This formula corresponds closely to that of judicial grants to *votchinniki* and monasteries.

1490.10. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Vasyuk Ivanov Tyrto, a grant in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>31</sup> A1, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Id, K.

In this document, instead of the J component (the exception clause concerning collection of the prince's tax), there is a clause after the *dokhod* form of component I that specifies 'just as that *volost'* was held by Konstantin Nemyi and his son Vasily' (со всъмъ по тому, как та волостька была за Костятиномъ за Немымъ и за его сыномъ за Василемъ). The collection duties given to the recipient of this grant were thus defined by reference to that *volost'*.

<sup>30</sup> S. B. Veselovsky, ed., *Akty russkogo gosudarstva 1505–1526 gg.* (Moscow, 1975), 54, no. 51. For a similar formulation, see the *tarkhannaya gramota* in *Pamyatniki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Moskovskogo gosudarstva XIV–XVII vv.*, ed. S. B. Veselovsky and A. I. Yakovlev (Moscow, 1929), 100, no. 140.

<sup>31</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i. 7–8, no. 73; see *NPK* (n. 26), v, col. 59. Samokvasov classifies this document as a *votchina* grant despite the appearance of the phrase 'въ поместьѣ' in it.

1500.5.25. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Mikhail, Gavril, and Nekras the sons of Vasily Chelyadnin-Korotnev, a grant in the *Obonezhskaya pyatina*.<sup>32</sup> A1, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Id, J, K.

The document tells us that the father's estate is to be transferred to the two sons, but does not say how, or whether, it is to be divided up.

1502.4.13a. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich and his son Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Afanasy Ivanov Moseev, and his son Fedor, a grant in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>33</sup> A2, B, C, D, E, F, H, Id, J, K.

1502.4.13b. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich and his son Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Zakhar, Olfer, Zyk, Volodimer, and Kuz'ma Ivanov Moseev, a grant in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>34</sup> A2, B, C, D, E, F, H, Id, J, K.

Both documents grant *pomest'ya* to the sons of Ivan Moseev; the first includes the son of one of those recipients as a recipient in his own right.

1503.1.23. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich and his son Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Semen Aleksandrov Ogarev, a grant in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>35</sup> A2, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Id, J, K.

This gramota includes information about the former owner, the Rozhdestvenskii monastery. Samokvasov also published, immediately following it, another, longer version of this gramota. The short version, which I use here in my sample, was apparently the original gramota, while the long version was intended as a further elaboration. This distinction is clear from the fact that the short version begins with the standard formula: 'Се яз княз великий [. . .] пожаловал' and ends with the date the gramota was written, whereas the long version begins with the date and tells us what the grand prince's action was: 'Лѣта 7001го на десят генваря пожаловал княз великий'. The longer gramota contains, among other things, the stipulation that the recipient, Semen Ogarev, is allowed to take *obzhas* (roughly 40 acres each) for his own use and to decide the duties of the peasants as long as he does not ruin them or devastate the *pomest'e*. In fact, this longer gramota is the only evidence from a gramota (as opposed to *pistovye knigi*) that Veselovsky cites in support of his statement that the oldest *pomest'e* grants provided for the establishment of such a separate holding by the *pomeshchik*.

<sup>32</sup> A. S. Yushkov, ed., *Akty XIII–XVII vv., predstavlennye v Razryadnyi prikaz posle otmeny mestnichestva* (Moscow, 1898), 40, no. 45.

<sup>33</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i. 8, no. 75.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 7, no. 72. Cf. *NPK* (n. 26), iv, cols. 264–5.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 6, no. 70. Cf. *NPK* (n. 26), iv, cols. 278–9. El'yashevich misread the date on this document as '1493'; see El'yashevich, *Istoriya prava* (n. 11), i. 374 n. 24. The document reads 'Писанъ на Москвѣ лѣта 7001го на десят генваря въ 23 д.' On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Ogarev family, see N. A. Baskakov, *Russkie familii tyurkskogo proiskhozhdeniya*, 2 ed. (Moscow, 1993), 214–15.

1504.2.8. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich and his son Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Vasyuk Ivanov and his brothers, a grant of 56 villages in the *Bologovskii stan* of the *Velikolukskii uezd*.<sup>36</sup> A2, B, C, D, E, F, H, Id, J, K, jg.

The copy of this gramota resides in RGADA and was made in the early nineteenth century from an original supposedly in the hands of the *dvoryanin* Semen Dmitriev Morkovitin, in Tobolsk. According to the inscription on the copy, Semen claimed he inherited the document. The provenance of the extant copy and the unusual variant readings of some components raise doubts about its authenticity. The date on the document is 7002 (1494) but Vasily Ivanovich was not yet co-tsar at that time. The granting of such a large number of villages in any single document in my sample is exceptional. The document uses the phrase 'обилные дани' instead of 'обежные дани'. The document refers to 'in the Novgorodian land' rather than 'in Great Novgorod' as do all the other documents in my sample pertaining to Novgorod. Nor is there a designation of which *pyatina* the grant is in; in this way too this gramota differs from all the other documents pertaining to Novgorod.

Yet there may be legitimate explanations for each of these peculiarities. The faulty date was most likely the result of a scribe's leaving out the phrase 'на десять' after 7002 (cf. 1503.1.23 and 1504.9.20). The phrase 'обилные дани' may be a later copying error and not in the original document. The fifty-six villages were divided among Vasyuk and his brothers (we do not know how many brothers there were or how many villages each received). In addition, Velikie Luki is not in any of the *pyatiny* of Novgorod but is located just south of the *Derevskaya pyatina*. Therefore, it may not have been technically part of 'Great Novgorod' although still considered part of the 'Novgorodian land'. One can surmise that, when Ivan III restructured most of the Novgorodian land into *pyatiny* after annexation in 1472, the part with *pyatiny* was called 'Velikii Novgorod' while the non-*pyatiny* part was referred to simply as the 'Novgorodian land'. Finally, the recipient of the grant may be the same Vasyuk Ivanov who received a *pomest'e* in *Shelonskaya pyatina* in document 1490.10 of my sample. For these reasons, I am inclined to accept the authenticity of the document.

One should point out, however, that the judicial grant has an unusual feature as well. In the third component of the judicial grant, instead of stating that the grand prince or a designated boyar should decide cases of complaint lodged against the *pomeshchiki* (as in all the other judicial grants in my sample), here the local *namestniki* are to

<sup>36</sup> S. M. Kashtanov, *Iz istorii russkogo srednevekovogo istochnika. Akty X-XVI vv.* (Moscow, 1996), 131-2.

decide such cases. We find no reference to a *volostel'* as in other judicial grants for *pomeshchiki*, apparently because there was no *volost'* here. Although I have no plausible explanation for why the *namestniki* are to decide such cases, the statement that they should do so does not in itself argue against authenticity.

1504.9.20. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich and his son Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Fedka and Andrey Chern'tsov Payusov, a grant in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>37</sup> A2, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Id, J, K.

The gramota indicates that the former holder of the *pomest'e* was the recipients' father, Chernets Payusov. It tells us that the father's estate has been transferred to his two sons, but does not say how, or whether, it is to be divided up.

1505.12.20. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Boris Zakharich Borozdin and his son Feodor in *Novotorzhskii uezd*.<sup>38</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, G, H, Idp, K, jg.

The gramota is unusual in that it is the only gramota from my sample that uses the term 'с оброкомъ' instead of 'з доходомъ' for component I.1. Immediately before the *obrok* form of component I, it has the phrase 'со всъмъ, что к тъмъ деревнямъ потягло', which is apparently connected with component H ('в помъстье'). Thus it is one of two documents in my sample that uses both the *dokhod/obrok* and *potyaglo* formulas (cf. 1526.2.25).

1511.2.25a. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Kostya Semenovich Chirikov, a grant in Yaroslavl'.<sup>39</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, Ip, K, jg.

The confirmation, dated 20 September 1558, indicates this grant is for a *pomest'e*. In that confirmation, Ivan IV stipulates that one of the recipient's descendants, Tret'yak, is 'to serve' [служить] while the other of the recipient's descendants, Kostentin, is 'to feed' [кормить]. The location of this document in the genealogy list of the Chirikov family in the Heraldic office book (under fols. 998<sup>r</sup>-999<sup>r</sup>) shows that the *pomest'e* continued to be maintained within the family.

<sup>37</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i. 4-5, no. 66. Cf. *NPK* (n. 26), vi, col. 674. El'yashevich misread the date on this document as '1492'; see El'yashevich, *Istoriya prava* (n. 11), i. 374 n. 24. The document reads 'Писанъ на Москвъ льта 7000 третьяго на десяя сентября 20 д.' See also S. M. Kashtanov, *Sotsial'no-politicheskaya istoriya Rossii kontsa XV-pervoi poloviny XVI veka* (Moscow, 1967), 231, where he discusses this gramota.

<sup>38</sup> *ASEI* (n. 28), iii. 200, no. 187.

<sup>39</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 68-9, no. 81. On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Chirikov family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 117-18.

1511.2.25b. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Semen Vlas'evich Chirikov, a grant in Yaroslavl'.<sup>40</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, Ip, K, jg.

Like 1511.2.25a, the location of this document in the genealogy list of the Chirikov family in the Heraldic office book (under fols. 997<sup>v</sup>–998<sup>r</sup>) shows that it continued to be maintained within the family. The recipient of this grant may be the father of the recipient of the preceding grant.

1511.3.15. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Mityuk, Yakush, and Andryuk Ignat'ev Sushkov, a grant in Yaroslavl'.<sup>41</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, Ip, K, jg.

The location of this document in the genealogy list of Yaroslavl' *pomeshchiki* in the Heraldic office book (under fols. 751<sup>v</sup>–752<sup>r</sup>) shows that the *pomest'e* continued to be maintained within the family.

1514.3. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Vasyuk Kroma and Mikhail Afonasy Elchaninov, a grant in *Volotskii uezd*.<sup>42</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, G, Ip, K, jg.

This document tells us that the former owner of the *pomest'e* was Vasyuk and Mikhail's father, Afonasy Elchaninov. The confirmation by Ivan IV dated 15 January 1542 indicates that it is for a *pomest'e*. The location of this document in the genealogy list of the Elchaninov family in the Heraldic office book (under fol. 102<sup>r</sup>) shows that it continued to be maintained within the family.

1519.2.19. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Istom Vasil'evich Sukhotin, a grant in *Tul'skii uezd*.<sup>43</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, G, Ip, K, jg.

The gramota includes the name of the former holder, Ignatii Yakovlev Baribin. The location of this document in the genealogy list of the Sukhotin family in the Heraldic office book (under fols. 778<sup>v</sup>–779<sup>r</sup>) shows that it continued to be maintained within the same family.

1523.3.7. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Mitya Olekseev Shcherbinin, a grant in *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>44</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, G, H, Id, J, K.

Instead of the phrase 'в своей отчине' found in all other grants in my sample for Velikii Novgorod, we find here the phrase 'придал ему к старому его помѣстью'. But this may have been an accidental omission (cf. 1525.4.2).

<sup>40</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 69, no. 82.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 70, no. 83.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 77–8, no. 91.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 92–3, no. 109.

<sup>44</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i. 6, no. 69. Cf. *NPK* (n. 26), iv, col. 240.

1524.2.13. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Semen Aleksnov Volzhin, a grant in the *Kremenskii uezd*.<sup>45</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

Fifteen years later, the recipient of this grant, Semen Aleksnov (Aleksandrov) received a *pomest'e* along with his son in Novgorod Severskii (see 1539.12.3).

1524.2.29. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Prince Khozyash' Chegodaev Sakol'sky, a grant in *Muromskii uezd*.<sup>46</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, Ip, K, jg.

The recipient of the grant was most likely a Chingisid. Khozyash' is the diminutive of the name Khozyain, which, as Baskakov pointed out, is the Russian equivalent for the Tatar *xudzajin* ~ *xuža*, Turkic *godža* ~ *xodža*, and Persian *xodža*, with the various meanings 'elder, lord, rich merchant, proprietor or host, and teacher'. 'Chegodaev' derives from Chagatay, the name of Chingis Khan's second son.<sup>47</sup>

1525.4.2. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Fedka Denisev Ragozin, a grant in *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>48</sup> A3, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Id, J, K.

The gramota has the phrase 'придал ему к старому его помѣстью' preceding 'в своей отчине'. From this we might conclude that component D was accidentally left out of 1523.3.7.

1526.2.25. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Orina wife of Ignatey Andreev Narbekov and to their son Ivanets, a grant in *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>49</sup> A3, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Idp, J, K.

I quote the grant in full for two reasons: first, it will give the reader a sense of the economy of wording of these grants; and second, in a number of ways this grant is certainly one of the most interesting in my sample.

Се яз княз великїи Василен Иванович всяя Руси пожаловал есми Орину Игнатеву жену Андрѣва сына Нарбикова да сына Игнатева Иванца в своей отчинѣ в Великом Новѣгороди, в Шелонские пятини, в Высотпкомѣ погосте деревнями, что были за Ориным мужемъ, а за Иван-

<sup>45</sup> *Akty sluzhilykh zemlevaladel'tsev XV–nachala XVII veka*, comp. A. V. Antonov (Moscow, 1998), ii. 87–8, no. 81.

<sup>46</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 101, no. 119. See S. B. Veselovsky, *Onomastikon. Drevnerusskie imena, prozvizhcha i familii* (Moscow, 1974), 348.

<sup>47</sup> Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 145. The name 'Khozyain' appears once in the *Dvorovaya tetrad* of 1552–60; see V. B. Kobrin, 'Genealogiya i antroponimika (po russkim materialam XV–XVI vv.)', in: *Istoriya i genealogiya. S. B. Veselovskiy i problemy istoriko-genealogicheskikh issledovanii*, ed. N. I. Pavlenko et al. (Moscow, 1977), 87. There is a village near Murom named Chegodaevo; see Veselovsky, *Onomastikon* (n. 46), 348.

<sup>48</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i. 32, no. 119. Cf. *NPK* (n. 26), iv, col. 373.

<sup>49</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i. 23–4, no. 103. On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Narbekov family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 152–3. I would like to thank Brian Boeck, Michael Flier, Leslie McGann, and Oleksiy Tolochko, among others, for allowing me to consult with them concerning this document.



цовымъ отцом за Игнатем: деревнею Луневым, деревнею Зубовымъ, деревнею Десяцкое, деревнею Влазневим, деревнею Раи, деревнею Кривково, деревнею Корсомоевымъ, деревнею Крутець Большой, деревнею Подчерене, деревнею Чирково, деревнею Калининым в помѣстьѣ со всѣмъ, что к тѣмъ деревнямъ потягло, и за доходомъ з денежнымъ и з хлѣбнымъ и с мѣакимъ доходом, оприч моеи великого князя обежныи дани; а поидет Орина замуж, и ей в том помѣстьѣ у сына двѣа нѣт. Писана на Москвѣ лѣта 7034 Ѳевраля 25 д.

Immediately preceding the *dokhod* form of component I, this gramota has the phrase 'со всѣмъ, что к тѣмъ деревнямъ потягло', which is apparently connected with component H ('в помѣстьѣ'). Thus it is one of two documents in my sample that use both the *dokhod* and *potyaglo* formulas (cf. 1505.12.20). Another special feature of this gramota is that the *pomest'e* is apparently granted to the former holder's wife Orina and minor son Ivanets as *prozhitok* (maintenance). There is no indication that only part of the holding is to be given to Orina for her support alone; instead the entire *pomest'e* is for the support of both of them. Furthermore, the document stipulates that, if she marries, then she has no claim on the *pomest'e*, which becomes her son's holding alone. This is the only case in my sample of the wife of a *pomeshchik* being granted any or all of her husband's holding and among the earliest evidence of a grant of this type.

Recent research has focused on women receiving *pomest'e* for their maintenance in the second half of the sixteenth century.<sup>50</sup> But we also have earlier examples. Gnevushev provides evidence of a case of *prozhitok* from the period 1495–1505. Ofim'ya, the wife of Ivan Kosagovsky, received seven *obzhas* (about 280 acres) with a total of six households for her maintenance in the *Uzhin'skii pogost* of the *Derevskaya pyatina*.<sup>51</sup> In the Novgorod *pistsovyie knigi* we find another early case of *prozhitok*, dating from the late 1490s. Okulina Stepanovskaya, the wife of Semichev, received, along with her children, Fedka and Danilka, *pomest'e* holdings both in the *Lazarevskii stan* of the *Kholm'skii pogost* of the *Derevskaya pyatina* and in the

<sup>50</sup> See Janet Martin, 'Widows, Welfare, and the *Pomest'e* System in the Sixteenth Century', in *Kamen' Kraug' l'n'*: *Rhetoric of the Medieval Slavic World. Essays Presented to Edward L. Keenan on His Sixtieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students*, ed. Nancy Shields Kollmann, Donald Ostrowski, Andrei Pliguzov, and Daniel Rowland (Harvard Ukrainian Studies, xix) (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), 337, on evidence in the Novgorodian *pistsovyie knigi* in the 1550s of grants to 18 women (15 widows [6 with minor sons], 1 mother from her son, 1 from her mother, and 1 unknown). See also Sandra Levy, 'Women and the Control of Property in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy', *Russian History*, x (1983), 201–12, on evidence from *Dopolneniia k aktam istoricheskim (DAI)*, 12 vols. (St Petersburg, 1846–72), vol. 1; and Ann M. Kleimola, "'In Accordance with the Canons of the Holy Apostles': Muscovite Dowries and Women's Property Rights', *Russian Review*, li (1992), 216, on evidence from the Ryazan' *pistsovyie knigi* of the 1590s.

<sup>51</sup> A. M. Gnevushev, *Ocherki ekonomicheskoi i sotsial'noi zhizni sel'skogo naseleniia Novgorodskoi oblasti posle prisoiedineniia Novgoroda k Moskve* (Kiev, 1915), Prilozhenie 1, p. 18.

*Kolomenskii pogost* of the *Shelonskaya pyatina*,<sup>52</sup> and the wife of Nikita Baskakov had a *pomest'e* in *Kolomenskii uезд* (see 1546.4.1 below). These cases would seem to refute Pushkareva's claim that 'in the early sixteenth century, women were barred from holding' *pomest'e*.<sup>53</sup>

1530.1.27. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich to Fedka and Ivashka Savlukov Bolotnikov, and to Fedka's son Lobanets, a grant in the *Vyazemskii uезд*.<sup>54</sup> A3, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

1533.8. From Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich (extended title) to Mikhail Il'ich Ginevl', a grant in *Kostromskii uезд*.<sup>55</sup> A4, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

This is the only gramota in my sample to contain the extended form of Vasily Ivanovich's title.

1539.7.18. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Ivan Vasil'ev Ievley, and to his sons Mikhail and Senka, a grant in *Tul'skii uезд*.<sup>56</sup> A5, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

1539.12.3. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Semen Aleksandrov Volzhin, with his son Andros, a grant in Novgorod Severskii.<sup>57</sup> A1, B, C, E, F, G, H, Ip, J, K, jg.

Fifteen years earlier, Semen Aleksandrov received a *pomest'e* in *Kremenskii uезд* (cf. 1524.2.13).

1544.9.5. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Ivan, Peshek, and Ivan, sons of Ivan Matyushkin, a grant in the *Yaroslavskii uезд*.<sup>58</sup> A1, B, C, E, F, G, H, K, jg.

1545.5.25. From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Mikhail Vasil'evich Verkhderevsky, a grant in the *Ryazanskii uезд*.<sup>59</sup> A1, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

<sup>52</sup> *NPk* (n. 26), ii, col. 861 and iv, col. 140. See also Veselovsky, *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie* (n. 12), 307–8.

<sup>53</sup> Natalia Pushkareva, *Women in Russian History: From the Tenth to the Twentieth Century*, trans. and ed. Eve Levin (Armonk, NY, 1997), 107.

<sup>54</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 112, no. 129. On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Sablukov family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 71–2. Loban Fedorov Savlukov Bolotnikov is mentioned as being a *dvorovyi syn boyarskii* from Vyaz'ma in the *Dvorovaya tetrad'*; see *Tsyachnaya kniga 1550 g. i Dvorovaya tetrad' 50-kh godov XVI v. (TKiDT)*, ed. A. A. Zimin (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), 190, and Veselovsky, *Onomastikon* (n. 46), 182.

<sup>55</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 114–15, no. 132. See also Veselovsky, *Onomastikon* (n. 46), 78 for Ginevl'.

<sup>56</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 117–18, no. 136. On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Ievlev family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 205. An Ivan Ievley is mentioned as a *streletskii solnik* in 1543; see *TKiDT* (n. 54), 216.

<sup>57</sup> *Akty sluzhilykh zemlevladel'tsev* (n. 45), 89, no. 83.

<sup>58</sup> *DAI* (n. 50) i. 38, no. 36. On the early Turco-Tatar origins of the Matyushkin family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 12, 14.

<sup>59</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 124–5, no. 145. The recipient is mentioned in the *Dvorovaya tetrad'* of the 1550s; see *TKiDT* (n. 54), 166.

**1546.1.12.** From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Grisha Ivanov Zhedrinsky, a grant in the *Nizhegorodskii uezd*.<sup>60</sup> A1, B, C, E, F, G, H, Ip, K, jg.

**1546.4.1.** From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Vasily Funikov Kurtsov, grants in the *Moskovskii*, *Kolomenskii*, and *Tul'skii uезды*.<sup>61</sup> A1 B, C, E, F, G, H, Ip, K, jg.

The settlement granted in this document in the *Kolomenskii uезд* is stated to have previously been for the maintenance of Nikita Baskakov's wife.

**1547.1.17.** From Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Ivan Ivanov Fomin, a grant in the *Ryazanskii uезд*.<sup>62</sup> A1, B, C, E, F, G, Ip, K, jg.

Although this gramota does not have the phrase 'в поместье', it uses the form 'поместьемъ' twice, in one case to indicate that the previous holder of the estate was the recipient's nephew Andrei Murzin.

**1547.3.20a.** From Great Tsar and Sovereign (государь) and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Petrusha Ivanov Bukovsky, and his nephews, Grishka Matfeev and Mitya Ivanov and Ivan Borisov, a grant in the *Ryazanskii uезд*.<sup>63</sup> A5, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

**1547.3.20b.** From Great Tsar and Sovereign (государь) and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Gavril Fedorov Vorupaev, grants in the *Ryazanskii uезд*.<sup>64</sup> A5, B, C, E, F, G, H, Ip, K, jg.

In both gramotas for 20 March 1547 the variant of component A: 'Се яз, великий царь и государь и великий князь [. . .]' is used.

<sup>60</sup> *Akty, otnosyashchiesya do yuridicheskogo byta drevnei Rossii*, 4 vols., ed. N. Kalachov (St Petersburg, 1857–1901), i, cols. 139–40, no. 44. Translated into English in *A Source Book of Russian History: From Early Times to 1917*, 2 vols., ed. George Vernadsky, Ralph T. Fisher, Jr., Alan D. Ferguson, Andrew Lossky, comp. Sergei Pushkarev (New Haven, 1972), i, 162.

<sup>61</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 130–1, no. 151. See also Veselovsky, *Onomastikon* (n. 46), 335. The recipient may have been the cousin of Nikita and Konstantin Funikov Kurtsov, mentioned in the *Dvorovaya tetrad'* of the 1550s; see *TKiDT* (n. 54), 126 (Nikita), 115, 126, 141 (Konstantin). On the Kurtsov clan in the sixteenth century, see S. B. Veselovsky, *Issledovaniya po istorii Oprichniny* (Moscow, 1963), 404–5.

<sup>62</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 132–3, no. 154. See also *Pistsovye knigi Ryazanskogo kraia. XVI vek*, ed. V. N. Storozhev (Ryazan', 1898), 213, which indicates that the village of Zhelezniitsa and the settlement of Motovilovo, mentioned in the grant, were still in the hands of a member of the Fomin family in the 1590s as *pomest'e*.

<sup>63</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 134, no. 156. See also *Pistsovye knigi Ryazanskogo kraia* (n. 62), 170, 174, which indicates that the hamlet of Bukov, mentioned in the grant, was still a *pomest'e* in the hands of a member of the Bukovsky family in the 1590s.

<sup>64</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 135, no. 157. See also *Pistsovye knigi Ryazanskogo kraia* (n. 62), 28, which indicates that the hamlet of Okulinsk, mentioned in the grant, was a *pomest'e* in the hands of Semen Gavrilov Vorupaev, presumably the son of Gavril Fedorov, in the 1590s.

**1547.6.7.** From Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Mikhail and Duvan, sons of Semen Timiryazev, grants in the *Kashirskii uезд*.<sup>65</sup> A6, B, C, E, F, G, H, Ip, K, jg.

Component A assumes in *pomest'e* grants hereafter in my sample the simpler form: 'Се язъ, царь и великий князь [. . .]'.

**1547.11.25.** From Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Ivan and Andrey Vasil'ev Rakhmaninov, grants in the *Dmitrovskii uезд*.<sup>66</sup> A6, B, C, E, F, H, Ip, K, jg.

**1549.7.18.** From Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Bogdan Tretyakov Rzhanikov, a grant in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*.<sup>67</sup> A6, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, Id, J, K.

This gramota is similar to earlier *pomest'e* grants for the Novgorod *pyatiny*. For example, it has component D (в своей отчине) and its form of component I is the earlier: 'со всеъмъ доходом з денежнымъ и з хлѣбнымъ и с мѣлкимъ доходом' (last seen in my sample in 1526.2.25). It also has the component J phrase following that in the form 'оприч царевы и великого князя обежные дани' (last seen in my sample also in 1526.2.25).

**1553.10.8.** From Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Brekh and Ivan Konstantinov Sadykov, grants in the *Zubtsovskii uезд*.<sup>68</sup> A6, B, C, E, F, G, H, K, jg.

The gramota indicates that it is the result of a petition ('били намъ челомъ') and goes into some detail about the circumstances of its being granted.

**1554.7.29.** From Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich to Afanasii Stepanov Sazonov, a grant in the *Tul'skii uезд*.<sup>69</sup> A6, B, C, E, F, G, H, K, jg.

Like 1553.11.8, this gramota indicates that it is the result of a petition ('били намъ челомъ') and goes into some detail about the circumstances of its being granted, that is the death of the recipient's father who held the *pomest'e* before.

As we might expect, wherever we find component A in these

<sup>65</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 135–6, no. 158. On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Timiryazev family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 214–15.

<sup>66</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 136–8, no. 159. On the Turco-Tatar origins of the Rakhmaninov family, see Baskakov, *Russkie familii* (n. 35), 169–70, and Veselovsky, *Onomastikon* (n. 46), 267. Andrey Vasil'ev Rakhmaninov is mentioned in both the *Tsyvachnaya kniga* of 1550 and the *Dvorovaya tetrad'* of the 1550s; see *TKiDT* (n. 54), 77, 185.

<sup>67</sup> Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material* (n. 24), i, 34, no. 123. See also *NPK* (n. 26), iv, col. 559.

<sup>68</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 144–5, no. 168. Both recipients are mentioned in the *Dvorovaya tetrad'*; see *TKiDT* (n. 54), 182.

<sup>69</sup> Yushkov, *Akty* (n. 32), 148–50, no. 173. Another Sazonov, Timofey Vasil'ev, is mentioned in the *Dvorovaya tetrad'* as being from Tula; see *TKiDT* (n. 54), 165.

documents we also find component B. Every gramota in the sample names a recipient or recipients (component C). Only documents associated with Novgorod, specifically *Obonezhskaya*, *Shelonskaya*, and *Vodskaya pyatiny*, include component D, the phrase 'в своей отчинь', with the exception of 1523.3.7. Its absence there is most likely the result of a scribal omission. Of the eleven documents granting *pomest'e* in the Novgorod *pyatiny*, nine are for estates in the *Shelonskaya pyatina*, one for an estate in the *Obonezhskaya pyatina*, and one for estates in both the *Shelonskaya* and *Vodskaya pyatiny* (see Table 2). Of the nine earliest documents in my sample, seven are estates in *pyatiny* of Velikii Novgorod. This predominance would seem to be the result of the confiscation of Novgorodian church and monastic lands by Ivan III and his transfer of Novgorodian landowners to areas around Moscow.<sup>70</sup> In exchange, he sent his own military servitors as *pomeshchiki* to serve on those estates. Some indication of the rapidity with which all this happened is given by Klyuchevsky, who tells us that by 1500 in the Ladoga and Orekhov districts alone of the *Vodskaya pyatina*, 106 *pomeshchiki* were settled.<sup>71</sup> In addition, Veselovsky estimated that 2,000 individuals had become *pomeshchiki* in the Novgorod lands by the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>72</sup> Of the twenty-five documents in my sample granting estates in areas other than Novgorodian *pyatiny*, most were granted in what were then frontier areas, including the *uezdy* of Kashira (1), Kostroma (1), Kremen' (1), Murom (1), Nizhegorod (1), Novgorod Severskii (1), Ryazan' (4), Tula (4), and Velikie Luki (1).

I first arranged the documents of my sample in chronological order to determine whether there were any discernible changes over time. My sample does seem to align itself into a possible chronological break between 1526 and 1530 for at least three reasons. First, ten of the twenty documents (50%) from the period 1482 to 1526 grant lands in the Novgorod *pyatiny*, whereas only one of the sixteen documents (6.2%) from the period 1530 to 1554 is for a grant in a Novgorod *pyatina* (see Table 3). We know from the *pistovye knigi* that *pomest'e* matters remained active in Novgorod *pyatiny* throughout the rest of the sixteenth century, but more *pomest'ya* were granted in other regions as Muscovy expanded its control into frontier areas.

Second, fourteen of the twenty documents (70%) from the period

<sup>70</sup> For an alphabetical list of those Novgorodian holders who had their land confiscated, see Gnevushev, *Ocherki* (n. 50), Prilozhenie 3, pp. 300-37. According to Timoshenkova, Gnevushev's list is incomplete because the *pistovye knigi* for some areas were not available to him; see Z. A. Timoshenkova, 'Raspredelenie zemlevladieniya do konfiskatsii Ivana III', in: *Agramaya istoriya Severo-Zapada Rossii. Vtoraya polovina XV-nachala XVI v.*, ed. A. L. Shapiro (Leningrad, 1971), 329-30.

<sup>71</sup> Klyuchevsky, *Kurs russkoi istorii* (n. 1), ii, 235.

<sup>72</sup> Veselovsky, *Feodal'noe zemleladenie* (n. 12), 200.

TABLE 2. Pomest'e grants by pyatina and other (some grants are for more than one pyatina or uezd)

<i>Pyatina</i>	Other	
Vodskaya 1482.2.27	Galich 1488.3	Zubotskii 1553.10.8
Shelonskaya 1482.2.27 1490.10 1502.4.13a 1502.4.13b 1503.1.23 1504.9.20 1523.3.7 1525.4.2 1526.2.25 1549.7.18	Kashirskii 1547.6.7	Dmitrovskii 1547.11.25
Obonezhskaya 1500.5.25	Ryazanskii 1545.5.25 1547.1.17 1547.3.20a 1547.3.20b	Yaroslavskii 1511.2.25a 1511.2.25b 1511.3.15 1544.9.5
	Moskovskii 1546.4.1	Kolomenskii 1546.4.1
	Volotskii 1514.3	Muromskii 1524.2.29
	Velikolukskii 1504.2.8	Novgorod-Severskii 1539.12.3
		Kostromskii 1533.8
		Novotorzhskii 1505.12.20
		Kremenskii 1524.2.1
		Nizhegorodskii 1546.1.12
		Tul'skii 1519.2.19 1539.7.18 1546.4.1 1554.7.29
		Vyazemskii 1530.1.27

TABLE 3. Variables according to chronological period

	1482-1526	1530-1554	Total
In Novgorod <i>pyatiny</i>	10/20 (50.0%)	1/16 (6.7%)	11/36 (30.5%)
income ( <i>dokhod</i> ) collection	14/20 (70.0%)	1/16 (6.2%)	15/36 (41.7%)
tax ( <i>potyaglo</i> ) collection	9/20 (45.0%)	12/16 (75.0%)	21/36 (58.3%)
judicial grants	10/20 (50.0%)	15/16 (93.8%)	25/36 (69.4%)

1482 to 1526 have the *з доходомъ/с оброкомъ* formulation for the *pomeshchik's* collection of revenue, whereas again only one of the sixteen documents (6.2%) from the period 1530 to 1554 uses this formulation. Of the fifteen documents that do not use the *dokhod* or *obrok* form during the post-1530 period, twelve refer to the *pomeshchik's* collection duties as *potyaglo* (tax) collection. Two documents in my sample use both formulations, and three use neither. In those fifteen cases where the *з доходомъ/с оброкомъ* formulation is found, twelve also include component J, the exclusion of the grand-princely tax (*дань*) from the collection duties of the *pomeshchik*. This grand-princely tax most likely was collected by the *namestniki*, *volosteli*, and their *tiuny*.

Third, ten of the twenty documents (50%) from the period 1482 to 1526 have judicial grants, whereas fifteen of the sixteen documents (93.8%) from the period 1530 to 1554 have such grants. How do we account for this difference? Bazilevich has identified the elimination of immunities as one of the five criteria of the centralizing state.<sup>73</sup> The general line of the historiography has been that the grant of 'immunity' charters to *votchinniki* that allow them to adjudicate crimes other than murder and robbery is a form of limitation on them by the centralizing state. The assumption is that, before the granting of such an immunity charter, the *votchinnik* also judged murder and robbery cases. Thus, the 'immunity' charter took away the previous right of the *votchinnik* to judge such cases on his own lands, and placed such cases under the jurisdiction of the state.<sup>74</sup> Zlotnik tells us that his

<sup>73</sup> K. Bazilevich, 'Opyt periodizatsii istorii SSSR feodal'nogo perioda', *Voprosy istorii*, 1949, no. 11, p. 71 (the other four are: the replacement of local laws by a standard general law system; abolishing vassal relationships; a unified military that carried out the foreign and domestic policy of the state; and a centralized administrative apparatus).

<sup>74</sup> See Richard Hellie, *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy* (Chicago, 1971), 89-91; Zlotnik, 'Immunity Charters' (n. 29), 113-42; Veselovsky, *Feodal'noe zemlevladenie* (n. 12), 122-3.

investigation of judicial immunities 'reveals a very clear policy of continually restricting privileges' by the state.<sup>75</sup> Kashtanov dates to the first third of the sixteenth century a standardization of judicial immunities.<sup>76</sup> This may be so for *votchinniki* and monasteries, but I found no evidence of a change in privileges in regard to the type of judicial immunities that *pomeshchiki* received between 1488 and 1554.

Zlotnik divided the 625 judicial immunities that he studied into four types:

- (Full) 'a full grant to try every type of case', which accounted for 11.5% (72/625) of his sample.
- (B) the recipient was not allowed to try murder cases, which accounted for 32.5% (203/625) of his sample.
- (C) the recipient was not allowed to try either murder or robbery with material evidence (*разбоя съ поличнымъ*), which accounted for 42.1% (263/625) of his sample.
- (D) the recipient was not allowed to try cases that involved murder, robbery, or theft with material evidence (*разбоя и татьбы съ поличнымъ*), which accounted for 13.9% (87/625) of his sample.<sup>77</sup>

According to Zlotnik, during the 1490s (1492-1500), an apparent reconsideration of judicial immunities was being made since very few were issued. After that, most judicial immunities were type C.<sup>78</sup> From 1489 to 1561, covering most of the period of my sample, 242 of 337 (71.8%) of judicial immunities were type C. In my sample, all (100%) of the judicial immunities are type C of Zlotnik's typology. Zlotnik also found that 82% of his sample (about 513/625) contained provisions for a mixed court if the crime involved people or property across juridical boundaries.<sup>79</sup> In my sample, this stipulation appears in all of the judicial grants (100%).

Strong as this chronological correlation is, the regional correlation is even stronger for these variables. If we separate the grants for Novgorodian *pyatiny* from the grants for other areas (see Tables 4 and 5), we obtain some rather remarkable results. All eleven documents for the Novgorod *pyatiny* have some form of the *dokhod/obrok* (income) collection formulation. Of the twenty-five other documents, twenty (80%) have some form of the *potyaglo* (tax) collection formulation. None of the eleven documents for Novgorodian *pyatiny* contains a judicial grant, whereas all twenty-five of the other documents have

<sup>75</sup> Zlotnik, 'Immunity Charters' (n. 29), 122.

<sup>76</sup> Kashtanov, *Sotsial'no-politicheskaya istoriya* (n. 37), 243.

<sup>77</sup> Zlotnik, 'Immunity Charters' (n. 29), 116-17. Zlotnik has no category of 'Type A' judicial immunities, and one assumes that 'Full' is the same as what type A would have been.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 127-8.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

TABLE 4. Variables according to region

	Novgorod <i>pyatiny</i>	Other
income ( <i>dokhod</i> ) collection	11/11 (100%)	3/25 (12%)
tax ( <i>potyaglo</i> ) collection	1/11 (9.1%)	20/25 (80%)
judicial grants	0/11 (0%)	25/25 (100%)

judicial grants. Essentially, then, we have two types of *pomest'e* grants. One type, for the Novgorodian *pyatiny*, uses the *dokhod/obrok* form to indicate income collection and does not have a judicial grant. The other type, for areas outside Velikii Novgorod, tends to use the *potyaglo* form to indicate tax collection and has a judicial grant. Although more evidence from a wider sample of documents may alter these preliminary findings, nonetheless, they are unexpected, surprising, and not explained or even discussed in the secondary literature.

Since the future *pomeshchiki* began with a different relationship towards their holdings from that of *votchinniki* in terms of judicial responsibilities—that is, they did not have any before the grant—the judicial grants given to *pomeshchiki* must have had a significance different from those given to *votchinniki*. If one argues, as those who hold the standard view do, that the judicial grants to *votchinniki* took away from them the right to decide murder and robbery cases, which they previously had, and that this represents the expansion of the centralizing state, then what did it mean for a military servitor, who did not have any judicial responsibilities to begin with, to be given the right as a *pomeshchik* to decide cases other than murder and robbery? In one sense, this apparently uniform treatment of *votchinniki* and *pomeshchiki* may be evidence in support of Kobrin's claim for the similarity of *pomest'e* and *votchina* in the first half of the sixteenth century. Additionally, one might argue that the state was not giving up any centralizing authority but merely shifting the responsibility from one set of state servitors (*namestniki*, *volosteli*, and their *tiuny*) to another set (*pomeshchiki*). Yet even so, giving judicial responsibilities to *pomeshchiki* in areas outside Velikii Novgorod on a regular basis along with tax-collecting responsibilities on their estates would seem to indicate a more involved relationship on the part of these *pomeshchiki* towards their estate allotments than merely 'feeding' off them.

But why is there such a sharp contrast in my sample between Velikii Novgorod and other areas under Muscovite jurisdiction in terms of income/tax collection and judicial grants? My working

TABLE 5. Pomest'e Grants 1482-1554

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	ig
<i>Pyatiny</i>												
1482.7.27	1	x	x	x	VSP	x			d	x	x	
1490.10	1	x	x	x	SP	x	x	x	d		x	
1500.5.25	1	x	x	x	OP	x	x	x	d	x	x	
1502.4.13a	2	x	x	x	SP	x		x	d	x	x	
1502.4.13b	2	x	x	x	SP	x		x	d	x	x	
1503.1.23	2	x	x	x	SP	x	x	x	d	x	x	
1504.9.20	2	x	x	x	SP	x	x	x	d	x	x	
1523.3.7	3	x	x		SP	x	x	x	d	x	x	
1525.4.2	3	x	x	x	SP	x	x	x	d	x	x	
1526.2.25	3	x	x	x	SP	x	x	x	dp	x	x	
1549.7.18	5	x	x	x	SP	x	x	x	d	x	x	
<i>Other</i>												
1488.3	1	x	x		G	x			d		x	x
1504.2.8	2	x	x	x	VIU	x		x	d	x	x	x
1505.12.20	3	x	x		NtU	x	x	x	dp		x	x
1511.2.25a	3	x	x		YaU	x			p		x	x
1511.2.25b	3	x	x		YaU	x			p		x	x
1511.3.15	3	x	x		YaU	x			p		x	x
1514.3	3	x	x		VoU	x	x		p		x	x
1519.2.19	3	x	x		TU	x	x		p		x	x
1524.2.13	3	x	x		KrU	x		x	p		x	x
1524.2.29	3	x	x		MU	x			p		x	x
1530.1.27	3	x	x		VU	x		x	p		x	x
1533.8	4	x	x		KoU	x		x	p		x	x
1539.7.18	1	x	x		TU	x		x	p		x	x
1539.12.3	1	x	x		NS	x	x	x	p	x	x	x
1544.9.5	1	x	x		YaU	x	x	x			x	x
1545.5.25	1	x	x		RU	x		x	p		x	x
1546.1.12	1	x	x		NU	x	x	x	p		x	x
1546.4.1	1	x	x		MKT	x	x	x	p		x	x
1547.1.17	1	x	x		RU	x	x		p		x	x
1547.3.20a	5	x	x		RU	x		x	p		x	x
1547.3.20b	5	x	x		RU	x	x	x	p		x	x
1547.6.7	6	x	x		KaU	x	x	x	p		x	x
1547.11.25	6	x	x		DU	x		x	p		x	x
1553.10.8	6	x	x		ZU	x	x	x			x	x
1554.7.29	6	x	x		TU	x	x	x			x	x

Key: DU = Dmitrovskii uезд; G = Galich; KaU = Kashirskii uезд; KoU = Kostromskii uезд; KrU = Kremenskii uезд; MKT = Moskovskii, Kolomenskii, and Tul'skii uезды; MU = Muromskii uезд; NS = Novgorod Severskii; NtU = Novotorzhskii uезд; NU = Nizhegorodskii uезд; OP = Obonezhskaya pyatina; RU = Ryazanskii uезд; SP = Shelonskaya pyatina; TU = Tul'skii uезд; VIU = Velikokulskii uезд; VoU = Volotskii uезд; VSP = Vodskaya and Shelonskaya pyatiny; VyU = Vyazemskii uезд; YaU = Yaroslavskii uезд; ZU = Zubotskii uезд; d = *dokhod*; p = *potyaglo*; ig = judicial grant.

hypothesis is that the difference may relate to the ease or difficulty in maintaining the presence of chancery agents—*namestniki*, *volosteli*, and their *tiuny*. In the Novgorodian *pyatiny*, it may have been easier to maintain chancery agents than in other frontier areas recently acquired by Muscovy. Thus in Velikii Novgorod, which the grand prince calls his 'otchina', chancery agents continued to collect taxes and preside over all judicial cases. In the other areas, the *pomeshchik*, in addition to supporting himself, also performed the duties of chancery agents, except for presiding over murder and robbery cases. One might also point out the rational nature of this division of judicial responsibilities. The more serious court cases were decided by those who presumably would have some experience in similar cases. The *pomeshchiki* and *votchinniki*, who would not be expected to have such experience, decided cases that were less serious (from the point of view of punishment of the culprit and the potential threat to society).

*Pomeshchiki* in the Novgorodian *pyatiny* would be expected to support themselves on the basis of the *dokhod* that they collected and from the separate holding within their estate. *Pomeshchiki* in the areas outside Velikii Novgorod would pass the *potyaglo* on to local officials and have their livelihood, arms, etc., supplied by the central *oklad*. This may have had something to do with the relative ease of obtaining weapons and accoutrements around Novgorod, so that the *pomeshchiki* there were responsible for supplying themselves, whereas in other frontier areas the *pomeshchiki* had to be supplied by the crown. More research is needed to test this hypothesis. One immediate problem with it is that it does not explain judicial grants and tax collection responsibilities given to *pomeshchiki* in non-frontier areas, like the *Moskovskii* or *Yaroslavskii uездy*.

Statistical studies of *pomest'e* transfers have already brought into question the issue of conditionality and inheritance. Rozhkov, using the evidence of the *pistsovye knigi*, found that, between 1500 and 1545 in the Tverskii half of the *Bezhet'skaya pyatina*, 63.7% of the *pomest'e* estates that changed hands were granted to sons or other relatives of the previous holder.<sup>80</sup> Maslennikova found a similar percentage (55.8%) of direct inheritance (48/86) in the *Porkhovskii uезд* of the *Shelonskaya pyatina* between 1498 and 1539.<sup>81</sup> Alekseev and Kopanev state that 38.7% (14/36) of the *pomest'ya* in the *Novgorodskii uезд* belonged to the children of old *pomeshchiki* in 1540, while 60% (18/25) of the *pomest'a* in *Ladozhskii uезд* belonged to the children of old

*pomeshchiki* in that year.<sup>82</sup> Hammond found that, between 1500 and 1540, 56.25% of the *pomest'e* holdings in *Shelonskaya pyatina* and 69% of the *pomest'e* holdings in *Vodskaya pyatina* remained with members of the same family.<sup>83</sup> Hammond goes on to point out that, in most of these cases where the *pomest'e* did not remain in the family, it was because the original holder did not have any male descendants serving by 1540. In addition, Degtyarev found that in the *uezdy* he studied for the second half of the sixteenth century the rates of inheritance by sons or other relatives were approximately the same for *pomest'ya* as for *votchiny*.<sup>84</sup>

Only six documents (1500.5.25; 1504.9.20; 1514.3; 1526.2.25; 1553.10.8; and 1554.7.29) in my sample indicate that the former holder of the estate was the father of the current recipient. In one case the former holder was the nephew of the recipient (1547.1.17). An additional six documents (1488.3; 1502.4.13a; 1505.12.20; 1530.1.27; 1539.7.10; and 1529.12.3) include at least one son as a recipient in the grant. If we assume that the son in those cases subsequently took over the estate on the death of his father, then that brings to 36.1% (13/36) the examples of direct in-family inheritance in my sample. Finally, external evidence tells us that in the case of seven additional grants (1511.2.25a; 1511.2.25b; 1511.3.15; 1514.3; 1519.2.19; 1547.3.20a; and 1547.3.20b) the *pomest'e* subsequently remained in the family of the recipient. The total for all these documents is thus 55.6% (20/36), a percentage comparable to the percentages that other investigators found in their samples for in-family inheritance in the first half of the sixteenth century. These percentages indicate that *pomest'e* estates, like *votchina* estates, tended to remain in the family of the original recipient when there was a male heir. Therefore the assertion that sixteenth-century *pomeshchiki* did not improve their estates because their sons could not inherit them seems to lack any basis in the evidence.

At this point, despite the relatively small number of documents, at least five general conclusions suggest themselves. First, we must re-evaluate the traditional definitions of *pomest'e* as conditional landholding in contrast to *votchina* as hereditary landholding. The evidence indicates that *pomest'e* was inheritable from the beginning, and in

<sup>82</sup> Yu. G. Alekseev and A. I. Kopanev, 'Razvitie pomestnoi sistemy v XVI v.', in: *Dvoryanstvo i krepostnoi stroi Rossii XVI-XVIII vv. Sbornik statei, posvyashchennyyi pamyati Alekseya Andreevicha Novosel'skogo*, ed. N. I. Pavlenko, I. A. Bulygin, E. I. Indova, A. A. Preobrazhensky, and S. M. Troitsky (Moscow, 1975), 59 n. 6.

<sup>83</sup> Vincent Hammond, *The History of the Novgorodian Pomest'e: 1480-1550* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1987), 319.

<sup>84</sup> A. Ya. Degtyarev, 'O mobilizatsii pomestnykh zemel' v XVI v.', in: *Iz istorii feodalnoi Rossii. Stat'i i ocherki k 70-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya prof. V. V. Mavrodina*, ed. A. Ya. Degtyarev, V. A. Ezlov, V. A. Petrov, I. Ya. Froyanov, and A. L. Shapiro (Leningrad, 1978), 85-9.

<sup>80</sup> Rozhkov, *Sel'skoe khozyaistvo* (n. 5), p. 448.

<sup>81</sup> N. N. Maslennikova, 'Pomeshchiki i krest'yane Porkhovskogo uезда Shelonskoi pyatiny k 40-m godam XVI v.', in: *Issledovaniya po sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii Rossii*, ed. N. E. Nosov, S. N. Valk, D. S. Likhachev, V. M. Paneyakh, and A. A. Furenko (Leningrad, 1971), 121.

this respect it was similar to *votchina*. In addition, *votchina*, as we know from other sources, was taken from the holder if he left the service of the ruler, and in this respect *pomest'e* and *votchina* were also alike from the beginning.

Second, we find no service requirements specified in any of these grants. The only two mentions of service in my sample (i.e., 1488.3 and 1511.2.25a) are meant to distinguish the grant from *kormlenie* grants, which were for a specified period of time. Nor is there any indication that these grants were conditional in any way. Presumably, in those cases where there was no son, the land reverted to the grand prince when the recipient died, but even that stipulation is not indicated in these grants.

Third, 25% of the families receiving *pomest'e* (8/32) in my sample involve *pomeshchik* families of recent Turco-Tatar origin (1503.1.23; 1511.2.25[a+b]; 1524.2.29; 1526.2.25; 1530.1.27; 1539.7.18; 1547.6.7; and 1547.11.25). This percentage is higher than the 17% of gentry families that Zogoskin estimated to be of Tatar and 'other eastern' origin by the end of the seventeenth century, and would seem to lend support to the hypothesis that *pomest'e* was, among other things, a means of accommodating the influx of Tatars into Muscovite service.<sup>85</sup> But their distribution, two in non-frontier areas, three on the western frontier, and three on frontiers (southern and eastern) that bordered Tatar lands, does not support the hypothesis that there was a policy of placing Tatar emigrés on borders away from Tatar-held areas.

Fourth, we have to reassess how we describe the *pomest'e* system in the first half of the sixteenth century, specifically as regards the *pomeshchik's* involvement with the administration of his *pomest'e*. Since *pomeshchiki* lived on their estates (I found no evidence that they were absentee landlords during this time), and since it is clear that from the beginning of the system their holdings were regularly passed on to their sons and/or widows, there was sufficient reason for them to improve their estates. To be sure, *pomeshchiki* exploited their peasants, but this exploitation was probably not worse than other types of landholding<sup>86</sup> and certainly not a particular factor in the functioning of the Oprichnina or the establishment of serfdom.

Finally, we should be careful about extrapolating general conclusions for all areas under Muscovite control from evidence about only one area. In particular, these documents show that, at least in terms of *pomest'e* grants and administration, the Velikii Novgorod region had a different status from other regions under Muscovite administration.

<sup>85</sup> See Donald Ostrowski, *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304-1589* (Cambridge, 1998), 56 and n. 94.

<sup>86</sup> Both Skrynnikov and Zimin concluded that exploitation of peasants on *pomest'e* lands in the sixteenth century was about the same as that on *votchina* lands; see R. G. Skrynnikov, 'Ekonomicheskoe razvitie novgorodskogo pomest'ya v kontse XV i pervoi polovine XVI v.', *Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta imeni A. I. Gertsena*, cl (1957), 24; A. A. Zimin, 'O politicheskikh predposylkakh vozniknoveniya russkogo absolyutizma', in: *Absolyutizm v Rossii (XVII-XVIII vv.)*, ed. N. M. Druzhinin, N. I. Pavlenko, and L. V. Cherepnin (Moscow, 1964), 22-3.