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S. M. Kashtanov with A. A. Zimin and S. Permitina (top left) and L. Ivina (bottom right) (1954)
The article (see the beginning in Quaestio Rossica, 2014, no. 3) is devoted to the scholarly work of an outstanding Russian historian, a corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Sergey Mihajlovich Kashtanov. Without exaggeration, he can be considered an authority of Soviet and Russian academic historical thought. The list of his professional interests alone is impressive as it ranges from the study of sources and archaeography to historiography and the history of state institutions as well as from diplomatics to historical demographics and geography. Sergey Kashtanov is a medievalist, whose research focuses on medieval Russia which he studies by referring to the historical context of European countries between the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period. As a result, Kashtanov's contribution to comparative medieval history is significant. Additionally, Kashtanov's works on diplomatics are recognized worldwide because he puts forward original methods of analysis for medieval acts. As a scholar, Sergey Kashtanov may be characterized both as a theoretician and practitioner as well as a researcher of feudal property. He proposed a number of new methods of analysis in paleography, filigree studies, and codicology, and, finally, he is an observant and witty historiographer. Being a follower of A. A. Zimin and S. O. Schmidt, S. M. Kashtanov is a rare representative of Russia's high academic tradition of humanities dating back to the prerevolutionary era. This unique atmosphere which is, sadly, becoming nonexistent, is permanently present in the life and work of the main character of the article.
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ния посвящены средневековой Руси, которую он исследует, обращаясь к историческому контексту европейских стран Средневековья — раннего Нового времени. В связи с этим велики заслуги Каштанова в области компаративной медиевистики. Заслуженным признанием мирового исторического сообщества пользуются труды Каштанова-дипломатиста, автора оригинальной методики дипломатического анализа среднеевековых актов. В профессиональной деятельности Сергея Михайловича удивительным образом сочетаются теоретик и практик; исследователь феодального землевладения, иммунитетов, финансовой политики средневековой Руси и создатель собственной концепции феодальной собственности; ученый, предложивший ряд новых методик в области палеографии, филиграноведения, кодикологии и остроумный наблюдательный историограф.

Ученик А. А. Зимина и С. О. Шмидта, С. М. Каштанов является одним из немногих носителей высокой академической традиции русской гуманитаристики, восходящей к дореволюционной эпохе. Эта уникальная и, к сожалению, уходящая среда явственно проступает через жизнь и творчество главного героя статьи.
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**Finances of Medieval Russia**

In his 1955 “Essays on the History of the USSR”, S. M. Kashtanov wrote chapters about Financial Russia in the 16th century [Каштанов, 1955а; Каштанов, 1955б]. He returned to this topic at various stages of his work. In 1961, he published an article on the financial policy of the Russian state in immunity charters in the first third of the 16th century [Каштанов, 1961], and later published a study on financial troubles involving Ivan the Terrible’s policy in relation to principalities (1968). The article continues research on the authenticity of narrative charters, which he researched first in his doctoral thesis and subsequently completed in “Essays on Russian Diplomatics” [Каштанов, 1968б]. In 1970 Kashtanov studied the state of taxation in Russia in the second half of the 16th century. He was able to obtain new data on the existence of various natural duties at the time: construction, city, prison duties [Каштанов, 1975].

In 1977, S. M. Kashtanov published an article on the participation of the major monasteries in the internal trade of Russia in the 14th–15th centuries [Каштанов, 1977а]. Referring to the source material, the researcher traced the range of goods offered for sale, as well as the dynamics of trade routes, which were used by monasteries during the 14th–15th centuries. For the first time in national historiography the researcher conducted a systematic analysis of immunity letters as a source on the history of Russian medieval trade.

In 1982, Kashtanov published articles about the finances of the Moscow principality in the mid-14th century [Каштанов, 1982д] (referring to
testaments of great and crown princes), and financial policy during the Oprichnina period. He showed that between 1565 and 1572 relatively large, permanent awards coexisted with temporary benefits, such as Tarkhan-pay privileges, which exempted only small duties (often in order to facilitate the procedure of tax payment), and they often coexisted with a complete lack of privileges. The historian found that, compared with the policy of the Izbrannaya Rada, Oprichnina was the period of expansion of financial immunity. In this case, full immunity at the time was almost never granted. In the first years after Oprichnina (1572–1573), financial immunity of major spiritual lords was in a state of crisis. However, already by 1575 there was a sharp increase in the number of letters exempting monasteries from taxes and certain obligations. Significant tax exemptions were provided to great monasteries in Central Russia during the Grand rule of Simeon Bekbulatovich and during Ivan the Terrible's time on a country estate [Каштанов, 1982г].

In 1985 Kashtanov published an article on the financial policy of Russia in the mid-16th century. In this study he provided a fuller picture of the financial conditions of immunity up to 1551, when the Tarkhans were audited [Каштанов, 1985]. The researcher analyzed the state of actual privileges for monasteries and counties [Каштанов, 1986а], privileges that were significantly reduced by the mid-16th century. Studying measures to limit judicial and financial privileges of feudal entities that had immunity (mainly monasteries) in Russia in the mid-16th century, he again turned to the study of the financial policy of the Izbrannaya Rada. At the same time (1986) he summarized the study of the internal policy of Russia in the mid-16th century, particularly policy that related to the elimination of Tarkhans [Каштанов, 1986].

In 1988 Kashtanov published a fundamental monograph dedicated to the finances of medieval Russia. He examined the history of feudal finance in connection with the study of the origin and modification of feudal obligations, duties and taxes, as well as with the study of tax policy in various principalities of Rus in the 14th–16th centuries. Before this monograph, the financial situation of medieval Russia had never been researched extensively in Russian historiography. Kashtanov identified the main trends of centralization and decentralization of funds in politics of the great feudal princes at the beginning of the 16th century, and he analyzed the specifics of fiscal policy at the beginning of the Izbrannaya Rada and finally turned to the problem of canceling tarkhans in the mid-16th century within the financial policy of Russia between 1551–1564. A special place in the monograph is given to the study of fiscal policy in the period of Oprichnina and the state taxation in 1572–1575. Again (after his research in the 1950s–1960s) he turned to the study of the financial aspects of domestic policy during the reign of Simeon Bekbulatovich and Ivan the Terrible's time on a country estate [Каштанов, 1988]. In 1993 he published a comprehensive study on the socio-economic history of Russia in the late 15th and the first half of the 17th centuries [Каштанов, 1993б].
History of Public Institutions of Medieval Russia

At different stages of his work Kashtanov turned to the history of public administration in medieval Russia. In 1968, he drew attention to the Zasechny Order of 1577, which was previously unknown in sources from the 16th century [Каштанов, 1968а]. In his article in 1989 the researcher began to study the system of local governance. He found that in Northeastern Russia principalities formed by the 14th century, which were represented by governors, volostels, administrators of princely property and their agents, or “nobles”. Being quite effective in relation to the parish people, who were independent of the monasteries and the private feudal system, this local judicial administration scarcely acted against large landowners and especially did not act against monasteries. Large landowners enjoyed broad legal immunity, reducing the impact of the prince’s administration and diminishing protection of the rule of law. The latter, as shown by Kashtanov, was realized in the 14th century mainly through mixed courts [Kachtanov, 1989; see also: Каштанов, 2000б].

In 2001 Kashtanov studied government institutions of Novgorod and Pskov during their period of independence (based on 25 German regulations from 1269–1466 and Pskov’s agreement with the Livonian Order in 1417 and 1503) [Каштанов, 2001а]. Exploring diplomatic features of the above mentioned documents, he prepared the texts and raised the issue of allowing two contracted parties to receive two copies of the original text: both in Russian and in German (allowing for the existence of 4 copies of the agreement). Particular attention was paid to the correspondence between Russian and German terminology, demonstrating its evolution in the documents of different periods. He was able to demonstrate that the governors, during the period of Novgorod independence in the German texts, appear not so much as administrators, but more as individuals representing the interests of the prince of Novgorod. Kashtanov noted that up to the 1420s, “posadnik” was defined by the term, “borchgreve” (burgrave), and later on (as of 1436) replaced by the term, “borgermester” (Mayor). According to him, it may indicate that the posadnik gradually became equal in rank to the city mayor. Since “burgrave” was a greater person than the mayor, changes in titles of the mayor could indicate a decrease in the authority of the posadnik in the eyes of German counterparts. Kashtanov connected the cause of this phenomenon with the increasing dependence of Novgorod on Moscow during the reigns of Vasily I, Vasily II, and Ivan III.

Problems in the history of law are reflected in the study of the particularities of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Russia in the late 14th – early 16th centuries. S. M. Kashtanov studied the issue of the division of jurisdiction as related to monastery superiors between the government and the church hierarchy (1990). He found that in most cases in the late 14th – early 16th centuries princely jurisdiction prevailed. The great feudal lords often interfered with the privileges in the jurisdiction of bishops over abbots and took them under their own jurisdiction [Каштанов, 1990г].
In 2014, his new monograph appeared, in which he sought to analyze the originals and copies of acts from the 10th–16th centuries in order to establish their origin [Каштанов, 2014]. For the first time in Russian historiography Kashtanov identified the characteristic features of the activity of proto-chancelleries (14th–15th centuries) and chancelleries (16th century), the highest secular authority in medieval Russia. With this extensive theme, the researcher used the essay format allowing him to revise ideas that he expressed previously and to make additions to them. The book of office practice in medieval Russia will influence the development of studies of diplomacy in this country for many years to come. Any additional research into proto-chancellery activities and its different manifestations as well as the history of the formation of chancelleries will follow Kashtanov’s model.

Comparative Studies

Comparative studies took a new direction in the works of S. M. Kashtanov. He first mentioned the similarity between social and political institutions in Russia during the 14th–16th centuries with similar structures in the era of “High Middle Ages” (7th–9th centuries) in the West in a report during the first readings in memory of L. V. Cherepnin in 1980, which was dedicated to the formation of the centralized Russian state [ИСССР]. At that time, the work was not published. Kashtanov gave a detailed account of relations between Russia during the 14th–16th centuries and the Frankish state of the era of the Merovingians and the Carolingians (1992) [Каштанов, 1992б]. He came to a paradoxical conclusion that by the end of the 15th–16th centuries the Russian government had generally the same social basis as the empire of Charles the Great. The historian tried to demonstrate that both in socio-economic and political terms the Old Russian state “does not correspond to the Carolingian monarchy”, and the Russian State of the 15th–16th centuries, even though close in its type of social relations to the Carolingian Empire, “had a very different historical perspective: not that of decay, but of strengthening, of transition to absolutism”. He has shown that the roots of terror of Ivan the Terrible’s Oprichnina lie in the aim of Ivan IV to prevent the breakdown of the state, to seal with blood and executions the territory which was almost ready to fall apart: “Ivan saw betrayal everywhere not because it was really there, but because the development of feudal tenure and servitude turned representatives of the ruling class into ‘seniors’ in a way – a tendency of feudal fragmentation of a new type, which had never before existed in Russia and which we know well from the history of Western countries in the 10th–13th centuries” [Ibid, с. 91–92].

In 1995 Kashtanov was asked to compare the historical role of Charles Martel and Ivan III in the formation of centralized states from their feudal basis. In both cases, the state was created with the support of the vassal-beneficiaries and large monasteries and was by nature a multinational state. The historian noted that “the essential similarity and common trends in the
development of the Frankish state in the 7th–8th centuries and of Russia in the 14th–15th centuries could be observed in the first region until about the mid-9th century, and in the second, until the end of the 16th century” [Каштанов, 1995а]. Some time later (1996) he articulated his ideas about the methodology for doing comparative-historical research [Каштанов, 1996а].

Observations of Kashtanov on different political institutions and socio-economic relations in medieval Russia prompted him to reflect on the features of feudalism in Russia. The historian devoted a number of lectures, meant for the students of the Graduate School of Practical Research at the University of Paris, to this issue and delivered them from 1994–1995, along with the lecture courses on the notes of the Russian foreign policy in the 16th century.1

In 1999 he published an article devoted to the study of private acts in Russia between the 12th–14th centuries, which was also a report for a conference on monasteries, organized by Prof. Jean-L. Lemetre in September 1995 in Paris. Because of his development of a comparative methodology for studying Russian medieval charters and acts of the Frankish state, Kashtanov notes some similarities and differences between Merovingian deeds and early immunity letters issued to Russian monasteries. The researcher showed that both of them were issued on behalf of the ruler (king of the Frankish state, the grand duke in Russia). Giving monasteries immunity privileges was an exclusive prerogative of supreme power. However, extant sources allowed him to argue that in Russia immunity policy first appeared in the 12th century, while in the Frankish state, it appeared five centuries earlier in the 7th century. The earliest tax immunity had to do with monastic land tenure. Customs privileges were given much later (in Russia only in the 14th century). And Western deeds, as well as some princely acts contain articles on the protection of superiors and monasteries. However, as Kashtanov demonstrated, Russian diplomas, unlike Western acts, did not provide monastic brotherhoods with the right of selection of the prior. Princes tried to usurp the role of the warden of spiritual corporations, “thus creating conditions enabling them to intervene in the appointment of a new rector in the future” [Каштанов, 1999б].

The study of medieval clerical practices in Europe played an important role in Kashtanov’s works at the end of the 1990s. Turning to the characteristics of the main trends in the office’s documentation processes in the 14th–16th centuries (1999), he came to the conclusion that until the mid-15th century in Russia, immunities on land and princely testaments and contract deeds prevailed. From the mid-15th century, the content of deeds changed significantly. At the time acts on slaves, records (?) of boyars, marriage contracts and others became more common. In the 16th century there appeared new kinds of private acts and new types of registration and records. Kashtanov demonstrated that land immunity deeds, which prevailed among the Russian princes’ acts, can be compared (by their diplomatic

1 The annual course of lectures on Russian history delivered by S. M. Kashtanov as directeur d’études associé (École Pratique des Hautes Études, IVe section) at the invitation of a prominent French specialist in Russian philology professor V. A. Vodov.
features and quantitative indicators) with the Merovingian precepts. He compares judicial acts that appeared in Northeastern Russia in the mid-15th century with Merovingian charters. According to him, princely spiritual deeds basically have no analogs among the Merovingian acts, but “in essence, it was a form of contract (with the heirs) and the law (on the management of common in the documentary practices of the Merovingian state and practically non-existent in Russian princely records until the mid-15th century” [Каштанов, 1999в].

Observations made in the article continue the theme of comparative studies of sources initiated by the historian during the 1980s–1990s in connection with the search for evidence of the typological proximity of social relations between the Russian state of the 14th–16th centuries and the Frankish state of the 6th–9th centuries. Kashtanov convincingly demonstrates that Russia came to the development of feudal institutions (immunity, vassalage, prekary, benefices, etc.) 500 years later, after their evolution had ceased in Europe. While Russian feudal relations took shape at the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Modern Period, in Western Europe, bourgeois relations had already begun to form. The latter could not but affect the nature of documentation in the European and Russian offices of the 14th–16th centuries.

In studying the text of Sudebnik of 1497 (2000), he compares this manuscript of Russian law with Serbian and Polish-Lithuanian legal documents, as well as with legislative sources of the Western Middle Ages. Exploring their inner form and content, the researcher concluded that the Russian Law Books of 1497, 1550, 1589 were common law of the epoch, when a centralized state emerged, but the udel system was still preserved. Under these conditions, according to Kashtanov, supreme power was perceived as an accessory of the “family”, when the sons and brothers of the sovereign enjoyed “his share of sovereignty”. He showed that in the Council Code of 1649, “we can already see an entirely different type of monarchy” [Каштанов, 2000г].

At the same time he published an article dedicated to the punishment of forgers in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period. The study examines documents from Roman, Byzantine, and Visigothic law and considers the legal documents of the Two Sicilies, France, England, and Germany in the 12th–13th centuries, containing articles on the punishment of forgers. Particular attention is given to the fight of the papal curia against forgers in the 12th–14th centuries. Kashtanov showed connections with the development of forgers’ activity; indeed, forgery was spreading there only at the end of the 14th century. He finds parallels between the forms of punishment of forgers in Russia at the end of the 15th century and in the Visigothic Kingdom in the 7th century (flogging). The historian examined the question of the origin of a forged document in Russia, where a forger was called podpishhik. The first fight against podpishhiks was noted in the Sudebnik of 1550, when forgery was characterized as an “evil deed”. The researcher drew attention to the impact of the legal regulations of the
Lithuanian Statute of 1529, which stipulated the death penalty for forgery, to the *Sudebnik* of 1550, which included the same sort of punishment. A change in the implementation of this punishment was observed in the *Sudebnik* of Tsar Fyodor Ioannovich of 1589, demonstrating the turn from the death penalty to flogging. Kashtanov showed that the articles of the Council Code of 1649 on forgery are comparable with articles of Lithuanian statutes. However, unlike in Lithuanian legislation, in Russia punishment was imposed only for forgery of sovereign credentials (falsification of private acts was not prosecuted by law) \[Каштанов, 2000в\].

In 2001 the researcher returned to the problems of the theory and methodology of comparative studies of source documents. Along with defining the general principles of comparative analysis, he turned to quantitative comparisons of Russian princely deeds with the Merovingian and Carolingian precepts, which equally contained land and immunity awards. For the first time in national historiography he made an attempt to determine the annual rate of issuance of Russian acts, starting with the first quarter of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century (during the reign of Vasily the Blind), till the end of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century (until the end of the reign of Ivan the Terrible). The calculation was based on immunity charters only. Kashtanov showed that land immunity acts – issued by the end of the reign of Vasily I, according to their quantitative indicators – are comparable to the Merovingian diplomas. The total number of immunity letters issued during the 160 years since the beginning of the reign of Vasily II and until the end of the reign of Ivan IV is comparable to the acts of the Carolingian era. The historian showed that the frequency of the issuance of deeds under Vasily II (7.3) and Ivan III (9.3) was lower than under Charles the Bald (13.5), but Vasily III even exceeded the specified rate (14.3). The average frequency of the issuance of deeds under Ivan IV (25.2) exceeds the norm of the Capets under Louis VI (16.5) and Louis VII (18.5). Along with this, Kashtanov noted a steady increase in the annual rate of issuance of immunity deeds in Russia \[Каштанов, 2001в\].

**Problems of Historiography**

Another area of Kashtanov’s research is historiographical studies. In the second half of the 1950s at the initiative of A. A. Zimin, he worked on the study of the history of sources and ancillary historical disciplines which determined the main directions in the development of paleography, diplomacy, genealogy, historical chronology and source studies in Russia in the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century – early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries (up to 1917). This research demanded that the historian study and understand extensive literature, develop his taste for historiography and push the horizons of his academic interests. Considerably abridged, historiographical articles of Kashtanov (except for his work on genealogy in Russia) were published in “Essays on the History of Historical Science” (1960, 1963) \[Очерки, 1960; Очерки, 1963\].
He paid special attention to the study of the historiography of serfdom in Russia (1965, 1969, 1973) [Каштанов, 1965а; Каштанов, 1973б; Каштанов, 1969], as well as the history of Russian historical thought. The researcher wrote detailed comments on the 25th, 26th and 29th volumes of the “History of...” by S. M. Solovyev (1965, 1966) [Каштанов, 1965б; Каштанов, 1966б]. He wrote reviews of French historiography of Russian feudalism (1966) [Каштанов, 1966а], of contemporary Soviet literature and of the history of Russia until the 19th century (1967) [Каштанов, Клокман]. In 1976, Kashtanov turned to the study of the evolution of ideas about feudal immunity in Russia in the historiography before the Revolution and in the early Soviet historiography of the 1920s [Каштанов, 1976]. In 1982, he produced an overview of the most recent European works on diplomatics in connection with the definition of directions in the development of diplomatics and especially in connection with the development of the theory and practice of publishing documents of medieval Europe [Каштанов, 1982б].

S. M. Kashtanov’s historiographical research continued in his essay about the works of S. V. Bakhrushin, in honor of his 100th birthday anniversary (1982). For the first time the stages of Bakhrushin’s work were systematically examined, including the main directions of his work, his prominent role in the study of the socio-economic history of European Russia and Siberia, the history of the cities and urban uprisings in the 17th century, the history of trade for the peasantry and merchants and the history of trade in the 17th–18th centuries [Каштанов, 1982в].

During 1974 and 1975 Kashtanov worked together with L. A. Kotelnikova; they wrote reviews of the 6th “week” of the International Institute of Economic History in Prato [Каштанов, Котельникова, 1974; Каштанов, Котельникова, 1975а; Каштанов, Котельникова, 1975б], initiating a systematic exposition that chronicled academic events abroad. In collaboration with N. A. Gorskaya, A. A. Svanidze and Yu. M. Yurginis, he published a review of lectures given during the 13th Prato “week” (1982, 1985) [Горская, Каштанов, Сванидзе, Юргинис, 1982; Горская, Каштанов, Сванидзе, Юргинис, 1985].

In 1986, Munich hosted the International Congress, entitled, “The falsifications in the Middle Ages”, which was organized by the Monumenta Germaniae Historica. A detailed review of the presentations, made at the Congress, included the key theoretical paper read by the Italian historian and writer, U. Eco. Kashtanov prepared a series of articles about the typology of fraud in the Middle Ages. His historiographical review turned into an interesting study in which the discussion with the medievalist studying medieval forgeries was accompanied by his own original observations and conclusions based on the analysis of Russian and European acts [Каштанов, 1989а; Каштанов, 1990в; Каштанов, 1992а; Каштанов, 1994г].

He wrote an obituary for L. V. Cherepnin (1978) [Каштанов, 1978г; Касштанов, Водофф] and wrote the first essays about A. A. Zimin, which

---

2 Report of Kashtanov by 6th “week” in Prato was dedicated to monastic trade: [Касштанов]. Russian text was published in 1977: [Каштанов, 1977а].
were written shortly after his death (1980) [Каштанов, 1980а; Каштанов, 1980б]. Recognition of the role of Zimin in national and world historiography of Russian medieval times occupied a central place in Kashtanov's work in the second half of the 1990s [Каштанов, 1999а, с. 7–10; Каштанов, Чернобаев]. At the time, he published several articles about Zimin, the most important of which is preceded by a complete bibliography of his works, compiled by V. I. Gulchinsky [Каштанов, 2000а]. After a systematic study of the scholarly heritage of Zimin, who was very close to him in the subject of their research, Kashtanov reconsidered the main issues of history and source studies in medieval Russia, which were of interest both to his predecessors and himself.

Theoretical Source Studies in the Scientific Activity of Sergey Kashtanov

In the early 1960s, Kashtanov became fascinated by the theory of source studies. In 1962, in collaboration with A. A. Kurnosov he wrote an article containing a description of a number of theoretical problems: the question of determining the origin and type in identifying historical sources and the principles of their classification according to their classes, types, etc. This article caused a heated debate, in which L. V. Cherepnin, A. A. Novoselsky, E. A. Lutsky, et al participated [Каштанов, Курносов].

In a study published in 1965, and written in collaboration with A. L. Litvin, the historian continues to reflect on the key issues of source studies, in particular, on the definition of the concepts of “authenticity” and “credibility”. He comes to the conclusion that the term, “authenticity”, should be understood as “the real origin of the source from that author... who is designated (or implied)” in the text. Kashtanov defines “credibility” as “the need for a sufficient degree of correspondence between the phenomenon and its description”. Assuming that this correspondence is never absolute, he justifies the need for the introduction of the concept of “confidence” (as opposed to the definitions of “complete authenticity” or “gross inaccuracy of the source”) and talks about the gradations of “power” [Каштанов, Литвин]. Later (1991) Kashtanov introduces the concept of “diplomatic authenticity” and “legal authenticity”, the notion of an “authentic” (i. e. genuine) copy [Каштанов, 1990б]. He justifies the distinction between “clerical forgery”, “suspicious (questionable) act”, “imaginary act”, “pseudo-original”, “pseudo-copy” and others. The researcher linked the problem of authenticity and credibility to the question of the existence of private acts in Russia in the 12th – early 13th centuries and turned to the study of the testament of Anthony, the Roman. According to the author, the acts associated with the name of Anthony were made in the 16th century but originate from some lost authentic documents of the second half of the 14th – early 15th centuries: “this deed of conveyance and last will of Anthony can hardly date back to the 12th century.
But at the same time it is difficult to assume that in the 16th century they were made without the use of documents of the late 14th – early 15th centuries, which may not even be from Anthony's monastery. Most likely, we are dealing here with a ‘pseudo-copy’ or ‘copies’ of a ‘pseudo-original’ [Каштанов, 1991б].

Another direction of source studies by Kashtanov is associated with the study of the concepts of “peasants” and “orphans” and the characteristics of their existence in ancient sources. He showed (1986) that the term “peasants” in the social sense did not appear in the acts until the end of the 14th century. Since the end of the 14th century, and especially in the 15th century, this term began to be used systematically in the charters to denote the agricultural population of Russia. The researcher found that for the first time it occurs in the charter deed of Metropolitan Cyprian of Varevokonstantinovsky Monastery in 1391 [Kashtanov, 1986b].

**Codicology, Palaeography and Filigree Studies**

At different stages of his work, S. M. Kashtanov addressed issues of codicology, palaeography and filigree studies. Back in the mid-1950s in the Collection of Manuscripts of Lenin State Library he found fragments of a number of Troitsk registers, some of which were withdrawn at the beginning of the 19th century by P. M. Stroev and were stored as part of the Pogodinskaya collection of the State Public Library (now State Russian Library). In 1956 the first edition of Kashtanov’s work, dedicated to source studies of a number of registers of the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius in the 16th century [Каштанов, 1956], was published. In the “Essays of Russian Diplomatics” (1970) the researcher attempted to reconstruct the original composition of these books based on a rigorous evaluation of their external and internal forms, as well as on the content. As a result, for the first time in national historiography, he developed the principles of diplomatic codicology (studying acts as a part of the collections of copies) [Каштанов, 1970] while using the material from Trinity Lavra.

Still focusing on the content of acts (which remained a traditional approach in Russian pre-revolutionary and Soviet diplomatic historiography), starting with the early 1970s, Kashtanov continues to deepen the study of their external form. In 1974 he wrote an essay about F. Gasparri’s book, which was published a year before in Geneva and Paris and is devoted to the palaeography and diplomatics of the French royal acts. The analysis of the external features of royal acts from the 12th to the first quarter of the 13th centuries, conducted by Gasparri, according to Kashtanov, convincingly demonstrate the impossibility of isolating proper diplomatic studies from the problems of paleography, especially when it comes to studying the history of medieval offices. The historian noted that in the new stage of development of historical research, methods in diplomacy and paleography contribute not only to the study of office
practices of the Middle Ages, but also to the creation of new perspectives in the study of social and political relations and culture [Каштанов, 1974б].

Gradually after studying the origin of ancient clerical acts, Kashtanov became aware of the need for careful paleographic study of original, surviving documents. For the first time in national historiography he raises questions about the study and classification of handwritten charters from the 16th century. Studying the outward signs of the original judgment memo list from June 7, 1536, issued by the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius on the ownership of Bezhetsky Verkh, with a copy of the same document as part of the Trinity Lavra register, book 518, Kashtanov found that the original document was made by the Trinity Lavra scribes. He came to the conclusion that only the signatures of officials are traces of the writing practice of the mandated office. Thus the researcher was able to demonstrate the non-office origin of the judgment list and to consider it a product of the scriptorium of Trinity-Sergius Monastery [Каштанов, 1977б].

In the late 1970s – early 1980s Kashtanov writes a fundamental monographic series, “On the Trail of the Trinity Lavra Register Books”. Studying the filigree of “The Hand with a Rosette”, et al. in the Trinity Lavra register books of the 16th century, as well as the Pogodinskaya collection, numbers 1846 and 1905, he sought to establish the place and origin of the sheets from these books in the register books, which were determined from the analysis of the placement of the same filigree at a certain interval between laid lines. The analysis is based on a thorough study of options and sub-options of the filigree, “The Hand with a Rosette”, and on rigorous measurements of the distances of different parts of the filigree from the next laid line. The principles of filigree research were combined with fundamental paleographic and codicological research on the Trinity Lavra register books and the Pogodinskaya collections. The implementation of this technique allowed the historian to conclusively demonstrate that the pages of the Pogodinskaya collection, withdrawn by P. M. Stroyev, were originally found in the Trinity Lavra register books [Каштанов, 1977в; Каштанов, 1979; Каштанов, 1981; Каштанов, 1982а; see also: Жуковская, especially с. 65, 71, 76].

In the 1990s, Kashtanov carried out research on paper watermarks in connection with the study of the history of spreading of paper in Russia in the 14th–16th centuries [Kachtanov, 1992]. By using material acts he determined the types of imported paper and traced the path of its introduction in Russia. Along with this, he turned to the question of the origin of the term, “Alexandrian paper”. Kashtanov refuted the hypothesis of the so-called “Eastern” paper, demonstrating that all paper at the time came from the West. He concluded that there was an erroneous assumption by O. A. Knyazevevskaia and L. V. Moshkova that in Russia paper was used for writing manuscripts in the gasket в prokladku (i. e., when the same code was written partly on vellum, partly on paper) [Князевская, Мощкова; Kachtanov, 1992] as early as the 13th century.

In 1995, S. M. Kashtanov together with L. V. Stolyarova published an article on codicology of the Siya Gospel and established the circumstances
of the emergence of this oldest parchment of Moscow. The authors showed that the heretofore accreditation of the person who ordered this gospel, monk Ananias, with the Moscow Great Prince, Ivan Kalita, had no basis in documentation. They argued that the gospel first appeared in 1339 and indicated that the existing record for the Siya Gospel joined the other two, which included Praise of Kalita and some initial record, which appeared before the Praise [Каштанов, Столярова, 1995].

In the mid-1980s, and especially in the 1990s, Kashtanov worked intensively on studying the composition and features of the Russian diplomatic grand and royal charters from the Athos Monasteries in the 16th century, especially in preparation for the publication of “Greek” ambassadorial books, numbers 1 and 2. They offered a detailed study of the codicology and filigree of book, number 1, “Greek Affairs”, in which copies of letters to the Athos Monastery date back to the more or less the same time as the originals. Around the same time, he began exploring the codicological structure and features of the paper of the register book of St. Paul Obnorsk Monastery [Каштанов, Столярова, 2002].

Historical Geography and Demography Works

Over the years Kashtanov productively deals with problems of historical geography. In 1963 he published a study on the earliest known Russian map of a piece of land (16th century) [Каштанов, 1963], which he discovered in the Collection of Manuscripts of Lenin State Library. In 1973, he completed a study of the origin of Russian land ownership in the Kazan region [Каштанов, 1973а]. Later the historian published a series of articles on the history of land tenure in Uglich and Sviyazhsky counties (1978). Studying fragments of the Trinity register books in the Pogodinskaya collection, number 1846, Kashtanov discovered a previously unknown excerpt, preserved by an ancient scribe’s description of Uglich County, namely of estates of the Trinity Lavra of St Sergius and St Nicholas Uleymsky monasteries. The researcher determined that this excerpt was part of the books of Semyon Nikitch Buturlin, dating back presumably before June 1537, and he also determined the location of the places mentioned in the source [Каштанов, 1978б]. Kashtanov connected the emergence of scribal descriptions of Uglich County with the government policy of Elena Glinskaya’s regency period that imposed anti-feudal measures. Those could be caused by attempts to neutralize possible claims of Andrei Staritsky to bequeath, through appanage, to his brothers [Каштанов, 1978а]. In the same year, he prepared the publication of two charters, from 1572 and 1575, relating to Sviyazhsky district [Каштанов, 1978в]. His interest in the historical and geographical studies of the Kazan region developed in an article devoted to the localization of the islands of Korovnich and Iryhov (2001) [Каштанов, 2001б].

In the 1990s, the researcher’s fascination with historical geography resulted in a series of studies about the history of feudal tenure in Rostov
and Rostov district formation [Каштанов, Кириченко; Каштанов, 1994б; Каштанов, 1995в; Каштанов, 1996б]. Along with the study of the history of the Rostov land, Kashtanov turned to the historical geography of Murom and Dmitrov districts [Каштанов, 1994в; Каштанов, 1994е].

In 1997 he published an article on the route of British travelers in mid-16th century Russia from the place of their disembarkation from ships to Moscow. Using sources of the 16th–18th centuries, historical and geographical descriptions, the historian sets the distance between the points of spans and identifies place names, mentioned by the British. He managed to systematize information not only about the length of the spans on the way from Vologda to Moscow, according to Jenkinson, but also on geographical maps, by specifying the minimum and maximum difference between them. The researcher determined the speed at which Jenkinson moved during his 6-day journey from Vologda to Moscow and showed that the rate of Russian Yamskaya horse chase on a sled (75.6 km) is significantly inferior to the maximum speed in England (112.65 km) and in France (86.9–90.12 km per day) in the 16th century [Каштанов, 1997б].

In the late 1990s, Kashtanov continued his study of the history of monastic land tenure in Dmitrov district in the 15th–16th centuries. He studied the historical and geographical characteristics of the Trinity estates, as well as the possession of the Boris and Gleb Monastery (1997). He was able to specify the time of inclusion of some territories of Dmitrov into estates of both the Trinity Monastery and the Boris and Gleb Monastery and to identify the location of names appearing in the land acts and descriptions in the 15th–18th centuries [Каштанов, 1997а].

The technique of historical and geographical research S. M. Kashtanov developed provides a thorough study of the sources of different types and varieties: the acts, chronicles, materials of geographical descriptions in the second half of the 19th century (including the List of localities), geographical drawings, maps and atlases (from ordnance survey maps to modern ones). Meticulous measurements of the distances between the known geographic objects and items in need of scholarly localization collated from different sources, allow us to demonstrate the accuracy of their original position.

In the 1990s, Kashtanov turned to the study of historical demography. He became interested in the problem of population size and Russian troops in the 16th century and spoke against the tendency, existing in historiography, towards exaggeration. Based on the material of lists of noble families, cadastres and military registers, the researcher found that the population size in Russia at the beginning of the 16th century did not exceed 4.5 million. This conclusion was close to the observations made earlier by P. P. Smirnov, who wrote that b Russia’s population was 3 million, and by the beginning of the Time of Troubles, 4.5 million. Also the number of Russian troops, according to him, did not exceed 20 to 30 thousand in the 16th century (let us recall that, according to S. M. Seredenin, it was 75 thousand at the time, and according to estimates of R. G. Skrynnikov, 60–80 thousand) [Каштанов, 1991а; Каштанов, 1993а; Качтанов, 1995].
Problems of Other Ancillary Historical Disciplines: Genealogical, Sigillographic and Numismatic Research

A significant place in Kashtanov’s work is devoted to the problems of ancillary historical disciplines. In connection with the investigation of the identification of signs of ancient letters, the most important of which are seals, and in response to the two-volume study of Russian documentary seals by V. L. Yanin, he published his thoughts about old sigillographic material (1974). Unlike Yanin, who maintained that the remaining without-bulla acts from the 11th–12th centuries “for the most part are the remains of numerous private acts” [Янин], Kashtanov supposed that the ancient seals were not always meant for acts. They could be used not only in documents, and, as, for example, in Hungary or the Czech Republic, were used to subpoena people [Каштанов, 1974а]. Later (1998) the researcher turned to the study of seals on the acts in the 16th century. For the first time in historiography, he gave a detailed description of the methods of attaching hanging seals with a cord to a document [Каштанов, 1998а].

In 1989, Kashtanov turned to the genealogy of Charles Tocco, “ses-trichich” (nephew) of Vasily III. In the “Greek” ambassadorial book, number 1, there is a letter from “a despot Artsky and Serpsky”, Charles, to Moscow’s Great Prince Vasily III, as a response to his last answer. He established the existence of kinship between the despot of Arta, Charles Tocco, and the Moscow grand house. He showed that the definition of “ses-trichich” (nephew), in Charles’s signature and address, was due to the fact that he happened to be a grandnephew of Sophia Palaeologus and, accordingly, the great-nephew (“ses-trichich”) to her son Vasily III [Каштанов, 1989б]. In 1994, the study of genealogical problems connected with the study of the king’s commemoration book in the “Greek” ambassadorial book, number 1, was continued in an article about Oda of Stade in connection with her marriage and progeny [Каштанов, 1994а]. In 1998, Kashtanov published an article on the time and circumstances of birth of the sons of Vasily Yaroslavich, Prince of Serpukhov-Borovsk [Каштанов, 1998б].

A year later, the specialist published an article on the classification of special historical disciplines, in which he identified three types. The first type was comprised of disciplines that have a certain homogeneous object of study (numismatics, notaphily); the second included disciplines that study a separate side of sources of different kinds and types (paleography, emblem study); and the third group included disciplines that study sources as such, and are based on a source, a range of issues, united by a single subject (chronology, genealogy). Kashtanov noticed that some disciplines fall, in fact, into some intermediate position. In particular, he showed how controversial the place of diplomatics among other ancillary disciplines is. Some researchers consider its objects of study to be “acts” or deeds, while others, “documents”, yet still others, all the written sources. In this case, the interpretation of the terms “act/deed” and “document” by different historians differ significantly [Каштанов, 1990а].
In the early 1990s S. M. Kashtanov turns to the study of numismatics. He is interested in the mysterious duty of sixty (shest′desyat), mentioned in the charters of the Ryazan princes of the 14th–15th centuries and wittily suggests that this duty is related to the transition of the 10-kun altyan into a 6-coins one (as a result of the influence of the Lithuanian bill on “kopas” – 60 being the basis of a counting system) [Каштанов, 1994д]. He also writes about “gold money” (zoloty′e den′gi) as a tax in the 16th century [Каштанов, 1995б].

Coda

Research activities of S. M. Kashtanov are extremely diverse. His works contain many innovative ideas. Referring to the extensive analysis of deeds, the historian researched the history of feudal land ownership, inheritance, domestic trade and customs policy, as well as Russia’s financial system in the 14th–16th centuries. S. M. Kashtanov was the first to identify the stages in the development of feudal immunity and immunity policy in the 16th century. He also showed how the struggle of the grand dukes (from 1547 on, tsars) within the specific system influenced the decline in feudal immunity. He demonstrated that the policy of Oprichnina was combined with the extension of taxation and financial rights of monasteries and denial of the interests of cities. The researcher believed that it significantly distinguished it from government policy of the Izbrannaya Rada, when dwellers of the “white” regions of Russia (belomescy′) were equalized with trading quarters (Posady′) in the tax and judicial relations and lost their rights to privileged trade. Additionally, he saw the roots of Oprichnina terror in Ivan IV Vasilyevich’s aim to prevent the collapse of the state.

Kashtanov gave fundamentally new definitions to the notions of “property”, “ownership” and “use” (now accepted in historiography and applied to the analysis of social relations in other countries and in other historical periods). Doing research in the field of social terminology, he traced the spread of the terms siroty′ and kreštyane and concluded that the latter was not used socially until late 14th century.

The historian defined “authenticity” and “credibility” for historical sources by introducing a clear distinction between them and the understanding of the first as the real origin of the document from the author, and of the second as the extent to which the facts stated in the source are matched with objective reality. Kashtanov developed an original classification scheme of historical sources according to their types and varieties. He published papers on the history of falsification of different types of sources in medieval Russia and in the West, on medieval methods of combating fraud and punishing forgers.

The researcher first produced a textual study of forms of charters from the 15th–16th centuries. He highlighted the theoretical foundations of diplomatics, the history of its origin in the West and its development in Russia.
He developed an original method for the analysis of diplomatic acts, where the origin of each act is regarded as a fact of the particular policy in a particular region. S. M. Kashtanov first introduced the distinction of four basic types of act forms (individual, group, abstract, conditional). The historian introduced the concepts of the “inner form”, “external form”, “domestic content” and “external content” of an act, which are widely used in modern historiography.

He developed a new methodology for analyzing watermarked paper, based on measurements of distances of different parts of the filigree to the next laid line – “Tracing Trinity register books of the 16th century (Pogodinsky collection of 1846 and the archive of the Trinity-Sergius Monastery)” [Перечень актов]. Matching schemes of agreements between Russian princes with Byzantium in the 10th century with the schemes of Byzantine-Italian acts in the 10th–12th centuries, Kashtanov reconstructed the procedure to conclude the former and demonstrated unarguably the influence of Byzantine office work on Russian-Byzantine treaties of the 10th century. Simultaneously with Ya. Malingudi, he concluded that the texts of the Russian-Byzantine treaties, which were part of the Primary Chronicle, are a translation from Byzantine register books of non-office origin. Researching and publishing the letters sent in the 16th century to Mount Athos, to Sinai, to Serbia and to Ecumenical Patriarchs, the historian studied the evolution of the structure of the initial and final reports of these acts. He demonstrated that both the title of a Russian tsar, and the final minutes of acts in the 16th century reveal that Moscow’s political role in international politics became more and more evident and pronounced.

The scale S. M. Kashtanov’s research is amazing. It seems that what he did and achieved in scholarship, including the diversity and complexity of the issues, the chronological order and “territorial” scope of his work, his deep and accurate conclusions, could only be matched by the work of a whole research institute. Above all, what should be noted is his abundance of new ideas, whose implementation could take the lifetime of not a single human being but dozens of them. Incredibly hard work, passion for his research, virtuosity and an enormous natural talent characterize Kashtanov as a historian.
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