

State Service in Sixteenth Century Novgorod

The First Century of the Pomestie System

VINCENT E. HAMMOND

State Service in Sixteenth Century Novgorod

The First Century of the Pomestie System

Vincent E. Hammond


UNIVERSITY PRESS OF AMERICA,® INC.
Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK

Copyright © 2009 by
University Press of America,® Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard
Suite 200
Lanham, Maryland 20706
UPA Acquisitions Department (301) 459-3366

Estover Road
Plymouth PL6 7PY
United Kingdom

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
British Library Cataloging in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008942619
ISBN: 978-0-7618-4385-6 (paperback : alk. paper)
eISBN: 978-0-7618-4386-3

™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum
requirements of American National Standard for Information
Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials,
ANSI Z39.48—1984

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Exchange and Acquisition of Additional Land in Early Sixteenth Century Shelonskaia Province	38
3	The Inheritability of the Early Sixteenth Century Shelonskaia Pomestie	76
4	The Revisionary Cadaster of 1552 and the Mid-Century Shelonskaia Pomestie	107
5	The Cadaster of 1571 and the Shelonskaia Pomesties of Novgorod District	132
6	The Cadaster of 1576 and the Shelonskaia Pomesties of Porkhov District	156
7	The Exchange and Acquisition of Additional Land in Early Sixteenth Century Vodskaia Province	190
8	The Inheritability of the Early Sixteenth Century Vodskaia Pomestie	202
9	The Cadaster of 1582 and the Later Sixteenth Century Vodskaia Pomestie	229
10	Conclusion	247
Appendix A The Shelonskaia and Vodskaia Cadasters, 1480–1576		255
Appendix B The Shelonskaia Pomesties of 1539		259

Appendix C	The Shelonskaia Pomeshchiks, 1539	261
Appendix D	The Classification of the Vodskaia Pomesties, 1540	273
Appendix E	The Vodskaia Pomeshchiks of 1540	277
Appendix F	Linear Regression Variables	281
Appendix G	The Shelonskaia Pomeshchiks of 1552–53	301
Appendix H	Shelonskaia Manorial Parcels, 1571	303
Appendix I	The Shelonskaia Pomesties of 1576	307
Appendix J	Glossary of Russian Terms	315
Bibliography		321
Index		329

Chapter One

Introduction

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POMESTIE

In the 1480s Ivan the Great (r. 1462 to 1505) needed to unify the Muscovite state that had more than doubled in size after Novgorod's recent annexation. After two revolts in ten years, the state needed loyal servingmen to prevent Novgorod's tradition of local autonomy from reasserting itself. Ivan solved the problem by confiscating the patrimonial lands of the Novgorod boyars, whom he resettled in the older districts of Muscovy. Most of their former estates were given to two thousand loyal middle service class gentry from Moscow and other, provincial, towns who held the ranks of courtier (*dvo-riani*) and junior boyar (*syn boiarskii*).¹ He gave the estates opposite the fortress of Vyborg near the Livonian border in northwestern Vodskaia province to the former unfree servants (*posluzhiltsy*) of the exiled Novgorod boyars.

Although earlier Russian rulers usually gave part of their ancestral lands to their servingmen in allodial tenure, Ivan III gave the former patrimonial lands of the Novgorodian boyars to his servingmen in military tenure. The dues (*obrok*) paid by the peasants who occupied and cultivated the land supported the lord's family and cavalry service. Since possession depended on military service, his estate was called a *pomestie* (pl., *pomestiia*) to distinguish it from the older *votchina* (pl., *votchiny*), which was not subject to military service before the Ivan IV's Service Decree (*Ulozhenie o sluzhbe*) of 20 September 1556.² The sovereign's failure to redistribute the confiscated land as *votchina* virtually destroyed patrimonial landholding in the region, leaving only the petty freeholder known as the *svoezemets* (pl., *svoezemtsy*).³

The crown's need for additional servingmen to garrison the expanding frontier and defend the state from the Poles, Swedes and nomads caused the

pomestie system to spread throughout Muscovy. During the sixteenth century, the pomestie replaced the votchina as the dominant form of landholding. The cadasters from the period show the pomestie's prevalence everywhere but the far north, where the "black lands" (*chernye zemli*) of the state were dominant, and the central region around Moscow. Anyone, whether free or unfree, could receive a pomestie if capable of military service. Most pomeshchiks were from the middle service class, which included approximately 25,000 cavalrymen by the mid-sixteenth century.⁴

The pomestie system altered the traditional relationship between the Muscovite state and its servingman. The need for additional servingmen to defend the state caused the disappearance of the close personal ties between the sovereign and his retinue. The enfeoffment of over two thousand pomeshchiks more than three hundred and fifty miles from Moscow required the government to establish legal norms to regulate their relationship with the state. After 1480, periodic censuses determined whether the pomestie provided a sufficient income for military service. Ivan IV later codified the norms enforced by the state secretaries, undersecretaries and clerks who conducted the censuses. His Service Decree required military service from one mounted and fully equipped warrior for every 300 chetverts of arable land.⁵ Pomeshchiks with more arable had to furnish another similarly equipped and mounted warrior for every additional 300 chetverts. A warrior going on a distant campaign had to bring a second horse.⁶ In the 1560s, the tsar established the Service Land Chancery (*pomestnyi prikaz*) to enforce the decree. The chancery clerks correlated the pomeshchik's service record entered on the rolls of the Military Chancery (*razriadnyi prikaz*) with the information on the location and amount of arable tax units maintained in the Service Land Chancery's files.⁷

THE ORIGINS OF THE POMESTIE

The tsar's dependence on the pomeshchik cavalry to defend Russia from foreign invasion made the pomestie system one of the most important state institutions. Since the service requirement found in the original charters convinced early historians of its conditionality, they focused on the origins rather than the legal development of the pomestie. While some pre-revolutionary historians recognized Ivan III as the father of the pomestie, others traced it to earlier examples of conditional landholding in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Nicholas Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766–1826), the conservative defender of the autocracy, considered the problem first. His *History of the Russian State*⁸ argued that Ivan III created the pomestie tenure to provide an adequate

income for his loyal rank-and-file cavalrymen.⁹ His thesis is consistent with the juridical school of Russian historiography that attributed Russia's development to the actions of the state in the person of the ruler.

Some historians thought Ivan was consciously following a foreign model suggested by the Byzantines in the entourage of his second wife, Sophia (Zoe) Paleologue, the niece of the last Eastern Roman Emperor, Constantine XI. The jurist Konstantin Alekseevich Nevolin (1806–1855) found proof of the grand princess's influence in the pomestie's resemblance to the Byzantine *topion* or *pronoia*, an estate granted by the emperor in return for military service.¹⁰ Paul Miliukov accepted Nevolin's arguments in an article on Russian feudalism written for the 1902 edition of the *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar* and A.A. Vasiliev agreed in his *History of the Byzantine Empire*.¹¹

The distinguished late medievalist George Vernadsky derived the pomestie from the *pronoia* through the later Ottoman *timar*, an estate granted by the sultan in return for military service.¹² Like the pomeschchik, the timariote had to appear fully equipped and mounted for war and supply additional warriors in proportion to the value of his estate. The terms *pronoia* and *timar* had the connotation of a "care" while the synonym *topion* often used for the *pronoia* was derived from the Greek *topos* (place, locality), which has the same meaning as the Russian *mesto* from which pomestie is derived.¹³

Despite their similarities, there is no direct evidence to link the *pronoia*, *timar* and pomestie.¹⁴ The term pomestie could not have been a translation of *topion* since the adjective *pomestnyi* distinguished the appanage princes from the grand prince in one of Metropolitan Iona's circular letters from 1454, long before Sophia's arrival on 12 November 1472.¹⁵ Searching for the antecedents of the pomestie in the Byzantine *pronoia* and Ottoman *timar* overlooks the existence of conditional landholding before the late fifteenth century. Ivan I's grant (c. 1328) of the village of Bogoroditskoe to a household servant, Borisko Vorkov, for "as long as he continues to serve" indicates the existence of conditional landholding in the early fourteenth century.¹⁶ Servitors received cathedral and monastic lands on a conditional basis during the same period. The pomestie tenure may represent the natural extension of conditional landholding to crown land granted in return for military service rather than Ivan III's conscious imitation of a foreign model.

While some historians sought foreign antecedents for the pomestie, others traced it to appanage Russia. The legal historian Alexander Dmitrievich Gradovsky (1841–1889) derived the pomestie from the concept of supreme proprietorship (*eminent domain*).¹⁷ He credited the Mongols with the introduction of the concept into appanage Russia. Before the Golden Horde, the private property of the Kievan princes coexisted with the allodial property of the boyars. Although the grand and the appanage princes bequeathed their

patrimonies as private property, they did not claim supreme ownership of all the land and its appurtenances. The Mongol conquest placed the Russian princes in the same position as the khan toward their subjects. Since the khan thought of himself as the supreme owner of the entire khanate, the Russian princes decided that they were the proprietors of their principalities as the khan's representative. After the disappearance of the Tatar yoke, the Russian sovereign inherited the khan's authority as the supreme proprietor of the entire tsardom.

By separating the immediate landlord's possession of immovable property from the permanent landlord's ownership, proprietorship enabled landowners to give the use of their lands to second parties without relinquishing control. Since the immediate landlord only had temporary occupancy, the permanent landlord (proprietor) could prevent the alienation of his land to a third party and reoccupy the estate upon the expiration of the immediate landlord's occupancy. Gradovsky's study of western legal institutions strongly influenced his thesis, for he found the distinction between ownership (*proprietas, dominum*) and possession (*seisin*) in the English common law.¹⁸

Although Gradovsky traced proprietorship to the Mongol khanate, a secular institution, he thought the church was the first Russian institution to utilize the concept. He cited Metropolitan Cyprian's confirmation charter (*nastolnaia gramota*) to Archbishop Ioan of Novgorod (1391) to show that clerical lands were inalienable by the fourteenth century, whether laymen had sold or donated them in the name of Christ the Savior or the Blessed Virgin. The charter stated that "whatever settlements and villages and lands and waters and customs that belong to the Church, whether purchased or given in remembrance of a soul, let no Christian interfere with, and whoever interferes God's laws do not bless."¹⁹ Neither the descendants nor collateral heirs could redeem the lands sold or donated to a monastery by their relatives.²⁰ Since these lands were never to be alienated, the church was the permanent landlord.

The conditions governing grants of monastic land to laymen for life support Gradovsky by showing the operation of the concept of inalienability. Zamiatna Vasilievich Likharev, who received the possession of seven hamlets in the Kostroma district from the Trinity-St. Serge monastery for life (1578), had to promise to neither sell, mortgage, nor give the land away as a dowry.²¹ Ivan Vasilievich Veliaminov, who received the abandoned settlement of Kukhovskaia in the Dmitrov district, could not alienate his land either and had to agree to return it, together with all of the grain standing in the field or stored in the granary, to the monastery at his death.²² When Zhdan Andreevich Grinev received the abandoned settlement of Mikhailovo in the Pereiaslavl district, he had to promise to neither alienate nor mortgage the lands for grain or money.²³

Even the sale of monastic land to laymen could not permanently alienate the land from the monastery. The deed received by Ivan Populatov in 1453 after purchasing a village from the Vvdenskii monastery, required him to return the land at his death.²⁴

The inalienability of clerical land supported by the cases cited above convinced Gradovsky of the church's recognition of the concept of proprietorship. Since the land's reversion to the church was the only condition of the monastic grants, however, his derivation of the pomestie from the possession of clerical land for life ignored the service requirement attached to the pomeshchik's possession of his estate.

Michael Ivanovich Gorchakov (1838–1910) tried to avoid the problem by deriving the state pomestie from the prelates' practice of granting cathedral land to their servingmen. The church's extensive land fund and broad jurisdiction required the metropolitans to employ a network of servingmen drawn from the same middle service class gentry as the later state pomeshchiks. The grants of cathedral land given by the metropolitans to their servingmen called "clerical pomesties" by Gorchakov resembled the state pomestie because the income derived from the land supported the servingman's service.²⁵

The émigré historian Vasily Borisovich Eliashevich accepted the connection between the state pomestie and cathedral landholding after comparing the formula used in the cadasters to designate the state pomestie with the one used in the metropolitan's charters for the clerical pomestie. The state cadasters referred to the lands of the "grand prince's volost" granted "in pomestie to . . ." (*velikago kniazia volost . . . v pomestie za*) to designate the state pomestie. The metropolitan's charters stated that the "lands belonging to the Church of the Most Pure Mother of God . . ." the metropolitan "has granted in pomestie . . ." (*zemlia Prechistye Bogoroditsa tserkovnaia . . . a pozhaloval v pomestie*).²⁶

The derivation of the state pomestie from cathedral landholding is weak. The two tenures do resemble each other as conditional grants of land given by the permanent landlord (the grand prince or metropolitan) to members of the middle service class to support their service. However, the reversion of the clerical pomestie to the metropolitan after the landlord's death was the only condition governing the lay servingman's possession of cathedral land. The state pomeshchiks had to provide military service and could lose their estates for failure to serve. The ability of the metropolitans' servingmen to retain their land after leaving service refutes the classification of the "clerical pomestie" as a service tenure.

The use of maintenance (*kormlenie*)²⁷ to compensate the metropolitans' servingmen in the fifteenth century further weakens the connection between the state and clerical pomesties. The practice of granting the metropolitan's

cathedral land as pomesties did not become widespread before 1500, after the introduction of the state pomestie system.²⁸

S.V. Rozhdestvensky traced the origin of the pomestie to leaseholding (*arenda*) in *Service Landholding (Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie)*, the only pre-revolutionary monograph on the subject. The depopulation of the fifteenth century and the fragmentation of their holdings prevented large landowners (monasteries, prelates, princes and boyars) from placing their patrimonial lands under a strong central administration. They tried to solve the problem by dividing their allods into economically self-sufficient estates (sometimes no larger than a single village or hamlet) that could be leased for life, with or without the payment of quitrent.²⁹ The same economic considerations that caused monasteries to lease older lands motivated them to lease newly donated land back to the donor.

Rozhdestvensky cited Kazarin Kherov's acquisition of the villages of Sergeitsovo (1582) and Pirogovo (1598) with their dependent hamlets and abandoned lands (*pustoshi*) in the Tver district to show the economic purpose of leaseholding. He thought the transaction was a lease motivated by the monastery's desire to restore abandoned lands to cultivation because Kherov had to promise to attract peasants to the abandoned lands. If he alienated the property from the monastery or despoiled the land, he had to pay five hundred rubles to the monastery.³⁰

Rozhdestvensky considered Andrew Ushakov's purchase of a village from the metropolitan's New monastery in 1490 a form of leaseholding.³¹ In addition to the purchase price of one and a half rubles, Andrew had to pay an annual quitrent of three chetverts³² of rye and promise to neither merge the village with his own property nor alienate it from the monastery. Although lessees of undonated land usually had possession for one life, Ushakov's village only reverted to the monastery after the disappearance of his family (*izvedetsia rod Andreev*).³³

Rozhdestvensky thought leaseholding resembled the pomestie. Neither the earlier lessees, who were usually the landlord's servingmen, nor later pomeshchiks, who served the Muscovite state, could alienate their lands from the owner. Both had to restore abandoned lands to cultivation and maintain the productivity of the parcels already occupied by the peasants.³⁴

Rozhdestvensky's emphasis on the state's desire to expand the agrarian economy ignores the military purpose of the pomestie. Since the new pomeshchik had to have an immediate income in order to provide cavalry service, Ivan III granted the former lands of the Novgorodian boyars already occupied by dues-paying peasants. The high cost of setting up their household and purchasing horses and weapons would have prevented new pomeshchiks from attracting the additional tenants needed to restore abandoned land.

The new pomeshchik's need for populated lands rather than the abandoned parcels often leased by monasteries caused S.M. Seredonin to reject the connection between leaseholding and the state pomestie system. He pointed out in a review of Rozhdestvensky's monograph published in the May 1897 issue of the *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction (Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia)* that the state only gave populated lands to pomeshchiks before the depopulation of the later sixteenth century.³⁵ The pomeshchiks were reluctant to accept abandoned land before the enserfment of the peasantry in the 1580s enabled them to transfer their peasants from one estate to another and the possession of the pomestie was hereditary in customary law.

After he was unable to uncover any references to the depopulation before 1550 cited by Rozhdestvensky as the motive for the leaseholds, Seredonin denied its existence.³⁶ The failure of contemporaries to notice a significant population decline and the ability to integrate Novgorod and the remaining appanages annexed before 1500 into the early sixteenth century Muscovite state implies a settled peasantry cultivating productive land capable of supporting the state's servingmen.

Other legal historians rejected Rozhdestvensky's derivation of the pomestie system from leaseholding. In the November 1897 issue of *Northern Messenger (Severnii Vestnik)*, S.V. Sergeevich denied the existence of the institution before the Imperial period, when the term *arenda* referred to contracts to lease immovable property.³⁷ Rozhdestvensky's leaseholds were actually grants of monastic land to lay donors. Instead of a lease, the donor of money or immovable property received a grant charter (*dannaia* or *zhalovannaia gramota*) setting out the conditions governing his possession of the monastery's land. Although most donors received their former estates back for life, they could acquire monastic land elsewhere. Some donors reserved the land for their descendants by making the donation contingent on their failure to leave children.³⁸ Others, occasionally, received land capable of alienation by sale, a legal attribute of ownership rather than possession.³⁹ The terms governing the grants were so dissimilar that Sergeevich concluded Rozhdestvensky's leaseholds were actually examples of different conditional tenures. Since service was not a condition, they had little in common with the later state pomestie.⁴⁰

Rozhdestvensky's attempt to link the pomestie with kormlenie also came under attack from the juridical historians. Rozhdestvensky had argued that the parcels given by the princes to their stewards (*kliuchniki* and *poselskie*) were kormlenie because they enabled the palace servants to carry out their duties and reverted to the prince after they left service. He used the passage in the Derevskaia provincial cadaster of 1495, which stated that the grand princes'

hamlets located in the Shegrinsk parish (*pogost*) formerly belonging to Zakhar Ovinov were now held by Gordei Semenovich Sarykhozin “as a *pomestie* and as *kormlenie*,” to support his thesis.⁴¹

Michael Flegontovich Vladimirsky-Budanov (1838–1916) refuted the *kormlenie* thesis in his *Survey of Russian Law (Obzor russkago pravo)* by demonstrating that the vagueness of the passage cited by Rozhdestvensky prevents the historian from determining whether it refers to one or two relationships concerning different hamlets.⁴² The use of *kormlenie* in the fifteenth and the *pomestie* in the sixteenth century to support state service does not prove a connection between the two institutions.

Vladimirsky-Budanov traced the *pomestie* to the conditional possession of secular land in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. He thought the testaments and interprincely treaties of the appanage age proved its emergence from the distribution of the prince’s demesne (the palace land, *dvortsove zemli*, administered by the royal household) to his servingmen in return for service. He cited Ivan I’s grant of Bogoroditskoe to Borisko Vorkov (1328) to show the legal existence of the *pomestie* in the early fourteenth century north-eastern principalities. Vladimirsky-Budanov believed the connection between possession and service justified the use of the term “*pomestie*” despite Vorkov’s status as a minor servant and Bogoroditskoe’s location on the grand prince’s private property.⁴³ Sergeevich accepted Vladimirsky-Budanov’s arguments, observing that the princes had to give part of their private domain to their servants on a conditional basis because they lacked the funds to pay salaries.⁴⁴

Vasily Osipovich Kliuchevsky (1841–1911) gave the most complete version of the palace landholding thesis in his *A Course of Russian History (Kurs russkoi istorii)*. The princes began to distribute their palace lands to their free or unfree servants in the fourteenth century.⁴⁵ The testament of Prince Vladimir Andreevich of Serpukhov (written in 1401 or 1402) demonstrated the conditional nature of the grants. After favoring his eldest son (Prince Ivan) with the equerry office (*koniushii put*), Prince Vladimir extended permission for the servants who did not want to live on their lands to leave, but they had to be freemen and forfeit their land to Prince Ivan.⁴⁶

Kliuchevsky concluded that the state *pomestie* system developed after the free servitors of the Muscovite grand prince lost the right of departure and began to receive state lands subject to service on the same legal basis as the palace land received by the free and unfree palace servants since the fourteenth century.⁴⁷ He cited the codicil to Vasily II’s testament (1462) to show boyars were holding conditional rather than allodial lands after 1450. The two villages in the Kolomna district, Okulovskoye and Repinskoye, earlier granted by his mother, Grand Princess Sophia Vitovtovna, to the boyar Fedor

Basenok were to revert to his consort, Grand Princess Maria Yaroslavna, after Basenok's death.⁴⁸ During the same period, the unfree servitors began to participate in campaigns on the same level as the free servitors and receive grants of state land (pomesties) subject to military service.⁴⁹

Despite his criticism of the juridical school, Kliuchevsky neglected the same social and economic factors contributing to the disappearance of the legal distinction between the free and unfree servitors. By tracing the pomestie to the free servingman's loss of the right of departure and the unfree servant's entry into military service to provide the state with enough cavalymen for its defense, Kliuchevsky also recognized the state as the creator of the pomestie system.

Nicholas Pavlovich Pavlov-Silvansky (1869–1908) was more successful in breaking away from the juridical school. He denied the state's role in the creation of the pomestie system despite his training by the jurist Sergeevich. His comparative studies of western European feudalism convinced him that social and economic conditions caused Russia to develop feudal institutions similar to medieval England and France. The small amount of money in circulation during the appanage age forced the prince to support his servingmen with grants of land cultivated by peasants. The term *zhalovanie* used to designate the grants of palace land made by the crown to its servants in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries had the same meaning as the Latin term for the Western European fief, *beneficium*.⁵⁰ The term *pomestie* referred to the fief after the service became mandatory in the later fifteenth century.⁵¹

The resemblance of the passage in Ivan I's testament to later pomestie charters caused Pavlov-Silvansky to recognize his grant of Bogoroditskoe to Borisko Vorkov as a pomestie.⁵² The hamlet's location in the principality of Rostov (which did not become subordinate to Moscow until the death of Ivan's son-in-law, Prince Fedor Vasilievich, in 1331) showed that the grants of palace land to household servants were so widespread that Ivan could not give Vorkov land in his Muscovite principality. This suggested to Pavlov-Silvansky that he was not the first pomeshchik.

Michael Nikolaevich Tikhomirov (1893–1965), who accepted Pavlov-Silvansky's views on feudalism, traced the pomestie to the twelfth century, when the princes gave palace land (*milosti* or 'favors') to servants known as milostniks (*milostniki*).⁵³ Several passages from twelfth century chronicles connect the milostniks with the prince's servants. The *Novgorod Chronicle* states that Andrew Bogoliubsky (Grand Prince of Vladimir: 1169–1174) was assassinated by his milostniks.⁵⁴ The story also appeared in the *Hypatian Chronicle*, a mid-fifteenth century redaction of the *Primary Chronicle*. The twenty conspirators included "Anbal (Ambal) Yasin the steward" and the other young servants of the prince, led by Peter Kutskov (Kuchkov).⁵⁵

Comparing the Hypatian redaction with the earlier Laurentian version written around 1377 shows the milostniki included stewards (*kliuchniki*). The former recorded the birth of Vladimir Sviatoslavich (St. Vladimir, Grand Prince of Kiev: 980–1015) to Malusha, milostnitsa to Princess Olga. The latter called Vladimir the son of Malusha, Princess Olga's stewardess (*kliuchnitsa*).⁵⁶ Tikhomirov concluded the milostniki were a special category of household servants resembling the unfree ministeriales of Western Europe.⁵⁷

Some sources suggest the 'favors' received by the milostniki were conditional grants resembling the medieval benefice. The second part of the *Expanded Version of the Russian Justice* ("The Statute of Grand Prince Vladimir Monomakh," c. 1113–1125) required a freeman who failed to complete his term of work to return his grant to the prince, but he could not become a slave.⁵⁸ The *Petition of Daniel Zatochnik* addressed to Prince Yaroslav Vsevolodovich of Novgorod stated that every member of the court had his honored place and 'favor'.⁵⁹ Yet neither source refers to a milostnik receiving land. The 'favor' mentioned in Monomakh's statute could have been a loan of money.⁶⁰ The term in Zatochnik's petition could have referred to weapons, grain, or money instead of land. As a result, the twelfth century sources do not support the conclusion that palace servants held conditional grants of princely land before 1300.

Pavlov-Silvansky and Tikhomirov's derivation of the pomestie from palace landholding ignores the connection of the pomestie with military service. The recipients of palace land from the Russian princes were minor servants who only held enough land for one peasant to cultivate without having to perform military service. The use of the pejorative "Borisko" for "Boris" proves Vorkov's status as a minor palace official.⁶¹ The pomeschchiks who received estates from the crown were middle service class servingmen obligated to serve in the cavalry.

The connection of palace landholding and the pomestie with feudalism ignores the differences between medieval Russia and feudal France and England. The military benefice or fief represents Western Europe's response to the breakdown of the sovereign's authority during the disorders accompanying the Viking invasions of the ninth and tenth centuries. The western knights who received the fiefs were cavalymen required to defend the church and local population and render the king forty days of military service a year. The lands occupied by dues-paying peasants given to the knights came from the crown lands rather than the king's private estates. The grants of palace land made by the Russian princes before the creation of the pomestie system in 1480 could not have been military fiefs since the servants were not required to private military service and the land received by the servants came from the princes' private estates. Borisko Vorkov's Bogoroditskoe, for example,

was located on Ivan I's patrimonial land in the principality of Rostov ruled by another prince. The resemblance of the pomestie to the western military fief is clearer since both tenures were subject to military service, but the Russian pomestie was associated with the strong central government established by Ivan III while western fiefs were associated with the weak central governments that survived the Viking invasions.

In an article "From the History of Pomestie Landholding in Russia" (*Iz istorii pomestnogo zemlevladieniia na Rusi*) Alexander Aleksandrovich Zimin derived the pomestie from the state's ability to confiscate "boyar lands."⁶² Zimin found some evidence of confiscations in princely charters and wills. The testament (1477) of Prince Boris of Volok, the younger brother of Ivan III, authorizes the return of the villages, "patrimonial estates," previously confiscated from Fedor Polev and his son Vasily, Andrew Yaropkin and the Bibikovs.⁶³ Prince Michael Andreevich of Beloozero's charter of 17 August 1475 confiscated the hamlet of Ilinskaia given by the boyar Ivan Aleksandrovich Knutov to St Cyril's monastery without his permission.⁶⁴

Zimin cited the litigation between local peasants and St Simon's monastery concerning Timothy Dubin's donation of Kuzemkino to the monastery to prove his thesis. The monastery was able to present a charter from the Grand Princess Sophia Vitovtovna (Vasily I's consort) granting the village to Dubin "as boyar land" and authorizing its donation to the monastery.⁶⁵ The records of the case, however, document the same peasants' attempt to claim possession of another parcel of "boyar land" located in the village of Dernkovo allegedly donated by a certain Vasily Mikhailovich Morozov to the same monastery. Instead of arguing that Dernkovo's donation did not have the state's permission, the peasants denied Morozov's prior ownership of the village.⁶⁶ The citation of the litigation to prove the crown's restriction of the right to alienate boyar land is therefore weak.

Since the term "boyar land" did not refer exclusively to patrimonial estates in the fifteenth century, the cases cited by Zimin do not prove that patrimonial landowners required the crown's permission to dispose of their holdings.⁶⁷ Landowners who had sworn allegiance to the prince could lose their estates and even their lives if they transferred their allegiance to and entered the service of another ruler. Ivan III's testament (1504) stipulated the forfeiture of the patrimonial estate of Lukh granted to Prince Fedor Ivanovich Belsky and his children if they left the crown's service.⁶⁸ However, Veselovsky convincingly argued that the oath sworn by Prince Belsky referred to the subject's subordination to and dependence on his sovereign and not an obligation to perform a specific service.⁶⁹ Unless the patrimonial landowner violated his oath by transferring his allegiance to another ruler (the grand prince of Lithuania, for example) he retained the full authority to

dispose of his patrimony. Since pomeshchiks lost their pomesties for failure to serve the crown, the connection between patrimonial landholding and the state pomestie is tenuous.

The weak connection with earlier tenures caused the distinguished medievalist Lev Vladimirovich Cherepnin (1905–1979) to connect the pomestie to the rise of the centralized state in the reign of Ivan III.⁷⁰ During the late fifteenth century, the peasants began to produce commodities for market and pay part of their dues in money.⁷¹ The rising value of land enabled Ivan III and his successors to support the gentry with conditional grants of land known as pomesties. Since the gentry defended the state and supported the crown against the older boyar aristocracy, which wanted to prevent the centralization of the state to preserve its immunities, the pomestie was a progressive institution.⁷²

Other twentieth century historians resembled Karamzin by emphasizing Ivan III's personal role in the creation of the pomestie. K.V. Bazilevich considered Ivan III the creator of the pomestie because the term first appeared in the late fifteenth century cadasters, which were prepared in his reign to determine the ability of the former Novgorod boyars' patrimonial land to support the newly settled Muscovite servingmen and former unfree servants.⁷³ S.V. Veselovsky called attention to the extensive lands in Novgorod, Riazan and Tver that passed to the crown during the later fifteenth century. The pomestie system began when Ivan III utilized the land fund to support the servingmen who defended the state.⁷⁴

THE TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE EARLY POMESTIE

Despite their disagreements on the origins of the pomestie, most historians have accepted the traditional view of the evolution of the pomestie from an inalienable possession conditioned by military service in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries into an allod capable of being exchanged, mortgaged, sold or bequeathed by will after 1550. Although Rozhdestvensky conceded the failure to resolve the problem of the inheritability of the pomestie in the sixteenth century, he concluded from the surviving Novgorod charters that the transference of the pomestie from father to son became customary after 1550.⁷⁵ The charters and testaments of the period show the servingmen's efforts to keep their pomesties in the family. The testator of a will written in the year 7040 (1532) ordered his executor to petition the crown not to take his pomestie from his wife and young son.⁷⁶ When the brothers Leonty and Zinoviy Kalitin divided their father's patrimonial estate in 7055 (1547), each received a small village, but Leonty also received his father's pomestie, the

small village of Grigorievskoe with its hamlets in the Mozhaisk district.⁷⁷

Western historians accepted the traditional view of the pomestie's development. In *Lord and Peasant in Russia from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century*, Jerome Blum argued that the pomestie began as a conditional tenure characterized by "temporary occupancy and non-heritability" because the pomeshchiks lost their lands for failing to provide military service.⁷⁸ The figures of N.A. Rozhkov, a pre-revolutionary historian, were cited to show the high rate of turnover, accelerated by the oprichnina and other disasters of the second half of the sixteenth century. In an (unnamed) district of Novgorod, only half of the 328 pomesties listed in the cadaster of 1500 were recorded under the same person or a close relative in 1539; in later sixteenth century Pskov, only sixty-one of the 394 pomesties remained in the same family by 1587.⁷⁹ Blum's recognition of the growing practice of allowing sons and nephews to take over the pomeshchik's service in the first half of the sixteenth century, which he calls "customary," is remarkable. If the rate of turnover was as high as Rozhkov's figures suggest, most estates would have passed to other families. Blum concluded the pomestie did not resemble from the votchina until the seventeenth century, when pomeshchiks exchanged land without prior permission and bequeathed their estates to their heirs.⁸⁰

Richard Hellie argued that the passage of pomesties to the pomeshchik's direct heirs became customary in the second half of the sixteenth century and cited Storozhev's⁸¹ reference to a 1555 decree banning the confiscation of a late father's pomestie if the son was capable of serving. After the state banned the transfer of pomesties to other families in 1611, 1613, 1614 and 1618, the inheritability of the pomestie was formally codified in statutory law through the Law Code of 1649 (*Ulozhenie*).⁸² The acceptance of the practice shows the new Romanov dynasty's recognition of the need for the gentry's support. The decrees of 1613, 1614 and 1618 were promulgated during the first decade of Michael I's reign (1613–1645), when Russia's medieval Parliament, the Assembly of the Land (*Zemskii sobor*), was almost continually in session and the *Ulozhenie* was the product of the Assembly of 1649.

In the last twenty-five years of the twentieth century, Russian historians reassessed the development of the pomestie. Yu. G. Alekseev and A.I. Kopanav agreed that the pomestie evolved from conditional into allodial property as the scope of the pomeshchik's ability to dispose of his estate broadened in the sixteenth century.⁸³ Their examples from the late fifteenth century showed that it was not unprecedented for the state to transfer a pomestie from one pomeshchik to another or to return pomesties to the status of crown land.⁸⁴ However, the passage of the vast majority of the estates from father to son, even in the earliest developmental stage of the pomestie system, caused them

to reject the sharp distinction between the pomestie as the conditional, non-hereditary estate of a servingman from the middle service class and the votchina as the hereditary property of the boyar. The presence of boyars among the early pomeshchiks and the extension of the service obligation to the patrimonial landlords after Ivan IV's Service Decree support their thesis.⁸⁵

A. Ya. Degtiarev's reassessment of N.A. Rozhkov's thesis on the connection between the conditional nature of the pomestie and the economic crisis of the later sixteenth century caused him to conclude that the pomestie was already hereditary in customary if not statutory law in the early sixteenth century. Rozhkov had argued that the transference of estates from family to family prevented the landholder from economically developing his land.⁸⁶ In a 1978 article, Degtiarev convincingly demonstrated that Rozhkov's failure to consider the interval of time between the descriptions of the various districts in the cadasters invalidated his comparison of the rate of turnover of pomesties from one family to another before and after 1550.⁸⁷

By using an index of utilization representing the annual rate of turnover of pomesties from family to family, Degtiarev found that the government transferred fewer estates to other families before 1550. In the Vodenskaia province, for example, the index of utilization for pomesties was 1.25 percent in the first and 4.4 percent in the second half of the sixteenth century.⁸⁸ In the Tver half of the Bezhetskaia province, the index of utilization was 0.23 percent in the first and 1.6 percent in the second half of the century.⁸⁹

Degtiarev also criticized Rozhkov for attributing the rate of utilization of pomesties to its conditional nature in law. He observed that the index of utilization for patrimonial estates after 1550 resembled the index of utilization for pomesties; in the Moscow district, for example, the index of utilization for votchina between 1565 and 1585 was 2.4 percent while the index for pomesties between 1559 and 1584 was three percent.⁹⁰ The indices cited by Degtiarev show that the degree of utilization of the pomestie was unrelated to its juridical nature.

Degtiarev found few instances of the despoliation implied by Rozhkov's thesis that the frequent shuffling around of pomesties prevented landlords from becoming interested in developing the economic potential of their land.⁹¹ The length of time pomeshchiks held their estates actually precluded such despoliation. Seventy percent of the pomeshchiks in the Toropets district held the same pomesties in 1504 and 1539 while in the Tver half of the Bezhetskaia province 33.6 percent of the pomesties between 1500 and 1545 had the same landlord and another 38.8 percent had passed to a direct descendant of the late pomeshchik.⁹² The petitions asking for the return of confiscated land instead of new pomesties support Degtiarev's thesis.⁹³

In an article on the establishment of the pomestie system published in 1980, V.B. Kobrin denied the traditional distinction between the votchina as an hereditary and the pomestie as an inalienable, conditional estate.⁹⁴ He used Degtiarev's indices of the utilization of pomestie land to demonstrate its hereditary character from the beginning of the system.⁹⁵ The record of the litigation between the Dudin Monastery at Nizhny-Novgorod and the grandsons of Semen Skariatin (1555) supports Kobrin. Semen's descendants still held the same pomestie given to his sons forty-one years earlier.⁹⁶

Kobrin's research demonstrated the hereditary nature of the pomestie in the center of the state during the first half of the sixteenth century. Indeed, the first generation of pomeshchiks was more likely to pass on their estates to their sons, brothers, or cousins than the servingmen of the last half of the sixteenth century.⁹⁷ Despite their validity, Kobrin's conclusions cannot be applied to the rest of the Muscovite state before a thorough study of the pomestie elsewhere.

The reassessment of the traditional view of the development of the sixteenth century pomestie undertaken by Alekseev, Kopanев, Degtiarev and Kobrin underscores the need to reexamine the relationship between the pomestie and votchina. If the pomestie could be inherited by the pomeshchiks' descendants, his heirs at law, and alienated by the pomeshchik without the consent of the crown from the beginning, the sharp distinction between the pomestie as conditional and the votchina as allodial property drawn by earlier historians is invalid.

THE NOVGORODIAN POMESTIE

The study of the pomestie after the annexation of the former republic of Novgorod is important because the first pomesties were granted in Shelonskaia and Vodskaia provinces in the 1480s. The surviving cadasters, almost all of which have been published, allow the historian to trace the tenure's evolution through the first century of its existence, long enough for the development of legal norms. Comparing the conclusions reached from the study of north-western Russia with Kobrin's research on the central region reveals the degree to which the Novgorod pomestie was part of a national system of military landholding regulated by the same norms.

Shelonskaia and Vodskaia provinces had the highest concentration of pomesties during the sixteenth century.⁹⁸ In the late fifteenth century almost half of Shelonskaia's and more than half of the Vodskaia's land were in pomestie tenure.⁹⁹ At the end of the sixteenth century pomeshchiks held 56.4% of the

Shelonskaia land and 39.6% of the Vodskaia lands remaining in the Muscovite state after the Livonian War.¹⁰⁰ Although the extensive later fifteenth century survey of Derevskaia province shows 45.2% of the land was held as pomesties in 1500, the few surviving sixteenth century cadasters indicate the decline of the percentage to 25% by 1582.¹⁰¹ Pomeshchiks may have held as much as 44% of Bezhetskaia province, but the small number of surviving cadasters (thirteen volosts of one parish) may not be representative.¹⁰² The largely unpublished sixteenth century cadasters show that the percentage of land held in pomestie declined to 37.6% by the 1580s.¹⁰³ Ivan III retained most of the estates confiscated from the boyars of Obonezhskaia province as obrok-paying crown land. His successors continued the policy, for the first pomesties were not granted in the province until the middle of the sixteenth century. By 1582 pomeshchiks still held less than a quarter of Obonezhskaia's arable land.¹⁰⁴

THE CADASTERS AND THE POMESTIE

This study relies on the cadasters (land registers) that survive from the general and revisionary censuses conducted in Shelonskaia and Vodskaia provinces during the sixteenth century. The Shelonskaia cadasters, all of which were published in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, cover the general censuses of 1498 and 1539, the revisionary census of 1552, the Novgorod district census of 1571 and the Porkhov area census of 1576. The Vodskaia cadasters cover the general censuses of 1498, 1540, and 1582. The cadasters, which were called "the clerks' books" (*pistsovye knigi*) or the "sokha register" (*soshnoe pismo*), were used to assess direct taxes. The first were compiled in 1257 by the census-takers (*chislenniki*) sent by the Tatar Khan Berke to assess the tribute (*dan'*). The records of the "new census" conducted on the territory of the five provinces of the former Novgorodian republic at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, however, represent the earliest surviving cadasters.¹⁰⁵ The exact date of the census is unknown. The title of the Vodskaia cadaster gives the Muscovite year 7008 since the creation (1500 A.D.), but the text indicates that Koporie district was surveyed in the autumn of 1498 while the Orekhov and Ladoga districts could not have been covered before 1500 or 1501 at the earliest.¹⁰⁶

The periodic censuses of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were motivated by military considerations. Since the government lacked the financial resources to pay its military servingmen, it had to grant pomesties occupied by dues-paying peasants. To insure that the pomeshchiks had enough income to serve, the state periodically surveyed the income producing appurtenances

on their estates. The number of male peasants, households, bushels of rye sown, bales of hay mowed, and dues paid by the peasants were important indices of the income-producing ability of the land. The census-takers (*pistsy*) included one or two state secretaries (*diaki*) and their undersecretaries (*pod-diachie*). Their ability to exercise the plenary administrative and judicial authority of the crown enabled them to decide which land should be distributed to new pomeshchiks incapable of being supported from their family's lands or given to old pomeshchiks in addition to their earlier holdings.¹⁰⁷

The census-takers were able to give immunities from taxation. Before 1550, peasants received tax exemptions for residing in a *pochinok* (pl., *pochinki*), a new settlement founded by the landlord in the forest, and bringing unused lands into cultivation. During the severe economic crisis of the later sixteenth century, the census-takers gave tax immunities for a specific number of years to peasants unable to pay taxes to the state or obrok to the landlord.¹⁰⁸

The introduction to the cadaster of State Secretary Volodimer Matveevich Bezobrazov (1576) illustrates the conduct of a sixteenth century census. The tsar ordered the Pskov state secretaries, Inozem Zhikhorev and Vesniak Msholin, to authorize Bezobrazov to conduct a general census of the crown lands, pomesties, and monastic estates located in the Porkhov district of the neighboring Shelonskaia province. After receiving their commission Bezobrazov, his colleague Msholin, and their assistant Petrusha Ivanov traveled to Porkhov, the district's administrative center, to hold court as circuit judges. They asked the community leaders (the abbot and the elder and his assistants) to "kiss the cross" (*tselovanie*) and tell to whom the villages, hamlets, new settlements and their appurtenances belonged. The priests and deacons had to bring along all the landholding records in their possession.¹⁰⁹

Calling the survey conducted between 1495 and 1505 the "new census" distinguished it from the "old census" conducted in the same region in the early 1480s. The exact date of the old census is unknown because the cadastral books are lost and other sources do not refer to it. Although K.A. Nevolin placed the first census of Novgorod in the early 1490s, its proximity to the beginning of the new census caused other historians to support an earlier date. L.V. Danilova proposed 1478, the beginning of the first confiscation of boyar lands and enfeoffment of Muscovite servingmen.¹¹⁰ Despite the loss of the old census books, the cadasters from the new census frequently incorporate the earlier information on the peasants' obligations to the former landlord. The deficiencies in the work of the clerks who surveyed the individual volosts (rural subdivisions of the district) at different times and without clear instructions from Moscow are evident from the old records incorporated into the new cadastral books.¹¹¹ Despite their defects the government recognized the

cadasters of the “old census” as a verifiable juridical document and advised pomeshchiks to levy dues based on the customary rent paid by the old peasants. Ivan III’s pomestie charter of 27 July 1482 authorized Erema and Mitia Trusov Vorobin to take obrok in kind and money “as of old” (*po starine*).¹¹²

The cadaster of Matvei Ivanovich Valuev is the basic source for the study of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Shelonskaia pomestie. The cadaster, prepared between 1498 and 1504, records the returns from sixty-nine of the province’s seventy-three parishes.¹¹³ The cadaster compiled by Dmitry Kitaev between 1498 and 1501 records fifty-seven of the fifty-nine parishes of the Vodskaia province.¹¹⁴ The government was interested in the changes in landholding caused by the breakup and distribution of the patrimonial estates of the Novgorod boyars to the Muscovite gentry as pomesties. The clerks recorded the total number of households (*dvory*), peasants (*liudi*), bushels of rye (*korobi*), bales of hay (*kopny*), tax units (*obzhi*), and income from the “old census” along with the corresponding totals from the new census.

The sums calculated by the clerks conducting the new census were not always accurate. While the assistance of local juries and the previous cadasters prevented serious errors in determining the amount of arable land, the clerks’ limited knowledge of arithmetic was sometimes a problem. They were only familiar with the simplest fractions and could not add and subtract fractions with different denominators. Despite these deficiencies, the cadasters were generally accurate and complete. The peasants’ usual inclination to conceal as much arable land and related appurtenances as possible from the clerks was countered by the pomeshchik’s desire to have the clerks record everything subject to taxation that determined his income and landholding rights.¹¹⁵

The cadaster compiled by Gregory Sobakin between 1539 and 1541 is the basic source for the study of Shelonskaia landholding in the first half of the century.¹¹⁶ The clerks recorded the returns for the pomeshchik’s *dacha* (the part of his claim actually received) under the parish where his manor house (*bolshoi dvor*) was located. Each entry gave the volost or rural district where the pomestie was located, usually named after the former Novgorod boyar who held the land before the Muscovite conquest. The name of the former landlord who resided on the estate in 1500 came after the Christian name, patronymic, and surname of current pomeshchik. The returns from the villages and hamlets located in the same parish as the manor were first, then the old hamlets located in other parishes and the new hamlets (*pridacha*) received in addition to the *dacha*. The total villages and hamlets, households, peasants, bushels of rye sown in one field, bales of hay mowed, and tax units assigned to the estate were next. The entry concluded with a detailed description of the dues annually paid in kind and money by the peasants. The entries also re-

ferred to the exchange of pomesties between pomeshchiks and donations of pomesties to a church or monastery. This information is especially significant since it suggests that the lords could alienate their pomesties like an allod.

The cadaster covering the half of Vodskaia province surveyed by Semen Klushin and Shemet Rezanov in 1540–1541 is the basic source for the study of the pomestie system's development in the northwestern part of the former Novgorod republic before 1550.¹¹⁷ The twenty-four parishes with published returns represent more than eighty percent of the returns surviving from the cadaster. The Vodskaia cadasters differ from Shelonskaia's by giving both the 1498 and 1540 dues paid by the peasants of each hamlet, with the total for the entire estate appearing at the end of each entry. This is especially valuable for figuring the equivalency of the exchanges of pomesties made between 1480 and 1540.

Abramovich convincingly argued the cadasters compiled between 1536 and 1545 were as accurate as the new census conducted at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.¹¹⁸ The small incidence of tax evasion through the concealment of taxable lands and their appurtenances discovered by the clerks who conducted the revisionary census (*pripravochnaia perepis*) of 1551–53 shows the accuracy of the earlier cadasters. State Secretary Fedor Neledinsky uncovered the concealment of only three hamlets on four tax units, representing 0.09 percent of the arable land in the quarter of Bezhet-skaia which he reviewed during the census. The fifty hamlets concealed by the Resurrection (*Voskresensky*) monastery were an exception. The local jurors blamed the census-taker Ivan Veliaminov, who supervised the last census.¹¹⁹ Their testimony implied bribery since Veliaminov had visited the area of the hamlets' location during the last general census, more than decade earlier.¹²⁰

In 1551, Tsar Ivan IV and the Church Council (which produced the collection of decisions known as the *Stoglav* or "Hundred Chapters") ordered a general census of the Muscovite land. Since the cadasters are lost, the records of the revisionary census (*pripravochnye knigi*) form the basis for the study of the mid-sixteenth century Shelonskaia pomestie. Fragments of the cadasters of Ivan Beleutov, Alexis Zherebtsov, and Mikita Kuzmin survive. The pomesties recorded in the cadaster of Alexis Zherebtsov cover nine parishes in two districts. The Porkhov district parishes include Obluchie, Vyshgorod, Smolna, and Zhedrity; the Novgorod District parishes include Retno, Skniatinsk-on-the-Porozhe, Mustsa, Svinort, and Strupinsk.¹²¹

The returns for the pomesties are shorter than earlier censuses' were, omitting information on the individual hamlets and villages. Since the census was revisionary, the clerks were interested in changes occurring in the fourteen-year interval between 1539 and 1552, which represented the period between

infancy and the beginning of military service. On the one hand, the sons of the pomeshchiks of 1539 had recently begun or were now entering military service. On the other hand, many of the pomeshchiks of 1539 were approaching the retirement age of sixty. Others had died, leaving their pomesties to their heirs. Some had died without heirs (intestate), after which the state regranted the land to other servingmen. The state had to record these changes to be sure that the northern landlords had enough land to serve. This was especially important in the early 1550s when the tsar was planning campaigns against the Tatar khanates (Kazan would fall in 1552, Astrakhan in 1556).

Although the state needed to secure the service of its northern lords with adequate pomesties, a comprehensive census recording every peasant homestead and tax unit was unnecessary. The complete census conducted only fourteen years earlier had shown little change in the pattern of landholding since 1500: the same families held the same land in 1539 they were holding in 1500. Another complete census would have been impractical because of the landlords' absence on the spring and summer campaign during the survey.

The cadaster of Yanysh Muraviev (1571) is the most important source for the study of the later sixteenth century pomestie in Shelonskaia's Novgorod district. It describes eight parishes (St Peter's, Shchepetsk, Bystreevsk, Dremiatsk, Lositsk, Sabelsk, Belsky, and Liadtsk) and the Ivangorod area (*Ivangorodskoe okologorod*). The loss of the 1539 returns prevents tracing the pomestie's possession from generation to generation. The failure of the abridged cadaster of 1498 to record the names of the hamlets and the complete cadaster of 1571 to refer to the volosts prevents the definite classification of all but a few estates whose returns refer to the former landlord.¹²² The presence of the same families in the same parishes can be determined by comparing the surnames of the pomeshchiks of 1498 and 1571. The results provide a valid index of the continuity of possession, the degree to which old families prefer to remain on their ancestors' lands. The seventy-year interval between the censuses, however, is sufficient for a pomeshchik from a second family to pass his lands to his children and grandchildren. This causes the index to underestimate the number of pomesties remaining in the same family for more than a generation.

The cadaster of Volodimer Matveevich Bezobrazov (1576), which describes the town of Porkhov and thirteen parishes, is the main source for the study of the later sixteenth century pomestie in the Porkhov district of Shelonskaia province.¹²³ The omitted parishes (Vysotsk, Yasno, Obluchie, Vyshgorod, and Zhedritsy) were located in the southern part of the district between the Shelon River and the Shelonskaia provincial boundary. Some of the parish returns are incomplete. The returns from Porkhov at the beginning and from

Ruchaisk parish at the end of the cadaster are fragmentary, which prevents a comparison with earlier censuses. The entries for the pomeshchiks Zhdan Bobrov and Maksim Shishkin, who resided in the Porkhov area (*Porkhovskoe okologorod*), were also fragmentary.¹²⁴ Several sheets also have been lost in the middle of the cadaster, which caused the returns for the Opotsk pomeshchik Andrew Vypovsky, the Degozhsk pomeshchik Yury Tyrtov, and the Karachunsk pomeshchiks Vasily Pleshcheev and Gregory Tsypilev to be incomplete.¹²⁵ Fortunately, these cases represent less than three percent of the 239 pomesties recorded in the cadaster.

Unlike earlier censuses, the Bezobrazov cadasters lack a standard formula. Most of the parishes' returns give the hamlets, farms, peasants, and amount of grain sown in one field. Others only list the pomeshchiks and total amount of living and abandoned arable land. The *obzha*, a measure of the number of tax units assigned to the pomestie, is replaced by the *vyt*, a measure of land area.¹²⁶ The pomeshchiks' absence after the devastation caused by the oprichnina explains the use of the *vyt*. Most were gone, their lands abandoned. The notation "confiscated by the sovereign" at the beginning of some pomeshchiks' returns indicates forcible eviction. Dmitry Tatianin's old Pazherevitsy pomestie is an example.¹²⁷ Others may have left because of a general order to vacate their pomesties. The last paragraph of seven parishes attributes the peasants' inability to give the census-takers information on the pomeshchiks' oklad to the tsar's order to the pomeshchiks to leave their estates.¹²⁸ Since the last paragraphs of the Karachunsk, Bolchino and Ruchie returns do not survive, there are only three known cases (Smolna, St Michael and St George's, and Dubrovno) where the notation was definitely absent. Since the former landlords had abandoned or lost most of the pomesties, which now belonged to the state, the census-takers were interested more in the arable land than the total tax units. They preferred the *vyt*, which traditionally measured land area on the crown and black lands of the north, to the *obzha*.¹²⁹

The cadaster of Elizar Saryi, Samson Dmitriev, and Semen Kiselev the Clerk is the only published source on Vodskaiia landholding after 1550.¹³⁰ Although the beginning of the cadaster gives 1582 as the date of the census, the actual year of completion was 1584. The last part of the cadaster refers to the enfeoffment of the Pernovsk pomeshchik Semen Mikhailov syn Muraviev in the Opolitsk parish of the Yamskoi judicial district in 1577. The reference was in a memorandum sent to Elizar Saryi from Yury Neledinsky on 13 February 7091.¹³¹ Since the Russian year 7091 since the creation began 1 September 1583, the memorandum dates from 1584.

The cadaster of 1582 covers twenty Novgorod and three Ladoga parishes located along the Volkhov River in the eastern section of the province, the

only area still in the Muscovite state after the Livonian War. The operation of the Livonian forces in the area precluded a survey of the thirteen parishes around Oreshek and Lake Ladoga. The remaining twenty-five parishes in the Korela, Koporie, and Yama districts held by the Livonians were no longer part of the Muscovite state after 1582.¹³² The original cadaster also contains returns from eight of the thirteen Orekhov parishes, surveyed in 1582, two years after the truce with Poland negotiated by the Jesuit Antonio Possevino.¹³³

I. Beliaev's abridgment, which appeared in 1850 in the sixth volume of the *Annals (Vremennik) of the Moscow University Society of History and Russian Antiquities*, is the only published version of the cadaster. The abridgment includes samples of the returns from the old and new pomesties still held by pomeshchiks, abandoned pomesties not yet assigned to new pomeshchiks, and abandoned pomesties now administered as crown land. It records the total lords, manors, and tax units for each category of pomestie, followed by the abandoned holdings of the petty landowners (*zemtsy*) and the returns from monastic votchinas for each parish. The total for all twenty-three parishes surveyed by Staryi, Dmitriev, and Kiselev follows.¹³⁴ The editor included parts of the returns, usually the total lords, manors, and tax units, for at least one estate in each category of pomestie in each parish. He occasionally cites the hamlet where the lord's manor was located. The totals for the individual parishes permit the calculation of the percentage of tax units belonging to each category of pomestie and provide an index of the unstable economic conditions of the later sixteenth century.

The cadasters from the censuses conducted between 1495 and 1582 show the degree to which the conditional pomestie resembled the allodial votchina. Tracing the possession of each pomestie from census to census is important because the lord's ability to pass his landed heritage to his descendants from generation to generation defines patrimonial landholding. Searching the cadasters for references to relatives who could have inherited the estates that did not remain in the family after the pomeshchik's death is also significant. The absence of references to other family members implied the landlord's death without heirs caused the transference of the land to another family. The cases of escheat (the estate's reversion to the state after the demise of an intestate landlord) did not disprove the pomestie's inheritability.

It was necessary to trace the sources of the pridachas, additional land received by pomeshchiks who did not earn enough from their old lands to continue service, to determine whether the land earlier belonged to other family members. This is an important index of the allodial character of the pomestie since the practice of giving other relatives' lands as pridachas recognizes the family's legal interest in the land.

A search of the cadasters for references to the exchange, sale, or donation of pomesties without the government's prior approval was also required. Since the ability to alienate one's land is an attribute of ownership exercised by patrimonial landlords, the pomeshchik's ability to exchange, sell or donate land without the state's prior approval is additional evidence that the state treated the conditional pomestie like an allodial votchina as long as the pomeshchik and his heirs served the crown.

NOTES

1. On the use of *dvoriane* and *deti boiarskie* to refer to the gentry serving in the cavalry after 1433, see L.V. Cherepnin, *Obrazovanie russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva v XIV-XV vekakh. Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Rusi* (Moscow, 1960), p. 756.

2. For definitions of *pomestie*, *votchina*, and other important Russian historical terms, see Sergei M. Pushkarev, ed., *Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917* (New Haven, 1970), pp. 93, and 181–82.

3. On the *svoezemets*, a late fifteenth century petty landowner also known as the *zemets* (pl. *zemtsy*), see G. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (Hew Haven, 1948) p. 167, and Jerome Blum, *Lord and Peasant* (New York, 1969), pp. 77, 101. The cadasters indicate the *zemets* was becoming an anachronism by the mid-sixteenth century.

4. On the number of *dvoriane* serving in the cavalry between 1550 and 1650, see Richard Hellie, *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy* (Chicago and London, 1971), pp. 24, 267–73.

5. The one hundred chetverts in each of three fields represented approximately four hundred acres. On the *chetvert'* as a land measure (which equalled 1.35 acres or half a *desiatin*), see Pushkarev, pp. 7–8.

6. On the Service Decree, see *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei (PSRL)*, (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1846–1968), 13: 268–69. Also, see the discussion in Hellie, *Enserfment* pp. 38 and 290 n. 112; Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime* (New York, 1978), p. 96; and Blum, *Lord and Peasant*, pp. 141–42. The number of servingmen who answered the tsar's summons without their full equipment may have been a serious problem in the early seventeenth century. The Great Sovereign and Patriarch Filaret Nikitich (who managed the affairs of state for his son, Tsar Michael Fedorovich, from 1619 to 1633) decreed in 1625 that servingmen could not mortgage their clothing and weapons; see Hellie, *Enserfment* p. 290 n. 113. For Filaret's decree see *Akty Moskovskogo gosudarstva, (AMG)*, edited by N.A. Popov (St. Petersburg, 1890–1901), 1: no. 199. The high cost of the equipment relative to the pomeshchik's income from his estate aggravated the problem. Although the average estate provided the lord with a cash income of five to eight rubles in the second half of the sixteenth century, a horse cost three rubles, a cavalryman's weapons cost one ruble, and his clothing cost two rubles. See the discussion in Pipes, *ibid*, p. 175,

based on the estimates of Alexander Eck, *Le moyen age russe* (Paris, 1933), p. 233, and N. Khlebnikov, *O vliianii obshchestva na organizatsiiu gosudarstva v tsarskii period russkoi istorii* (St. Petersburg, 1869), pp. 31–32.

7. On the Service Land Chancery, see Hellie, *Enserfment* p. 37. On the Military Chancery, which emerged as a separate administrative unit with its own staff of secretaries in the 1530s, see A.K. Leontiev, *Obrazovanie prikaznoi sistemy upravleniia v russkom gosudarstve* (Moscow, 1961), pp. 73–116. Also, see A.A. Zimin, *Reformy Ivana Groznogo. Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii Rossii serediny XVI v.* (Moscow, 1960), p. 450. Although the records of the Service Land Chancery perished in the Moscow fire of 1626, the service records, which give the pomeshchik's service appointments and position at court ceremonies, do survive. For the records from the late fifteenth century and first half of the sixteenth century, see *Razriadnaia kniga 1475–1598 gg.*, edited by V.I. Buganov (Moscow, 1966). Additional records from the last half of the sixteenth century are in *Razriadnaia kniga 1559–1605 gg.*, edited by V.I. Buganov (Moscow, 1974).

8. Karamzin, Alexander I's "official historiographer," received an annual pension of two thousand rubles to write his comprehensive history in 1803.

9. See N.M. Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo*, VI (St. Petersburg, 1842), p. 213, and *Zapiska o drevnoi i novoi Rossii* (St. Petersburg, 1914).

10. On the Grand Princess Sophia's influence on Ivan III and on the Byzantine *topion*, see K.A. Nevolin, *Istoriia rossiiskikh zakonov*, II (St. Petersburg, 1851), p. 195. On the *topion* (*pronoia*) also see: Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "Feudalism' in the Byzantine Empire," in Rushton Coulborn, ed., *Feudalism in History* (Hamden, Connecticut, 1965), pp. 160–64; Cyril Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (New York, 1980), pp. 53–54 and 288 n. 64; G. Ostrogorsky, "Die Pronoia unter den Komnenen," *Zbornik Radova Vizant. Instituta*, XII (1970), pp. 41–54; and A.A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire, 324–1453* (Madison, 1952), pp. 566–70. Alexis I (r. 1081–1118) made the first known grant of a *pronoia*, an estate and dependent peasants (*paroikoi*), to a knight on condition of military service; see Mango, *ibid.*, p. 53. The *pronoetes* could not sell, bequeath, or otherwise alienate his estate until the reign of Michael VIII Paleologue (1259–1282); see Kantorowicz, *ibid.*, p. 164.

11. See Pavel Miliukov, "Feudalizm v Rossi (v severo-vostochnoi Rusi)" in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, edited by F.A. Brokgauz and I.A. Efron (St. Petersburg, 1902), pp. 548–50. Also, see Vasiliev, p. 569.

12. George Vernadsky, "On Some Parallel Trends in Russian and Turkish History," in *Trans. of the Conn. Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXXVI (July 1945), 33–34. See also J. Deny, "Timar," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 4 (1934), pp. 767–76. Like the pomeshchik, the timariotes had to appear fully equipped and mounted for war and supply additional warriors in proportion to the value of his estate. The timariotes whose estates yielded an annual income of 6000 aspers had to bring one fully equipped horseman and an additional horseman for each 3000 aspers of extra income. See Albert H. Lybyer, *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent* (New York, 1966), p. 101.

13. Vernadsky, *ibid.*

14. See M. Szeftel's observation in "Aspects of Feudalism in Russian History" in Coulborn, p. 182 n. 16.

15. V.O. Kliuchevsky, *Sochineniia*, II (Moscow, 1957), p. 216.

16. The passage in Ivan I's testament on the granting of the village of Bogoroditskoe to Borisko Vorkov is the first known reference to the conditional holding of princely land. For the wording of Ivan I's grant to Vorkov, see L.V. Cherepnin and S.V. Bakhrushin, ed., *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV-XVI vv.*, (DDG) (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), pp. 9–11. The passage reads, "A chto esm' kupli selo v Rostove Bogorodichskoe, a dal esm' Borisku Vor"kovu, azhe imet' synu moemu kotoromu sluzhiti, selo budet za nim', ne imet' li sluzhiti detem moim, selo otoimut." ("And concerning the village of Bogoroditskoe in Rostov, which I purchased, I have given it to Borisko Vorkov, as long as he serves my sons, the village will be his; if he does not serve my children, he will forfeit the village.") On the date of Ivan's testament, which was written sometime between 1328 and 1339, see L.V. Cherepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy XIV-XV vekov*, I (Moscow, 1951), pp. 12–16. A reliable translation of the complete will is given in H.C. Howes, *The Testaments of the Grand Princes of Moscow* (Ithaca, 1967), p. 116.

17. A.D. Gradovsky, *Sobranie sochinenii*, II (St Petersburg, 1899), p. 149–51. On Gradovsky as a juridical historian, see Anatole G. Mazour, *Modern Russian Historiography* (New York, 1958), p. 112.

18. On the distinction between possession and ownership, see Sir Frederick Pollock and Frederic W. Maitland. *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*, 2nd. Edition. (Cambridge, 1968), I, pp. 2, 6, and 7 and 33–35 as well as Bryce Lyon, *A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England* (New York, 1960), pp. 292–94.

19. See Metropolitan Cyprian's charter in *Akty istoricheskie, sobrannyya i izdaniya Arkheograficheskoiu kommissiei* (AI), I (St. Petersburg, 1841), p. 16. The passage reads: "A chto pogosty i sela i zemli i vody i poshliny, chto potiaglo k Tserkvi Bozh'i, ili kupli, ili shto dal" po dushi pamiati delia, a v to ni edin khristianin ne v"stupaetsia, a kto v"stupit'sia togo ne blagaslovliaiut" bozhestvenaia pravila."

20. See Gradovsky, p. 151, and the following deeds published in *Akty, otmosiashchiesia do iuridicheskago byta drevnei Rossii*, (AiuB), II (St. Petersburg, 1864), Nos. 147, IV, V, VI, and VII where it is stated: "... a kupili my to selo ... v prok bez vykupa" ("... we have purchased this village ... for the future without the right of redemption.")

21. S.V. Rozhdestvensky, *Sluzhiloie zemlevladienie v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVI veka* (St. Petersburg, 1897), p. 12.

22. Ibid

23. See the following passage from the deed to Zhdan Grinev in Rozhdestvensky, p. 12: "... ni v kakikh krepostiakh v klebnykh i denezhnykh ne uviaziti."

24. See Gradovsky, pp. 151–52. For the deed, see *Akty feodal'nogo zemlevladieniia i khoziaistva XIV-XVI vekov* (AFZKh), I (Moscow, 1951), No. 307, p. 257.

25. M. I. Gorchakov, *O zemel'nykh vladeniakh vserossiiskikh mitropolitov, patriarkonov i sv. sinoda*, (988–1738 gg.). *Iz opytov izsledovaniia v istorii russkago prava* (St. Petersburg, 1871), pp. 247–49.

26. See V.B. Eliashevich, *Istoriia prava pozemelnoi sobstvennosti v Rossii*, I (Paris, 1948), p. 371. The cadasters used the following formula to designate a state pomestie: “velikago kniazia volost . . . v pomestie za. . .” (the lands of the “grand prince’s volost” the sovereign has granted “in pomestie to. . .”) The metropolitan’s charters used a similar formula: “zemlia Prechistye Bogoroditsa tserkovnaia . . . a pozhaloval v pomestie. . .” (the “lands belonging to the Church of the Mother of God . . .” the metropolitan “has granted in pomestie. . .”)

27. See S.V. Veselovsky, *Feodal’noe zemlevladienie* (Moscow, 1947), p. 431. The kormlenie system included the *namestnichestvo* (lieutenancy) in Moscow, Vladimir, and Yuriev; the positions of *desiatnik* (decurion), *volostel* (rural district chief), *prikazchik* (administrator), and *poselskii* (steward) in the villages. The offices of *pristav* (constable) and *pravitchik* (executor of a court order) in the metropolitan’s courts were also part of the system. The metropolitan’s boyars and servitors received definite incomes (*kormleniia*, “feedings”) to carry out their official functions.

28. Veselovsky observed (*Feodal’noe zemlevladnie*, 435–38) that less than a dozen and half junior boyars and three dozen servitors resided on the metropolitan’s major possessions at the close of the fifteenth century.

29. Rozhdestvensky, pp. 42–44.

30. For the grant charter see S. Shumakov, *Tverskie Akty*, v. I, No. LXXII. Also see Rozhdestvensky, p. 10.

31. Rozhdestvensky, p. 17.

32. The *chetvert* or quarter of a bushel varied from four to eight puds before the official chetvert for measuring grain was set at eight puds in the seventeenth century. Since the pud equalled thirty-six American pounds, the quitrent could have been as low as twelve puds, 432 pounds, or twenty-four puds, 864 pounds. See Pushkarev, p. 7. On the chetvert also see L. Cherepnin, *Russkaia metrologiia* (Moscow, 1944), p. 43.

33. Rozhdestvensky, p. 17.

34. Rozhdestvensky, pp. 24–25.

35. S.M. Seredonin, “Kritika i bibliografiia: S. V. Rozhdestvensky, *Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie v Moskovskom gosudarstve*,” in *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* (May 1897), pp. 231–34.

36. Ibid

37. V.I. Sergeevich, “Peresmotr istorii sluzhilago zemlevladieniia: S. V. Rozhdestvensky, *Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie v Moskovskom gosudarstve*” in *Severnii vestnik* (November 1897), pp. 43–45.

38. See Rozhdestvensky, p. 17.

39. Sergeevich, “Peresmotr,” 44–45.

40. Sergeevich, “Peresmotr,” pp. 48–49, and *Russkii iuridicheskii drevnosti*, I, (St. Petersburg, 1901), p. 382.

41. *Novgorodskii pistovyiia knigi*, II (St. Petersburg, 1862), p. 198.

42. M.F. Vladimirsky-Budanov, *Obzor russkago prava*, 6th. Edition (St. Petersburg and Kiev, 1909), pp. 566–67.

43. Vladimirsky-Budanov, *Obzor*, p. 566.

44. Sergeevich, “Peresmotr,” pp. 47–48.

45. See the reprint of *Kurs russkoi istorii* in V.O. Kliuchevsky, *Sochineniia*, II (Moscow, 1957), p. 219.

46. See the following passage from the testament of Prince Vladimir Andreevich of Serpukhov and Borovsk in *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov* (SGGD), I (St. Petersburg, 1813), No. 40, pp. 74–75, and DDG, No. 17, p. 46. It states, “A tekh bortnikov, ili sadovnikov, ili psarei, ili bobrovnikov, ili barashov, deliuev ne vskhochet zhyti na tekh zemliakh, in zemli lishon, poidi proch’, a sami synu, kniazii Ivanu, na nadobe, na kotorogo gramoty polnye ne budet, a zemli ikh synu, kniazii Ivanu.” (“And of the beekeepers, or gardeners, or keepers of the kennels, or beaver trappers, or tentmakers, artisans who do not want to live on these lands, their lands are forfeited, let them leave, and that does not concern my son, Prince Ivan, if they are freemen but these lands are Prince Ivan’s.”) The passage translated as “freemen” literally reads “those on whom there are no *polnye gramoty*,” deeds by which a person sold himself into slavery. On the equerry office, see Howes, *Testaments*, p. 85.

47. See Kliuchevsky, *Sochineniia*, II, pp. 219–20, and Veselovsky, pp. 304–305. After the unification of northern Russia and the liquidation of the last appanages in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, a servingman dissatisfied with the grand prince could only flee beyond the borders of the Muscovite state to Poland-Lithuania or Sweden. Since the servingman could not leave the Muscovite ruler without breaking his oath of hereditary service, his flight was treason (as Ivan IV correctly observed in his correspondence with Prince Andrew Kurbsky, who had fled to Lithuania in 1564). The numerous genealogies surviving from the period illustrate this situation. Before 1475, they record a family member’s departure for Lithuania or Tver, Riazan, and other appanages; after 1475 they simply record the servingman “fled” (*bezhal*).

48. On the grant to Fedor Basenok, see the codicil to Vasily II’s testament in DDG, No. 61, p. 199. On Fedor Basenok’s background, see Howes, *Testaments*, p. 266 n. 18. Basenok was one of Vasily II’s most loyal supporters during Shemiaka’s usurpation and commanded the host that defeated the Tatars under Khan Sedi-Akhmet’s son in 1455.

49. Kliuchevsky, *Sochineniia*, II, p. 220.

50. N.P. Pavlov-Silvansky, *Feodalizm v udel’noi Rusi* (St. Petersburg, 1910), 381–82.

51. Pavlov-Silvansky, p. 385.

52. Pavlov-Silvansky, *Feodalizm v udel’noi Rusi*, pp. 381ff. Also see his *Feodalizm v drevnei Rusi* (Moscow and Petrograd, 1923) in which he compares the wording of the passage in Ivan I’s testament with the later pomestie charters that used the following formula: “A pozhaloval esmi N toiu derevneiu, dokole sluzhit N mne i moim detiam.” (“I have granted N this village as long as he serves me and my sons.”) On Pavlov-Silvansky as an economic historian who rejected the tenets of the juridical school on the state’s role in the creation of the pomestie, see Mazour, 173174.

53. See M.N. Tikhomirov, “Uslovnoe feodal’noe derzhanie na Rusi XII v.” in *Sbornik statei—akademiku B.D. Grekovu ko dniu 70 - letiia*, Moscow, 1952, pp. 100–105.

54. *Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis'* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), p. 34.

55. The murder of Bogoliubsky's milostnik Prokofy followed his assassination. After placing the stolen royal treasury on Prokofy's horse, the conspirators collected their weapons and gathered their comrades to fight Bogoliubsky's retinue (*druzhina*). See the *Letopis' po Ipatievskomu spisku* (St. Petersburg, 1871), pp. 397–402. On the *Hypatian Chronicle* (*Ipatievskaiia letopis'*) as a source for this period, see the introduction to the *Letopis' po Ipatievskomu spisku*, p. iii, and Samuel H. Cross and Olgert Sherbowitz-Wetzor, translators and editors, *The Russian Primary Chronicle: The Laurentian Text* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), p. 4. The discovery of the chronicle, possibly a mid-fifteenth century copy from Pskov, occurred in the Hypatian monastery at Kostroma.

56. Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, p. 4, observe that the Laurentian redaction was copied between 14 January and 20 March 1377 by the monk Lavrenty for Prince Dmitry Konstantinovich of Suzdal. For the passage on Vladimir's parentage in the *Hypatian Chronicle*, see *Letopis' po Ipatievskomu spisku*, p. 45. Vladimir was sent to be Prince of Novgorod with his uncle Dobrynia in the year 6478 (970 A.D.) because his mother and uncle were children of Malk of Liubech.

57. Tikhomirov, "Uslovnoe feodal'noe derzhanie," pp. 101–102. Like the ministeriales of Western Europe, the milostniks often came from slaves, later amassed great wealth, and even entered the nobility. The *Hypatian Chronicle* stated (see *Letopis' po Ipatievskomu spisku*, p. 401) that Anbal Yasin, who had the keys to the whole palace, wore silk after coming to Bogoliubsky in rags. A certain Kuchka, another of Bogoliubsky's milostniks, became a great feudal magnate; indeed, Moscow's original name was Kuchkovo because of its location on his votchina.

58. See the following passage (Article 111) from the *Russian Justice* in B.D. Grekov, ed., *Pravda Russkaia*, I (Moscow-Leningrad, 1940), p. 116. It states, "A v dache ne kholop, ne po khlebe rabotiat; ni po pridattse no ozhe ne dokhodiat goda, to vorochati emu milost'; otkhodit' li, to ne vinovat est'." "And with his dacha a person is not a slave, neither can he be enslaved because of grain, nor because of the *pridattse*; but if he does not complete the term, then he must return the grant; if he finishes, then he is not to be faulted." (My translation.) The *pridattse* was the extra grain that he had to supply upon repayment of the loan.

59. See the following passage from the *Slovo Danila Zatochnika po redaktiiam XII i XIII i ikh peredelkom*, edited by N. N. Zarubin (Leningrad, 1932), pp. 68–71: "... vsiakomu dvorianinu imeti chest' i milost' u kniazia." ("... every member of the court has his honored place and grant from the prince.")

60. See the translation of Article III of the *Russkaia Pravda* in *A Source Book for Russian History from Early Times to 1917*, I, compiled by Sergei Pushkarev and edited by George Vernadsky (New Haven and London, 1972), p. 38. It equates *milost'* with a grant of money. On the significance of Article III, see the note in George Vernadsky, *Medieval Russian Laws* (New York, 1947), p. 54.

61. Veselovsky, pp. 282, 300–305. Veselovsky argued that Vorkov received Bogoroditskoe as a patrimonial estate since it was located outside of the principality of Moscow. While the princely authority of Ivan I did not extend to Rostov, however, the principality was subordinate to him after 1331. The "Life of St. Sergei of Radonezh"

related that Ivan sent his commander Vasily Kochev to Rostov to plunder its wealth; see *PRSL*, X, p. 128. On Ivan's authority over Rostov, see Cherepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy*, I, p. 18, and Howes, *Testaments*, pp. 32–33. On Moscow's annexation of the last remnants of the principality in the mid-fifteenth century, see Howes, p. 46. Veselovsky also observed that in the fourteenth century the term "service" (*sluzhba*) referred more often to a legal status (*chin*) than a specific position in the prince's household. The passage in Ivan's testament requiring Vorkov to serve his sons referred to his "general dependence" on the grand prince as his servant. He supported his argument by citing Ivan III's grant of the patrimony of Lukh to Prince Fedor Ivanovich Belsky (a member of the Lithuanian House of Gedymin) in return for an oath of hereditary service. However, Veselovsky ignored the significance of Vorkov's status as a minor household servant. Although his exact position in the prince's household is unknown, it must have been minor since Ivan's testament referred to him by the pejorative form of Boris, "Borisko." On the significance of the pejorative, see Gradovsky, p. 149. It is therefore more reasonable to assume that the grant of Bogoroditskoe was subject to the performance of service in the prince's household (*dvor*).

62. See A.A. Zimin, "Iz istorii pomestnogo zemlevladieniia na Rusi," in *Voprosy istorii*, 1959, No. 11, pp. 132–33.

63. See the following passage from the testament of Prince Boris Vasilievich of Volok written on 14 October 1477, shortly before his departure for Novgorod on business for his elder brother Ivan III, in *DDG*, No. 71, p. 251. "A chto esm' potoimal v svoei vine sela ot Fedora ot Poleva, i ot ego syna ot Vasiliia, i ot Ondreia ot Iaropkina, i ot Ivana ot Bibikova, i ot Davydovykh detei Bibikova, ot Vasiliia ot Volodi, ikh otchiny, i te ikh sela im i est', a moi syn i moia kniagini v te ikh sela ne vstypaiutsia, a oni vedaiut svoi otchiny po starine." "And what villages I have taken away for cause from Fedor Polev and his son Vasily, and from Andrew Yaropkin, and from Ivan Bibikov, and from the children of Davyd Bibikov, Vasily and Volodia, their votchinas, and let these villages of theirs be returned to them, and let my son and my princess not interfere in these villages of theirs, and they shall govern their votchinas as of old." (My translation.)

64. For the charter of 17 August 1475, by which Prince Michael Andreevich of Beloozero confiscated the hamlet of Ilinskaia, see *Akty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe istorii severo-vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV-nachala XVI v.(ASEI)* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1952–1964), II, No. 214; for the charter by which he restored the hamlet to the monastery, see *ASEI*, II, No. 228.

65. See Zimin, pp. 132–33. For the record of the litigation, see , II, No. 375. For the Grand Princess Sophia Vitovtovna's charter authorizing Timothy Dubin to grant the village to St. Simon's monastery, see *ASEI*, II, No. 341.

66. *ASEI*, II, No. 375.

67. The term "boyar lands" (*boiarskie zemli*) did not always refer to a votchina (which in the fifteenth century was inherited, patrimonial land rather than an inheritable purchased estate) or a boyar's land. When Daniel Blin called his earlier donation to a monastery "boyar lands from of old, not black land," he did not mean that boyars had owned the land for a long time. Even if Blin was a boyar, the records document

his purchase of the land from a certain Moskovtinev of unknown rank. He used the term to distinguish the donation from the state land occupied by the black peasants. Eliashevich concluded that the term simply referred to private landholding in general. See Eliashevich, pp. 232–233. For the records of the late fifteenth century case involving Blin's donation, see *Akty iuridicheskie, ili Sobranie form starinnago delo-proizvodstva*, izd. Arkheograficheskoi komissii (St. Petersburg, 1838), No. 3, p. 6.

68. See the following passage from Ivan III's testament in *DDG*, No. 89, p. 357: "A chto esmi pozhaloval kniazia Feodora Ivanovicha Belskogo, dal esmi emu v votchinu gorod Lukh s volostmi da volosti Vichiugu, da Kineshmu, da Chikhachev, i kniaz' Feodor i ego deti sluzhat syny moemu Vasiliuu, a tu svoiu votchinu dr'zhat po tomu, kak bylo pri mne. A ot'edet kniaz' Feodor ili ego deti ot moego syna ot Vasiliia k moim detem k menshim, ili k komu ni budi, i ta ego votchina Lukh i s temi volostmi syny moemu Vasiliuu." See the following English translation in Howes, *Testaments*, p. 279. "And concerning that which I granted to Prince Fedor Ivanovich Belsky, that which I gave him as his patrimony, the city of Lukh with its volosts, and the Vichiuga volosts, and Kineshma, and Chikhachev, now if Prince Fedor and his children serve my son Vasily, then they shall hold the patrimony as it was under me. And if Prince Fedor or his children should leave my son Vasily, and should (go over) to my younger children, or to anyone whomsoever, then this his patrimony, Lukh, with these volosts (shall pass) to my son Vasily."

69. Veselovsky, pp. 300–302.

70. L.V. Cherepnin, "Osnovnye etapy razvitiia feodal'noi sobstvennosti na Rusi (do XVII v)" in *Voprosy istorii*, 1953, No. 4, pp. 56–57. Although he recognized the existence of conditional landholding before Ivan III's reign, Cherepnin agreed with Veselovsky's observation in *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie*, p. 300, that Vorkov was a votchinnik rather than a pomeschchik; see L. V. Cherepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy XIV-XV veka*, I, pp. 18–19.

71. On the growth of the domestic market, see Cherepnin, "Osnovnye etapy," pp. 60–61.

72. Cherepnin believed the patrimonial estates of the princes and boyars of the appanage age and the conditional lands of the middle service class of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were both forms of feudal property because they were characterized by the same means of production (the exploitation of peasant labor), a view consistent with Marxism. The pomestie, however, was a more progressive tenure because it was unencumbered by the immunities of the appanage age and the landlords who owed their estates to the crown supported the autocracy against the reactionary feudal aristocrats whose power came from their patrimonial lands. See Cherepnin, "Osnovnye etapy," pp. 59–60, 62–63, and B.D. Grekov, *Krest'iane na Rusi s drevneishikh vremen do XVII veka* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946), pp. 599–600).

73. K.V. Bazilevich, *Vneshniaia politika russkogo tsentralizovanogo gosudarstva* (Moscow, 1952), p. 347.

74. Veselovsky's *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie* in 1947 was the first monograph on medieval landholding since Rozhdestvensky's thesis in 1898. See Veselovsky, p. 305.

75. See Rozhdestvensky, pp. 367–70. V. N. Storozhev believed that Ivan IV's decree of 1555, which stated that a father's service land could not be taken away from

his sons if they were suitable for service, legalized the inheritance of pomesties by the pomeshchik's sons in the second half of the sixteenth century; see his *Istoriko-iuridicheskie materialy izdavaemye Moskovskim Ministerstvom iustitsii*, Vol. I, *Ukaz-naia kniga Pomestnago prikaza* (Moscow, 1889), pp. 22–23, and 193. For Ivan IV's decree, see AAE, I, No. 225. Other historians denied the legalization of the passage of the pomestie to direct heirs in the second half of the sixteenth century; see the following: E. D. Stashevsky, "Sluzhiloe soslovie" in M.V. Dovnar-Zapolsky, ed., *Russkaia istoriia v ocherkakh i stat'iakh* (Kiev, 1912), 3: 25–26; and A.M. Gnevushchev, "Zemlevladienie i sel'skoe khoziaistvo v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVI-XVII vv," in Dovnar-Zapolsky, 3: 286.

76. Rozhdestvensky, pp. 367–68.

77. Rozhdestvensky, p. 367.

78. See Jerome Blum, *Lord and Peasant*, p. 182.

79. See N.A. Rozhkov's *Sel'skoe khoziaistvo Moskovskoi Rusi v XVI veke* (Moscow, 1899), pp. 446–51, cited in Blum, pp. 182–83.

80. Blum, pp. 184–85.

81. Hellie, pp. 57 and 297, n. 63. Also see V.N. Storozhev, *Istoriko-iuridicheskie materialy izdavaemye Moskovskim Ministerstvom iustitsii*, I (Moscow, 1889), pp. 22–23, 193.

82. Hellie, pp. 57 and 297, n. 64. Also, see articles 13, 22, 23, 34, 53, 55, and 62 in the sixteenth chapter of the *Ulozhenie* in M.N. Tikhomirov and P.P. Epifanov, eds., *Sobornoe ulozhenie 1649 goda*. (Moscow, 1961). As Pavlov-Silvansky observed in *Gosudarevy sluzhilye liudi* (St. Petersburg, 1898), p. 193, (discussed in Hellie, pp. 57 and 297, n. 65) the supporters of the statutory recognition of the son's right to succeed his father wanted to provide the new pomeshchiks with enough income to secure a military education.

83. Yu. G. Alekseev and A.I. Kopanov, "Razvitie pomestnoi sistemy v XVI v" in *Dvorianstvo i krepostnoi stroi Rossii XVI-XVIII vv: Sbornik statei, posviashchennyi pamiati A.A. Novosel'skogo* (Moscow, 1975), pp. 58–61. A.M. Sakharov also argued that the pomestie gradually resembled the votchina as the practice of granting the deceased pomeshchik's estate to his sons became more widespread and the establishment of maintenance pomesties supported widows and minor children. See A.M. Sakharov, "Ob evoliutsii feodal'noi sobstvennosti na zemliu v Rossiiskom gosudarstve XVI veka," in *Istoriia SSSR*, 1978, No. 4, p. 28. On the evolution of the pomestie in northeastern Russia, see Yu. G. Alekseev, *Agrarnaia i sotsial'naia istoriia Severno-vostochnoi Rusi XV-XVI vv: Pereiaslavskii uezd* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1966).

84. Alekseev and Kopanov, p. 59.

85. Alekseev and Kopanov, pp. 58, 60. On the granting of pomesties to boyars, also see Sakharov, pp. 28–29.

86. A. Ya. Degtiarev, "O mobilizatsii pomestnykh zemel' v XVI v" in *Iz istorii feodal'noi Rossii: Stat'i i ocherki k 70-letiu so dnia rozhdeniia prof. V.V. Mavrodina* (Leningrad, 1978), p. 85, and N.A. Rozhkov, pp. 447ff. Rozhkov's thesis influenced L.V. Danilova, who wrote that the frequent transference of pomesties on the eve of the agrarian crisis (caused by the juridical nature of the pomestie) was the principal cause of the economic dislocation of the last quarter of the sixteenth century. See L.V.

Danilova, "K voprosu o prichinakh utverzheniia krepostnichestva v Rossii" in *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii stran vostocnoi Evropy za 1965 god* (Moscow, 1970), pp. 130–40.

87. Degtiarev, p. 87, and Rozhkov, pp. 447–51. Rozhkov argued, for example, that the rate of utilization of pomesties was the same in the first and second halves of the century because in Vodskaiia piatina between 1500 and 1540 slightly more than half of the pomesties passed to servingmen who were unrelated to their former landlord.

88. Degtiarev, pp. 86–87.

89. Ibid

90. Degtiarev, p. 88. The data on the utilization of votchina used by Degtiarev came from Rozhkov, p. 451.

91. Degtiarev, p. 88.

92. Degtiarev, pp. 88–89. N. N. Maslennikova found similar data on the length of time pomeshchiks held their estates and the government's tendency to grant the deceased pomeshchik's estate to his sons in the first half of the century in Porkhov district; see "Krest'iane i pomeshchiki porkhovskogo uezda Shelonskoi piatiny k-40-m godam XVI v" in *Issledovaniia po sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii Rossii* (Leningrad, 1971), pp. 121–22. The charters surviving from the period also support these findings. See *Dopolneniia k aktam istoricheskim (DAI)*, collected and published by the Archeographical Commission, I (St. Petersburg, 1846), No. 52 (VII, XV, and XVII). For cases of pomesties passing to the third generation occurring in the 1560s, see *DAI*, No. 52 (X), pp. 94–95, (XVII), pp. 100–101.

93. Degtiarev, pp. 89–90. At the time of the lifting of the ban against the netchiks (those who had failed to answer the tsar's summons for the Kazan campaign) the Novgorod state secretary K. Dubrovsky received numerous petitions from pomeshchiks who wanted the return of their old pomesties, some of which had been redistributed to other pomeshchiks. See *DAI*, I, No. 52 (XIX), p. 102.

94. See V.B. Kobrin, "Stanovlenie pomestnoi sistemy" in *Istoricheskie zapiski*, 1980, No. 105, pp. 150ff. Kobrin conceded that a comparison of the formulas used in pomestie and votchina charters shows that the prohibition against selling or giving away the pomestie existed from the pomestie system's beginning. However, he observed that the comparison is incomplete because of the small number of surviving votchina charters, many of which appear to be forgeries or interpellations. On the issue of sixteenth century forgeries, see A. A. Zimin, "K izucheniiu fal'sifikatsii aktovykh materialov v russkom gosudarstve XVI-XVII vv" in *Trudy moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo istoriko-arkhivnogo instituta* (Moscow, 1963), pp. 399–428, and N.P. Likhachev, *Razriadnye d'iaki XVI veka* (St. Petersburg, 1888), pp. 358, 429–40.

95. Kobrin, pp. 151–52.

96. Kobrin, p. 152.

97. Kobrin, p. 180.

98. The government made extensive grants of pomesties in other parts of the Muscovite state during the sixteenth century. The most important example is Ivan IV's enfeoffment of 1071 Muscovite *dvoriane* and *deti boiarskie* ("The Chosen Thousand") on 118,200 chetverts of arable land within a seventy-kilometer radius of Moscow in 1550. On their composition and significance, see N.E. Nosov, *Stanovlenie soslovno-*

predstavitel'nykh uchrezhdenii v Rossii. Izyskaniia o zemskoi reforme Ivana Groznogo (Leningrad, 1969), pp. 386ff. A. A. Zimin argues that few estates actually were distributed: see *Reformy Ivana Groznogo. Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii Rossii serediny XVI v.* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 366ff.

99. Pomeschchiks held 46.3 percent of the land in late fifteenth century Shelonskaia province. See A.L. Shapiro, ed., *Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii: vtoraia polovina XV — nachalo XVI v.* (Leningrad, 1971), (Shapiro, I), p. 133. Shapiro accepts the calculations of A.M. Andriiashev, published in his "Materialy po istoricheskoi geografii Novgorodskoi zemli. Shelonskaia piatina po pistovym knigam 1498–1576 gg" in *Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitet 1914 g.*, kniga III, pp. lxx–lxxv. A. A. Kaufman calculated that the late fifteenth century Shelonskaia pomeschchiks held only 40.4 percent of the arable land; see his *Novgorodskii pistovyya knigi v statisticheskoi obrabotke*, I: *Pogosty i drevni Shelonskoi piatiny po pis'mu 1498–1501 gg.* (Petrograd, 1915), pp. 122–29. However, as Shapiro observes, Andriiashev's calculations were more representative since he based them on 16,579 rather than the 7695 tax units considered by Kaufman. Pomeschchiks held fifty-two percent (7976.5 of the 15,349.5 tax units) of Vodskaia province in the late fifteenth century. See Shapiro, I, Table 100, p. 188.

100. The Novgorod, Ladoga, and Orekhov districts of Vodskaia province remained in the Russian state after the Livonian War. The percentage of land held by pomeschchiks in these districts in 1500 and 1582 respectively was 59.3 and 39.6 percent. The Novgorod and Porkhov districts of Shelonskaia province also remained in the Russian state after the Livonian War. The percentage of land held by pomeschchiks in these districts in 1500 and 1582 respectively was 48.6 and 56.4 percent. See A.L. Shapiro, ed., *Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii XVI veka: Novgorodskie piatiny* (Leningrad, 1974), (Shapiro, II), p. 271.

101. For the percentage of land held by pomeschchiks in late fifteenth century Derevskaia province, see Shapiro, I, pp. 89–91. In the fifty-four of the sixty-seven parishes surveyed in 1582, pomeschchiks held 24.7 percent and monasteries 15.7 percent of the tax units while the remaining 59.5 percent was abandoned land. See Shapiro, II, p. 271.

102. The few cadasters surviving from the period caused Shapiro to use the information in the cadasters of 1536–1545 and 1551–1553 on the "old census" to reconstruct the pattern of landholding in Bezhetskaia during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. See Shapiro, I, pp. 227–28. Also see Table 158 in *ibid*, II, p. 196, which shows that the crown held 51.2 percent and pomeschchiks held 44.3 percent of the province's 18,786.5 tax units in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

103. Shapiro, II, Table 212, p. 271.

104. On the pattern of landholding in late fifteenth century Obonezhskaia, see Shapiro, I, pp. 272–78; on the sixteenth century, see Shapiro, II, pp. 241–42, 250–52, 260–67, and Table 212, p. 271. The small number of surviving cadasters complicates the problem. Only fragments of the books of Yury Konstantinovich Saburov (1495–1496) survive. The returns from only nineteen of eighty-one parishes survive from the cadaster of 1563–1566. All of the cadaster of Andrew

Pleshcheev and Semen Kuzmin, 1582–1583, is preserved, but is unpublished and located in the Central State Archive of Ancient Documents (TsGADA: *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov*), fond 1209, No. 963 — the Zaonezhskaia half, and No. 965 — the Nagornaia half. See Shapiro, II, p. 242, and I.I. Perelman, “Novgorodskaia derevnia v XV-XVI vv” in *Istoricheskie zapiski*, No. 26 (1948), pp. 128–29.

105. See Shapiro, I, p. 12; Blum, *Lord and Peasant*, p. 230–31; and Henry Eaton, “Early Russian Censuses and the Population of Muscovy, 1550–1650” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1970), p. 19.

106. On the date of the Vodskaia census, see Shapiro, I, 14–15. For the reference to autumn as the date of the Koporie district’s survey, see *NPK*, III, pp. 645, 713. On the date of the Orekhov and Ladoga districts’ census, see *Vremennik*, XI, pp. 91, 286.

107. On the need for a “new census” and on the authority of the census-takers, see Shapiro, I, pp. 14–15. The census-takers also determined the level of obrok on the crown lands.

108. For an example of the tax exemptions granted by the state officials who conducted the later sixteenth century censuses, see *NPK*, V, 684. Afanasy Vasilievich Belsky received a tax exemption from July 7083 since the creation (1575) to July 7086 (1578) for 13.5 of his twenty-five vyts.

109. See P.I. Savviatov et al., eds., *Novgorodskii pistovyiia knigi (NPK)*, V (St. Petersburg, 1905), 571.

110. On the date of the old census see K.A. Nevolin, “O piatinakh i pogostakh Novgorodskikh v XVI v” in *Zapiski imperatorskogo russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva*, VIII (St. Petersburg, 1853), p. 11; L.V. Danilova, *Ocherki po istorii zemlevladieniia i khoziaistva v Novgorodskoi zemle v XIV-XV vv.* (Moscow, 1955), p. 12; and Abramovich’s discussion in Shapiro, I, pp. 13–14.

111. On the old census see Shapiro, I, pp. 11–14.

112. For Ivan III’s charter to Erema and Mitia Trusov Vorobin of 27 July 1482, see D. Ya. Samokvasov, *Arkhivnyi material: Novootkrytye dokumenty pomestno-votchinnnykh uchrezhdenii moskovskago gosudarstva XV-XVII stoletii*, I (Moscow, 1905), otd. 2, no. 63a, p. 3.

113. The returns for Shelonskaia province from the “new census” are in *NPK*, IV, 1–232, and *NPK*, V, 1–315, 407–427.

114. The returns from the “new census” for Vodskaia province are printed in (1) *NPK*, III (St. Petersburg, 1869), covering Novgorod, Koporie, and Yama districts; (2) I. Beliaev, ed., “Perepisnaia okladnaia kniga po Novgorodu vot’skoi piatiny. 7008 goda,” in *Vremennik imperatorskago moskovskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh*, (Vremennik), XI (Moscow, 1851), covering Ladoga and Orekhov districts; and (3) “Perepisnaia okladnaia kniga po Novgorodu Votskoi piatiny. 7008 goda. (Prodolzhenie.)” in *Vremennik*, XII, (Moscow, 1952), covering Korela district.

115. See Blum, pp. 231–32 on the deficiencies of the clerks. See Shapiro, I, p. 16 on the general accuracy and completeness of the cadasters. In the eighteenth century, the gentry cited the cadasters in court to prove their genealogy and landholding rights; see Shapiro, I, p. 11. The completeness and accuracy compares favorably to *Domesday Book*, the extensive survey of taxable appurtenances conducted by William I of

England in 1087. The ability of the Muscovite clerks to compile similar information from a much wider geographic area is a tribute to their considerable administrative talent.

116. For the returns from the census of 1539 for Shelonskaia province, see *NPK*, IV, 237–522. On the survival of the sixteenth century cadasters, see Shapiro, II, pp. 79–80. The parishes for which returns survive from 1539 are in Appendix A.

117. A.M. Gnevushev edited and published 720 of the 1010 folios of the cadaster of Semen Klushin and Shemet Rezanov, covering Novgorod, Ladoga and part of Orekhov districts in *Pistsovaia kniga Votskoï piatiny 1539 g. (PKVP)* (Novgorod, 1917). A list of the parishes for which returns survive from the 1540 census is in Gnevushev, iii, and Appendix A. The unpublished fragments (folios 721–1010) covering two parishes of Orekhov and three parishes of the Korela districts are in the TsGADA, fond 137, Boiarskie i gorodnye knigi, no. 5-a. Part of Gregory Mikhailovich Meshok Valuev's cadaster, also prepared in 1539–40 and covering six parishes of the Yama district, survives and is located in the TsGADA, fond 1209, no. 17145; see the discussion in Shapiro, II, p. 141. The published cadasters cover twenty-four parishes and part of St Nicholas's parish at Izhersk in Orekhov district, representing 82.7 percent of the Rezanov and Klushin cadaster and 77.4 percent of the surviving cadasters from 1540.

118. Shapiro, II, p. 6.

119. On the *pisets*, see Pushkarev, *Dictionary*, p. 87.

120. On the hamlets uncovered by Fedor Neledinsky, see *NPK*, VI (St. Petersburg, 1910) 839. On the Resurrection monastery's concealment of hamlets, see *NPK*, VI, 826. Also, see the discussion in Shapiro, II, p. 6.

121. See *NPK*, IV, 530–84 for the pomestie returns recorded in the Zherebtsov cadaster. Although the beginning is lost, Alexis Zherebtsov's signature validates the individual sheets; on this see *NPK*, IV, ii. The returns for the petty landowners and monasteries come after the pomesties. The published fragments of the cadaster of Ivan Beleutov and Alexis Zherebtsov with the returns for the obrok-paying crown lands are in *NPK*, V, 315–32.

122. See *NPK*, V, 427–571, for the Muraviev cadaster.

123. The surviving returns from the Bezobrazov cadaster, which consists of 357 sheets countersigned by Ivan Andreev Trifonov and Sulmen Bulgakov, are in *NPK*, V, 571–696. The census-takers placed the original sheets in a folder filed in the Pomestie Chancery. They were found by the editors of the *Novgorodskiiia pistsovyia knigi* in Manuscript No. 6 of the Pomestie Chancery in the Moscow Central Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; see the unnumbered last page of the introduction to *NPK*, V. The thirteen parishes besides the town of Porkhov include the Porkhov area, Karachunsk, Bolchino, Pazherevitsy, Belsky, Nativity, Degzha, Smolna, St Michael and St George's, St Michael's-on-the-Uza, Dubrovno, Opoka and Ruchie. The table of contents includes the Bolchino returns with those from Karachunsk. The census-takers' heading at the top of sheet 77 (*NPK*, V, 600), however, indicates that the returns recorded between *NPK*, V, 600 and *NPK*, V, 613 (the beginning of the Pazherevitsy returns) refer to Bolchino parish. The heading reads "And along with the sovereign's village is described within the [returns for the] peasant arable Bolchino parish. ("Da

k tomu zh gosudarevu selu pripisan v krest'ianskuui pashniu pogost Bolchi(n)skoi.”) The returns for St. Dmitry’s parish church follow the heading and precede the pomesties. The returns for the individual pomeshchiks also refer to Bolchino parish. See, for example, “. . . in all Vasily had in the parish at Bolchino” (“. . . vsego bylo v Bolchine na pogoste za Vasiliem . . .”) in the returns of Vasily Pleshcheev in *NPK*, V, 600–601. The Bolchino returns follow the Karachunsk returns for the former pomesties set aside by the state for the peasants.

Unfortunately, the table of contents in volume five fails to distinguish between the two Belsky parishes in the Shelonskaia province. The problem is minor in the case of the 1576 census. Since the Bezobrazov census-takers had to survey the Porkhov district, the “Belsky” referred to in the table of contents for 1576 was the Porkhov district Belsky parish formerly belonging to the Yuriev monastery. The problem is more complicated for the earlier censuses since the returns from several parishes do not refer to the district. The table of contents for 1498, for example, directs the reader to three separate sets of returns for a “Belsky” parish beginning on pages 17, 61, and 256 of the fifth volume of the *Novgorodskye pistsovye knigi*. Since the census-takers filed the returns in the order of their completion, neighboring parishes were next to one another. The abridged Belsky returns printed in *NPK*, V, 17–18, refer to the Belsky parish in the Novgorod district in the extreme northwestern section of the province because they were filed with the returns from the Novgorod parishes of Sumersk, Kotorsk, and Dremiatsk. The abridged Belsky returns printed in *NPK*, V, 61, however, refer to the Belsky parish in the Porkhov district because of their filing with the Porkhov parishes of Pazherevitsy, Bolchino, and Obluchie. The returns in *NPK*, V, 61, confirm Belsky’s location by referring to the Yuriev monastery as the former holder of the crown lands. The unabridged Belsky returns from 1498 in IV, 71–83, refer to the Belsky parish in the Novgorod district because they are recorded immediately before the Kotorsk, Dremiatsk, and Kolomna parishes and immediately after the Lubinsk returns; all the parishes were in Novgorod district. The 1539 returns (*NPK*, IV, 416–35) are found with the other Porkhov returns and mention St Yury’s monastery. The 1539 returns from the Belsky parish in the Novgorod district are lost with the cadaster of Meshok Valuev. The “Belsky” parish mentioned in the 1571 table of contents was located in the Novgorod district since the returns were included with those from the Sabelsk and Liadtsk parishes, both in the district.

124. For Bobrov’s returns, see *NPK*, V, 572–73. Shishkin’s are in *NPK*, V, 573.

125. Gregory Tsypilev’s returns are in *NPK*, V, 584; Vasily Pleshcheev’s in *NPK*, V, 612; Yury Tyrtov’s in *NPK*, V, 646; and Andrew Vypovsk’s in *NPK*, V, 687.

126 On the tax unit (*obzha*), see Pushkarev, *Dictionary*, p. 73. Since the Novgorod tax unit usually equalled 10 chetverts (*cheti*) in each of the three fields, the tax unit represented fifteen desiatins.

127. See *NPK*, V, 616: “Dmitrieva pomestii Tatianina, a nyne otpisano na gosudaria.” The Tatianins were an old parish family. Ivan Andreev syn and Dmitry Tatanin were old Pazherevitsy pomeshchiks in 1539. See *NPK*, IV, 394, for Ivan’s and IV, 403, for Dmitry’s returns.

128. The last paragraph of the returns for the Porkhov area (see *NPK*, V, 582) contains the following statement. “A pro oklad v Okologorodie detem boiarskim v kni-

gakh ne pisano, potomu chto starye pomeschchiki, kotorym gosudar' v udele byti ne velev, i te pomeschchiki do pisma is tovo pogosta vyekhali i pro oklad skazati nekomu; a starosty i krest'iane pro oklad detei boiarskikh skazati ne vedaiut." "And there was nothing written in the cadasters about the *oklad* in Okologorod of the junior boyars, because the old pomeschchiks, whom the sovereign had ordered not to reside in the district, had left the parish before the census, and there was no one to speak about the *oklad*. The elders and peasants have no knowledge to speak about the junior boyars' *oklad*." (My translation.)

129. On the *vyt* (pl. *vyti*) as a measure of a plot of land, see Appendix J and Pushkarev, 183–84. The standard *vyt* equalled 12 *cheti* of good land, 14 *cheti* of medium quality land, and 16–20 *cheti* of poor land in one field. Since the *chet'* (*chetvert'*) equalled half of a *desiatina* and medieval Muscovy followed the three-field system, the total land area represented 18 *desiatins* of good, 21 of average, and 24–30 of poor land. Since the *desiatin* (Pushkarev, 11) equalled 2.7 acres, the *vyt* equalled 48.6 acres of good, 56.7 acres of average, and 64.8–81 acres of poor land. Note the peasants rotated the fields under cultivation in the three-field system, planting two and leaving the third fallow.

130. Two unpublished cadasters survive from the 1560s. *Kniga 1-B*, located in the TsGADA, f. 137, Novgorod, covers five Novgorod and six Koporie parishes. The cadaster of Insh Vasiliev syn Bulgakov and Posnik Shepelev, located in TsGADA, f. 137, Novgorod, no. 7, describes six Novgorod, all six Ladoga, one Orekhov, and four Korela parishes. Both cadasters were prepared in 1568/69. See the discussion of the contents in Shapiro, II, 142. Also, see Appendix A.

131. *Vremennik*, VI, 57.

132. See *Vremennik*, VI, 54–57, for the census-takers' list of the parishes that were not surveyed in 1582, either because they were under enemy occupation or near the scene of military operations.

133. The original cadaster is located in TsGADA, f. 1209, No. 958. The cadaster was described in the *Opisanie dokumentov i bumag khraniashchiksia v moskovskom arkhive Ministerstva iustitsii*, t. I, Moscow, 1868, p. 170. Also, see the discussion in Shapiro II, 174, and the citation in Appendix A.

134. Staryi and Kiselev surveyed the following parishes of the Novgorod judicial circuit: Klimettsk, Our Savior's-on-the-Aredezh, Sabelsk, Kosittsk, St Nicholas's at Peredolsk, St Dmitry's at Gorodnia, and St Nicholas's of Budkovo. Dmitriev and Kiselev surveyed the following parishes of the Novgorod circuit: Zaveriazhie, St Egor's at Luzhsk, and St Andrew's at Gruzinsk. The cadaster concludes with the returns from the remaining Novgorod parishes surveyed by Staryi and Kiselev. They included St Gregory's at Krechnevo, St Nicholas's at Pidebsk, Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov, Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov, St Ivan's at Pereesk-on-the-Volkhov, St Peter's-on-the-Volkhov, St Dmitry's at Gditsk, and St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda and the three northern parishes of the Ladoga judicial circuit (St Ilia's on the Volkhov, St Nicholas's at Gorodishche, and St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov). See *Vremennik*, VI, 1–44.

Chapter Two

The Exchange and Acquisition of Additional Land in Early Sixteenth Century Shelonskaia Province

INTRODUCTION

The original estates received by the first generation of Novgorod pomeshchiks, which comprised their *dacha* (the portion of land to which they were entitled, the *oklad*, which they actually held), could be altered on one of two ways. The location of their holdings could be changed by the exchange of pomesties with other landlords and the amount of their holdings could be increased by a grant of additional pomesties (a *pridacha*). While the exchange of pomesties could take place at any time, pridachas were granted at the annual muster and enrollment in the spring in response to the pomeshchik's petition for additional land to support a larger family or a fifteen-year-old son's entry into service.

Nineteenth century historians, who relied on surviving pomestie charters rather than the cadasters, denied the pomeshchiks' ability to exchange land with one another before 1550. K.A. Nevolin found the first references to the exchange of pomesties in the charters of 1555/1556.¹ Despite the additional references in the later sixteenth century charters, the practice did not receive formal approval under statutory law before Tsar Michael Fedorovich authorized the exchange of land between pomeshchiks in a 1636 decree.²

Later historians found references to the exchange of pomesties in the cadasters of the first half of the sixteenth century. In his study of the 360 pomesties surveyed in Bezhetskaia province during the census of 1536-41, G.V. Abramovich found two exchanges of entire estates and 150 exchanges of parcels.³ Yu. G. Alekseev and A.I. Kopanev found exchanges in the 1539 Vodskaia provincial cadaster.⁴ Additional references to the exchange of pomesties were discovered in the Shelonskaia cadasters of 1498 and 1539.

These cases show that the practice of exchanging pomesties was recognized in customary if not statutory law throughout the Novgorod land from the beginning of the pomestie system.

The granting of pridachas became common during the first half of the sixteenth century. The forty-six estates receiving pridachas between 1500 and 1539 represent thirty-six percent of the 128 classifiable pomesties held by servingmen in 1539. Pomesties enlarged with pridachas were found in fifteen of the twenty-four parishes (62.5 percent) whose returns were published in the fourth volume of the *Novgorodskii pistsovyia knigi*.⁵ The distance of the pridacha from the old parcels of the pomestie was considered to determine whether the pomeshchiks were concerned with consolidating their lands near the manor, which served as the administrative center of their holdings. The sources of the pridachas were examined to determine whether they came from the lands of other deceased or retired family members. This information is significant because it reveals the degree to which the pomestie was considered the family's possession.

EXCHANGES BEFORE 1500

The cadaster of Matvei Valuev records six exchanges of Shelonskaia pomesties between the original enfeoffment in the 1480s and the "new census" conducted between 1495 and 1505. The twelve parcels belonging to five families (the Esiukovs, Kharlamovs, Kvashnins, Nashchokins, and the Trusov Vorobins) were located in the Buregi, Dubrovno, St Michael's, Opoka, and Khmer parishes. The geographic distance between the parishes proves the extension of the practice to the entire province.⁶ Dubrovno and Opoka parishes were located in the Porkhov district nearly sixty-seven versts southeast of the Khmer parish, which belonged to the Novgorod district. Dubrovno, St Michael's, and Opoka parishes were more than seventy versts to the southwest from the Buregi parish, which was located in the eastern area of the Novgorod district along the Vodskaia provincial border.

Three transactions concern the exchange of pomesties between related servingmen. Lev Kharlamov gave five tax units in the St Michael's parish volost of Marfa Isakova Boretskaia to his kinsman Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov in return for an equal number of tax units in the Dubrovno parish volost of Ivan Kobylkin.⁷ Boris and Karas Esiukov exchanged 1.5 tax units in the Dubrovno parish; Karas gave Boris 1.5 tax units in the volost of Ivan and Fedor Batin in return for the same number of tax units in the volost of Alexander and Fedor Batin.⁸ And the two sons of Andrew Nashchokin, Istoma and Daniel, exchanged pomesties in Khmer parish; Istoma gave Daniel the parcel

of Ivan Kuzmin in the hamlet of Moseikovo in return for the parcel of Semen Petrov in the hamlet of Devichie.⁹ Since both of the parties to these transactions were related, the exchanges did not alienate the land from the original pomeshchik's family.

The remaining cases involving the transference of pomesties from one serving family to another without evidence of the state's prior permission did alienate the land from the original serviceman's family. The same Lev Kharlamov referred to above also exchanged pomesties with Vasiliev syn Kvashnin.¹⁰ Ivan Mikiforov syn Kvashnin and Chernets Paiusov exchanged eight tax units formerly belonging to the Novgorod boyars Andrew and Gregory Saveliev and Yakov Morev in the Buregi parish.¹¹ Dmitry Trusov syn Vorobin exchanged a parcel in the volost of Pavel and Ivan Mikhailov for one in the volost of Vasily Kirilov; both volosts were located in the Buregi parish.¹²

The pomeshchiks' desire to consolidate their holdings motivated almost all of the exchanges. Half the three tax units obtained by Lev Kharlamov from his exchange with Ilia Kvashnin were located in the same Dubrovno parish as his manor of Luka while the remaining 1.5 tax units were located in the Opoka parish twenty-three versts to the northeast.¹³ What Kvashnin received back is difficult to determine. The Kharlamov returns do not refer to what was relinquished to obtain the additional Dubrovno and Opoka land. The omission of Kvashnin's patronymic in Kharlamov's Dubrovno and Opoka returns complicates the problem of tracing his holdings.

Two references in the Korostynia and Buregi returns from an Ilia Vasiliev syn Kvashnin offer a possible solution. The reference to "ten hamlets, twenty-one households, except the Dobrovno ones . . ." in the summary of old census holdings establishes Ilia Vasiliev syn as an old landholder in the parish.¹⁴ Since the Dubrovno returns only mention one Kvashnin, the Korostynia and Dubrovno returns refer to the same pomeshchik. The reference in Ilia Vasiliev syn Kvashnin's Buregi returns to the acquisition of 2.5 tax units in the hamlet of Seltso from an exchange with Lev Kharlamov confirms the common identity of Ilia and "Vasily Kvashnin's son Ilia."¹⁵ The exchange of Dubrovno and Opoka land for the Buregi parcel was probably motivated by Ilia's desire to consolidate his holdings. Buregi was less than ten versts from the Korostynia parish where he resided on his manor in the hamlet of Malets. Opoka and Dubrovno parishes were sixty-seven and ninety-one versts to the southwest.

Since Kharlamov received three and Ilia Kvashnin 2.5 known tax units from the exchange, Kvashnin could have received an additional half unit elsewhere. His Korostynia returns refer to additional pomesties in the Cherenchitsy, Efremovo, and St Michael's parishes. The absence of references to the exchange of pomesties in his Cherenchitsy and Ofremovsk returns restricts

the additional half unit's location to St Michael's parish.¹⁶ Despite the loss of the complete 1500 St Michael's returns, the abridged returns record his possession of thirteen tax units in the volost of the Novgorodian mayoress Marfa Isakova Boretsky. The half tax unit received from Kharlamov was therefore probably located in the same volost and parish where Ilia Kvashnin already held 12.5 tax units.

Lev Kharlamov's exchange with Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov is additional proof of the pomeshchiks' preference for land near the manor. The 6.5 tax units obtained from Ivan Mikhailov syn were located in the same Dubrovno parish as the original pomestie of twelve tax units and the parcel of 1.5 tax units acquired from Ilia Kvashnin. Since five of the 6.5 tax units given to Ivan Mikhailov syn were located in St Michael's parish, Lev was exchanging a more distant parcel in a neighboring parish for land in the same parish as the manor. The location of the remaining 1.5 tax units given to Ivan in the Dubrovno parish suggests the exchange of noncontiguous for contiguous parcels.¹⁷ The net gain of five Dubrovno tax units represented by the transaction raised Lev's Dubrovno holdings by twenty-five percent.

Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov's interest in the five St Michael's tax units formerly held by the Novgorod mayoress Marfa Isakova Boretskaia that he received from Lev Kharlamov is more difficult to determine. Ivan held eleven tax units in the Ruchaisk parish, where he resided on his manor at Zakebezh, in addition to the 1.5 tax units retained in Dubrovno. The relative distance of St Michael's and Dubrovno parishes from Ruchaisk does not explain the exchange. St Michael's was twenty-four versts to the southeast while Dubrovno parish was nineteen versts to the northeast of Ruchaisk. The relative distance of the two parishes from the regional administrative and commercial center of Porkhov could have been a factor. St Michael's was ten versts closer to Porkhov. The relative productivity of the parcels also could have been a factor. Lev's interest in consolidating his holdings in the Dubrovno parish could have presented Ivan with the opportunity to exchange less for more productive land.

The four remaining transactions involving Ivan Nikiforov syn Kvashnin and Chernets Paiusov, Dmitry Trusov syn Vorobin and Fedor Vasiliev Kvashnin, Daniel and Istoma Nashchokin, and Boris and Karas Esiukov concern the exchange of noncontiguous for contiguous parcels of land. Daniel and Istoma Nashchokin's exchange of two Khmer parcels is representative. Istoma received the lands of the former Novgorod landowner Semen Petrov in the hamlet of Devichie in return for the parcel of Ivan Kuzmin in the hamlet of Moseikovo. Since Istoma already held the adjacent parcel of Stepan Shcheglov (Shchoglov) in Devichie and Daniel already held the adjacent Pleshkova

Street parcel in Moseikovo, the two brothers were exchanging noncontiguous for contiguous parcels.

The exchange between Ivan Kvashnin and Chernets Paiusov is representative. Neither pomeshchik was exchanging a distant parcel for land closer to the manor because both parcels were located in the same Buregi parish. The redistribution of the lands of the former Novgorod landowners Yakov Morev and Andrew Saveliev between the two pomeshchiks implies the exchange of noncontiguous for contiguous parcels.¹⁸

Although the location of the parcels was important, the pomeshchiks of 1500 probably also considered the relative income producing ability of the lands being exchanged before becoming a party to the transaction. The late fifteenth and sixteenth century pomeshchiks were entirely supported by the dues paid in kind and/or money by the peasants who resided on their lands because the state did not have the financial resources to pay regular salaries to its military servingmen. The dues recorded by the clerks at the conclusion of each pomeshchik's returns therefore represent the annual income received from the land.

Unlike their successors, who only recorded the pomeshchik's total income, the clerks of 1500 also recorded the income received from each volost. This enables the historian to calculate the pomeshchiks' income from the transactions in which the exchanged land represents all of his holdings in the volost. Lev Kharlamov's exchange with Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov is an example. Lev's income is known because his only holdings in the Ivan Kobylkin volost were the 6.5 tax units received from his kinsman. The peasants of the volost paid annual dues of three grivnas, a denga, five hens and five cheeses worth a denga a piece, five sheepskins worth two dengas a piece, five fifths (*piatki*) of flax worth five dengas a fifth, and a percentage (*izdolie*) of one fourth of the rye harvest. Since the peasants sowed thirty-two bushels of rye in one field and the three-field system of two cultivated and one fallow field prevailed in Muscovy, sixty-four bushels of rye were sown on the parcel.¹⁹ Assuming a yield of three, 128 bushels of rye remained after seed. Since rye cost ten dengas a bushel, a quarter of the harvest added 320 dengas to the income of forty-five dengas represented by the hens, cheese, sheepskins, and flax.

Although Lev Kharlamov's returns do not give the value of the silver grivna, other passages from the 1500 cadasters prove that the grivna was worth fourteen dengas. The returns from the crown volost of Boris and Davyd Neradov in the 1500 Vodskaia cadaster refers to the peasant's privilege of converting their dues to two rubles and three grivnas. The dues consisted of one poltina (a half ruble), 15.5 bushels of rye, thirty-one bushels of oats, and eight bushels of barley. The peasants were allowed to substitute ten dengas

for each bushel of rye and five dengas for each bushel of oats and seven dengas for each bushel of barley. At this rate the peasants paid 155 dengas for the rye, another 155 dengas for the oats, and fifty-six dengas for the barley. Adding the 108 dengas represented by the half ruble gives a total obrok of 474 dengas. To be able to substitute two rubles and three grivnas for the obrok, the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century ruble would have to equal 216 and the grivna fourteen dengas.²⁰ Since the late fifteenth century grivna was worth fourteen dengas, the three grivnas received by Lev Kharlamov added forty-two dengas to the income of 320 dengas received from the parcel obtained from Ivan Kharlamov.

The income equivalency of the exchange cannot be determined because the total income received by Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov from the transaction is unknown. The obrok paid by the peasants of the hamlet of Strupino located in the volost of Marfa Isakova Boretskaia only accounts for the income received from 1.5 of the 6.5 tax units that Ivan received from the exchange.²¹ The complete cadaster's loss and the abridged returns' omission of the dues paid by the peasants of St. Michael's parish prevent the calculation of the income from the five remaining tax units.

The loss of the complete St Michael's cadaster also prevented the income equivalency of the exchange between Lev Kharlamov and Ilia Kvashnin from being determined. Kharlamov's income from the two parcels of 1.5 tax units is known. The peasants of the Dubrovno parish hamlet of Gorka paid the equivalent of 11.5 dengas: a grivna, two dengas, a ram, two hens, two cheeses, a fifth of flax, half of an animal carcass, three *chetvertki* (three fourths of a basket) of hops, a sheepskin, a cartload of hay, and a fourth of the rye (six bushels). The peasants of Liutoi, which was located in the neighboring Opoka parish, paid eighty-four dengas: eight dengas, a half of an animal carcass, a ram, a hen, a cartload of hay, and a fourth of the rye (six bushels).²²

Only part of Ilia Kvashnin's income from the transaction is known. The dues paid by the peasants who occupied 2.5 tax units in the Buregi parish hamlet of Seltso consisted of three grivnas and ten fish a night from the evening catch. Since 1000 fish cost forty-two dengas, the peasants would have to give 3650 fish to make up for the 153.5 dengas of income lost by giving the Dubrovno and Opoka tax units to Kharlamov. At the rate of ten per night, the peasants would have to fish every night of the year.²³ The discrepancy in the incomes provided by the two parcels supports the thesis that the fifteen tax units assigned to Ilia in the abridged St Michael's cadaster of 1500 included a half unit received from his exchange with Lev Kharlamov.

The incomes received by the parties to the four remaining transactions cannot be compared because at least one party's lands were located in the same volost as his original pomestie. Since the dues paid by the peasants of the individual

hamlets were not recorded, the income from the new parcel cannot be separated from the total income received from the entire volost. Karas Esiukov's exchange with Boris Esiukov is an example. The hamlet of Podmoshie acquired from Boris was located in the same volost of Alexander Batin where Karas already held 13.5 tax units and resided on his manor in the small village of Batino.²⁴ Chernets Paiusov's exchange with Ivan Nikiforov syn Kvashnin is another example because the eight tax units received from Kvashnin were located in the same volost of Andrew and Yakov Morev where he already held 10.5 tax units.²⁵

Less accurate indices than the peasants' dues are available for determining a parcel's income producing ability. The bushels of rye sown on the exchanged parcels can be compared because most of the peasants' dues were paid in grain or money obtained from the sale of grain. Chernets Paiusov's peasants were able to sow forty bushels in one field while Ivan Nikiforov syn Kvashnin's could only sow thirty-two bushels in one field on their Buregi parcels of eight tax units each.²⁶ With a yield of three and rye selling for ten dengas a bushel, the 160 bushels of Paiusov's grain remaining after seed were worth 1600 dengas while Kvashnin's 128 bushels after seed were only worth 1280 dengas. The location of the newly acquired lands near his old manor at Smirno shows Kvashnin's willingness to relinquish more for less productive land to consolidate his holdings.

Although the incomes received from the Dubrovno parish parcels exchanged by Karas and Boris Esiukov are unknown, both pomeshchiks exchanged an equal number of tax units on which the same amount of grain was sown and harvested. The two peasants residing in the hamlet of Golkovo received by Boris and the two peasants residing in the hamlet of Podmoshie received by Karas sowed six bushels of rye in one field.²⁷ Assuming a yield of three, the twenty-four bushels remaining after seed were worth 240 dengas (one ruble, one grivna, and ten dengas) in terms of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century price level.

The value of the grain remaining after seed on the parcel received by Dmitry Trusov syn Vorobin from his exchange with Fedor Vasiliev syn Kvashnin can only be estimated because the clerks merely recorded the households and peasants, omitting the amount of rye sown and number of tax units into which the parcel was placed. The exchange gave Vorobin two peasant households occupied by two peasants (one adult male per household) residing in the Vasily Kirilov volost hamlet of Solobskoe where he already held eight peasant households occupied by fourteen peasants. Since the sixteen peasants of Solobskoe residing in ten households sowed thirty-eight bushels of rye in one field on nine tax units, the exchange represented 20% of the households and 12.5% of the peasants living in the village around 1500.²⁸ If

the rye and tax units depended on households rather than peasants, the two peasants living in the two households on the exchanged parcel of Solobskoe sowed 7.6 bushels of rye in one field on 1.8 tax units instead of 4.75 bushels of rye on 1.125 tax units.

Correlation analysis²⁹ was used to determine whether the bushels of rye sown and tax units were more closely related to households than adult male peasants. The coefficients computed from the data from Vorobin's eleven hamlets included rye and households (0.9894), rye and tax units (0.9916), tax units and male peasants (0.9896), and rye and male peasants (0.9843). The multicollinearity between the correlations calculated from the data for the entire estate suggests but does not prove that the percentage of adult male peasants and peasant households were equally valid estimators of the rye sown and tax units received from Kvashnin.

The correlations calculated from Vorobin's other hamlets (Parukino, Fomkino, Butovo, Katelinina, Koren, Klimentino, Evanovo, Savkino, and Ivantsovo) indicate that Solobskoe was not representative.³⁰ The correlations between rye and households (0.46), rye and tax units (0.46), tax units and male peasants (0.72) and rye and male peasants (0.72) were significantly lower than the ones obtained from the data from Vorobin's other eleven hamlets. The stronger correlations between rye and male peasants and tax units and male peasants imply the imposition of the peasants' dues on the adult males rather than the household. If this is so, the percentage of adult males living on the exchanged parcel was a better indicator than peasant households of the amount of rye sown and tax units received from the transaction. The need to distribute the amount of labor among the male peasants on an equitable basis supports this thesis.

Using the percentage of peasants rather than households to estimate the monetary value of the grain after seed on the parcel obtained by Vorobin from his exchange with Kvashnin gives a lower figure. Since the sixteen peasants of Solobskoe sowed thirty-eight bushels of rye in one field, the total grain harvest after seed came to 152 bushels of rye. At ten dengas per bushel on the open market the value of the Solobskoe harvest was 1520 dengas. If the amount of rye sown on the parcel depended on the number of peasants residing there, the two peasants sowed 12.5% of the grain and harvested nineteenth bushels after seed worth 190 dengas. If the amount of rye sown depended on the number of households, the two households sowed 20% of the rye and harvested after seed of 30.4 bushels worth 304 dengas.

The income producing ability of the three tax units received from Vorobin by Kvashnin can be accurately determined because the two peasants residing on the parcel formerly belonging to the Novgorod landowners Ivan and Pavel Mikhailov sowed twelve bushels of rye in one field. Assuming a yield of

three, the forty-eight bushels remaining after seed were worth 480 dengas.³¹ The higher value of the grain on the parcel received by Kvashnin shows that Vorobin was giving up more for less productive land. Since Vorobin was exchanging noncontiguous for contiguous parcels, the difference in the two parcels' income producing ability represents the purchase price of the more desirable location: 290 dengas if the percentage of rye sown depended on the adult males or 176 dengas if the percentage of rye sown depended on the peasant households.

The equivalency of the parcels exchanged by Daniel and Istoma Nashchokin could not be estimated because the clerks failed to distinguish between the older and exchanged sections of the hamlets involved in the transaction. Daniel Nashchokin's returns fail to separate the households, peasants, rye sown, and tax units on the Ivan Kuzmin section of the hamlet of Moiseikovo obtained from Istoma Nashchokin from those on the Pleshkova Street section received with the original grant of pomesties.³² Istoma Nashchokin's returns fail to distinguish between the households, peasants, rye, and tax units on the Stepan Shcheglov section of Deviche obtained from Daniel Nashchokin and the older Semen Petrov section granted by the state before 1500.³³

The six cases discussed above show that the first generation of pomeshchiks could alienate at least some of their lands without the state's prior permission. The exchanges between representatives of different families show that the ability to exchange pomesties was a privilege extended to pomeshchiks in general and not a favor occasionally granted by the government to members of the same family. The percentage of the estate acquired by exchange shows the importance attached to the privilege by the original pomeshchiks. In four of the seven cases where the dacha and the tax units acquired from the exchange are known, the exchanged parcels represented 25% or more of the landlord's holdings. In three of the four cases the exchanged parcels represented more than 30% of the dacha. The 9.5 tax units acquired by Lev Kharlamov from his exchanges with Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov and Ilia Vasiliev syn Kvashnin, for example, accounted for 44% of his holdings in 1500.³⁴

EXCHANGES AFTER 1500

The cadaster of Gregory Sobakin contains additional evidence of the exchange and donation of pomesties before 1550. The twenty cases (nineteen exchanges and one donation to a parish church) represent 15.6% of the 128 classifiable pomesties held by the Shelonskaia pomeshchiks of 1539. Since the estates were located in fifteen parishes, pomeshchiks probably were ex-

changing pomesties throughout the province.³⁵ Although most concern pomeshchiks exchanging lands with other servingmen, some pomesties were also exchanged with parties who were exempt from military service. They include widows supported by maintenance pomesties, petty landowners and monasteries.

Thirteen cases involving pomeshchiks from nineteen families concern the exchange of pomesties between servingmen. Ten cases involving sixteen families (the Zamutskys, Blagois, Samarins, Erokhovs, Aigustovs, Chebotaevs, Zasekins, Bulgakovs, Buzheninovs, Bundovs, Miakinins, Tatianins, Vdovins, Shchulepnikovs, Turovs, and Oboturovs) concern the exchange of pomesties between unrelated servingmen. The exchange between the Zamutskys and Samarins is one example. Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky, who resided on his manor in Cherenchitsy parish, obtained six additional tax units in the Belsky parish of the Novgorod district from Zamiatnia Samarin.³⁶ The exchange between the Chebotaevs and Zasekins is another example. Michael Chebotaev and his sons Rusinets and Fedok received two tax units in the hamlet of Tochnye Bortki in the same Our Lady's parish as their manor at Ostrov from an exchange with Michael Zasekin.³⁷

The transaction between the service prince Zasekin and the provincial servingman Chebotaev is legally significant. Although both parties held the rank (*chin*) of junior boyar (*syn boiarskii*), exchanges between the Moscow service ranks (which included serving princes) and provincial servingmen were not permitted officially before Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich's decree of 13 August 1647.³⁸ The cadastral evidence of the practice nearly a century earlier shows that the decree represented the crown's recognition of a longstanding custom incapable of being abolished by earlier sovereigns.

Three of the thirteen cases involving three families (the Nazimovs, Bundovs, and Turovs) concern pomeshchiks exchanging lands with relatives. Two involve paternal relatives. Matvei Vasiliev syn Bundov exchanged one Kolomna parish tax unit with his nephew, Gregory Dmitriev syn Bundov.³⁹ Andrew Shirshik Surin syn Nazimov and his younger brother Boris exchanged the Pazherevitsy hamlet of Vorobievo with his cousin Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov in return for the hamlet of Olisovo Eskino.⁴⁰ The third case involves an exchange between the Turovs and Turgenevs, who were related maternally. Grisha Alekseev syn Turov and his two brothers (Fedok and Ivanets), who resided in the Resurrection parish, obtained 4.5 tax units from their uncle, Fedor Turgenev. Four tax units came from the former hamlets of the petty landowner Luka Usov in the Okolorusie while the additional half tax unit was located in the Cherenchitsy parish.⁴¹

Six of the twenty cases concern the exchange of lands with nonserving landholders. The three Turov brothers referred to above received a half tax

unit in the hamlet of Sergeevo from an exchange with their aunt Elena Tatari-nova. Despite the loss of her 1539 returns, her nephews' returns imply that Elena held the land in her own right and not through her late husband. The passage reads, "And for them too in the Ramyshevo parish the hamlets of their uncle Gridia Turov. The hamlet of Sergeevo, what they had from an exchange with their own aunt Elena, Timothy Tatarinov's widow . . . one half tax unit."⁴² The passage of the hamlet from Gridia Turov to his sister Elena Tatarinova implies a residual interest in the family land enabling pomeshchiks' sisters to receive part of their brothers' pomesties if their deceased husband's lands could not support their widowhood.

The records of Retno parish provide evidence of the exchange of pomesties between servingmen and the petty landowners whose estates were recorded after the pomestie returns for the parish.⁴³ Tretiak and Fedor, the sons of Ivan Kropotov, received the hamlet of Klin from an exchange with the petty landowner Ulian and his brother, who received Zaborovie.⁴⁴ Since Ulian's land was an allod and exempt from military service before the Service Decree of 1555/56, the transaction implied the pomeshchik's ability to alienate the pomestie from the state's service land fund.

Although lands alienated to the church also were removed from the service land fund, the state permitted pomeshchiks to exchange lands with monasteries. Peter Mikhailov syn Kropotov received an additional three tax units in the Retno parish from an exchange with the archimandrite of St. Yury's monastery.⁴⁵ The two sons of Boris Evreev, Vasily and Gorian, received the hamlet of Shelonskoe in return for the hamlet of Prokhno in an exchange with the abbot of the Sknetinsk (Skniatinsk) monastery.⁴⁶ The two brothers also gave the abbot Dovorets and Zamosie in return for additional land adjacent to the hamlet of Strugi-on-the Shelon where they already resided on their manor.⁴⁷

Pomesties could be donated to the church. The returns from the estate of the Pazherevitsy landlord Dmitry Ivanov syn Tatianin refer to the donation of a half tax unit to the priest of the Church of St. Nicholas. The passage immediately following the returns from Dmitry's manor at Gorka refers to ". . . one tax unit of the hamlet of Sereodka he received, and the other tax unit of the hamlet Sereodka he gave to the St. Nicholas priest, and they say, that the clerk Gregory Kosholev [Koshelev] gave this tax unit to the priest."⁴⁸ Dmitry's father probably made the donation, for the returns from the hamlet of Sereodka state that "the clerk Gregory Koshelev gave one tax unit to the priest, and one tax unit Dmitry's father Ivan took into his manor."⁴⁹ Since Ivan Tatianin was serving from the same pomestie in 1500, the donation could have been made before the new census. The lack of references to the exchange in the abridgement of the 1498 cadaster and the loss of the complete 1498 Pazherevitsy re-

turns, however, prevent the historian from conclusively dating the transaction before 1500.⁵⁰

The two references to the clerk Gregory Koshelev's approval of Tatianin's donation underscore the landlord's need for the state's permission to alienate his land without compensation. The donation of pomesties permanently reduced the service land fund because the church was exempt from military service. Although the state did allow pomeshchiks to exchange land with the church without prior permission, the parcels of pomesties lost to service were at least partially replaced by the former clerical lands given by the church to the pomeshchik. Exchanges of pomesties could also be made with the state. The returns from the Los pomestie of the four sons of Dmitry Shcherbinin (Postnik, Porosha, Ivan, and Nazim) refer to their exchange of ten tax units in the hamlet of Zalesie in the Kotorsk parish in return for the state's ten tax units formerly held by Fedor Vseslavin in the Degzha parish. Since the four brothers already held a Degzha pridacha of fourteen tax units including Vseslavin's former manor (abandoned in 1539), the brothers wanted to consolidate their holdings in a parish where they already held pomesties. Since the Kotorsk and Degzha parishes were 105.5 and forty-one versts respectively from their Los parish, the new land was significantly closer to their manor at Velikoe Selo.⁵¹

Most pomeshchiks shared the Shcherbinin's desire to consolidate their holdings. Nine of the nineteen transactions involving the exchange of pomesties brought additional land in the same parish as the manor to the representatives of eight families (the Chebotaevs, Bulgakovs, Aigustovs, Erokhovs, Nazimovs, Tatianins, Kropotovs, and Evreevs). His exchange with the archimandrite of St. Yury's monastery gave Peter Mikhailov syn Kropotov three additional tax units in the same Retno parish where he already held eleven tax units and resided on his manor.⁵² Ivan Tatianin received an additional three and one half tax units in Pazherevitsy parish from his exchange with Fedor Vdovin: two in the same hamlet (Gorka) as his manor; one in Seredka, where he already held two tax units; and a half unit in Ptitsa, where he already held two tax units.⁵³ Bulgak Timofeev syn Piatin acquired an additional tax unit in the same Efremovo parish as his manor (which was located in the small village of Manuilovo Sushchovo) from an exchange with Alexis Buzheninov.⁵⁴

Eight transactions involving five families (the Erokhovs, Shcherbinins, Bundovs, Turovs, and Oboturovs) brought additional land in the same parishes where the pomeshchiks already held nonmanorial pomesties. The transaction between the three sons of Alexis Turov (Grisha, Fedok, and Ivanets) and their uncle Fedor Turgenev is one example. Four of the 4.5 tax units received by the Turov brothers were located in the Okolorusie where

they already held 7.5 tax units inherited from their paternal uncle Gridia Turov. The additional half tax unit in the hamlet of Voronovo was located in the same Cherechitsk parish where they held a pridacha of eleven tax units.⁵⁵ The Resurrection pomeshchik Ivanets Volodimerov syn Erokhov obtained the hamlets of Sushchevo and Sapozhek, two tax units, in the Efremovo parish where he already held two tax units in Megletso and a tax unit in Kamenka from one of his exchanges with Menshoi Aigustov.⁵⁶

The remaining exchanges were motivated by one of the party's desire to relocate the family seat to the newly acquired land. Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky established his manor in the countryside of the Cherenchitsy parish on the lands formerly belonging to St. Yury's monastery obtained from his exchange with Michael Zamiatnia Vasiliev syn Blagovo. The transaction moved the administrative center of Zamutsky's estate from the Belsky parish of the Novgorod district to the Staraia Rusa district 150 versts to the southwest, near the town of Staraia Rusa along the Lovat River on the border with Derevskaia province.⁵⁷ Daniel Ivanov syn Shchulepnikov exchanged his entire Shchirsk parish pomestie inherited from his father Ivan in return for 6.5 tax units in the Vyshgorod parish, where he established a new manor in the hamlet of Zagorie in the volost of Vasily Kostelev.⁵⁸ While the old Shchirsk pomestie was located in the Novgorod district more than 100 versts to the northwest, the new Vyshgorod estate was only twenty-two versts from Porkhov, the most important administrative and commercial center along the route from Moscow to Novgorod. Since both of the transactions moved the pomeshchik's manor closer to major trading centers, geographic considerations motivated the transactions.

Seven of the transactions motivated by the desire to consolidate pomesties involved the exchange of noncontiguous for contiguous parcels of land located in the same parish. Two of the cases concern the exchange of noncontiguous for contiguous parcels located outside of the parish of the pomeshchik's residence. The hamlet of Ostree received by the Okolorusie pomeshchik Matvei Bundov was located in the same Kolomna parish as the hamlet of Briakovo given to his nephew Grishka Dmitriev syn Bundov.⁵⁹ Matvei also exchanged the hamlet of Sholotkovo Menshoe with Fedor Neveia Miakinin in return for four new settlements located in the same Kolomna parish.⁶⁰ The transaction is legally significant as the only exchange between servingmen involving the state. Bundov's returns refer to the state's charter authorizing the restoration of the new settlements originally established by his father to the Bundov family. Since the other exchanges between servingmen do not refer to the state, Miakinin's surrender of the new settlements was probably involuntary, resulting from Bundov's petition to the government.

The five remaining transactions concern the exchanges of noncontiguous for contiguous parcels located in the same parish as the pomeshchik's residence. The exchange between Bulgak Timofeev syn Piatin and Alexis Buzheninov is one example. The hamlet of Gorka received by the Piatin was located in the same Efremovo parish as Piatin's residence at Manilevo Sushchevo and the hamlet of Sholtskova given to Buzheninov.⁶¹ The exchange between Boris Evreev's sons, Vasily and Gorian, with the abbot of the Sknetinsk (Skniatinsk) monastery is another example. The Evreevs received an additional tax unit in Shniatinsk hamlet of Strugi-on-the-Shelon where they resided on their manor in return for the Shniatinsk hamlets of Zamosie and Dovorets.⁶² Since the pomeshchiks were giving up old for new land in the same parish, they were motivated by the desire to obtain contiguous parcels.

The survival of both parties' returns for only five of the nineteen exchanges prevents the historian from reaching a definite conclusion concerning the degree to which the exchanges were equivalent. Although both parties received the same number of tax units in two exchanges, the exchanged parcels were not equally productive. Dmitry Ivanov syn Oboturov and the three sons of Alexis Turov exchanged one tax unit and one peasant farm, but Turov's new peasants sowed four bushels of rye in one field and mowed sixty bales of hay while Oboturov's only sowed three bushels of rye in one field and mowed twenty bales of hay.⁶³ The lands exchanged by Fedor Neveia Ivanov syn Miakinin and Matvei Bundov were also unequally productive. Although both parties received one tax unit, Fedor Neveia's was occupied by one peasant farm sowing four bushels of rye in one field and mowing forty bales of hay. Matvei's four new settlements (Voronino, Ortiukhovo Podosinie, Velikii Ruchei, and Borovina) were occupied by four peasant farms sowing seven bushels of rye in one field and mowing ninety bales of hay.⁶⁴

The three remaining transactions with returns from both parties did not involve an equal number of tax units. The exchanges between Ivanets Volodimerov syn Erokhov and Menshoi Aigustov provide two examples. In one transaction Evreev received five tax units in two hamlets. The tax units in Borisovo included one peasant household sowing three bushels of rye in one field and mowing forty bales of hay while the four tax units in the hamlet of Goryshka included two peasant households sowing sixteen bushels of rye in one field and mowing 120 bales of hay.⁶⁵ Although Menshoi Aigustov received more tax units from the same transactions, his six tax units were less productive than Evreev's five tax units, consisting of five peasant farms sowing fifteen bushels of rye and mowing 120 bales of hay.⁶⁶ In the other transaction Evreev received two tax units (one in the hamlet of Sushchovo and the other in the hamlet of Sapozhek) and five rubles in cash in return for giving Aigustov three tax units in the village of Shotovo. The two hamlets received

by Evreev consisted of two peasant farms sowing seven bushels of rye in one field and mowing seventy bales of hay.⁶⁷ The village received by Aigustov, consisted of the manor, two servant's households, three abandoned peasant homesteads, on which thirteen bushels of rye were sown in one field and 200 bales of hay were mowed.⁶⁸

The exchange between Andrew Shirshik Surin syn Nazimov and his brother Boris with their cousin Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov was also unequal. The hamlet of Vorobievo received by Vesniak was occupied one peasant household sowing five bushels of rye in one field on 1.5 tax units and two additional peasant households sowing six bushels of rye in one field on one tax unit. The hamlet of Olisovo Eskino received by Andrew and Boris was occupied by two peasant homesteads sowing eight bushels of rye in one field on two tax units. As a result Andrew and Boris only received the equivalent of 67% of the peasant households, 73% of the bushels of rye sown in one field and 80% of the tax units given to their cousin. The contrast between Vesniak's position as the sole landlord of his pomestie and Andrew and Boris's position as joint landlords makes the transaction look even more unequal. While Vesniak received the entire income from his 2.5 tax units, Andrew and Boris had to share the income from their two tax units.⁶⁹

The references to the amount of tax units received by both parties in the returns for the pomeshchiks exchanging land with the church and the petty landowner Ulian provide additional evidence of unequal transactions. Vasily and Gorian Evreev had to give the abbot of the Sknetinsk monastery two tax units in order to acquire an additional tax unit in the same hamlet as their manor.⁷⁰ The two brothers also had to pay two tax units to obtain an additional tax unit in the hamlet of Shelonskoe.⁷¹ The unequal nature of these transactions implies the willingness of pomeshchiks to sacrifice more for less productive land and pay cash, if necessary, to consolidate or (as in Aigustov's case) to relocate their estates.

The percentage of land acquired by exchange shows the importance attached by pomeshchiks to their ability to exchange parcels of pomesties. More than ten percent of the pomestie was acquired by exchange in the case of eight of the seventeen pomesties for which data survives. The hamlets (Gremok, Maziltsovo, and Dorogusha) acquired by the Retno pomeshchik Peter Mikhailov syn Kropotov from his exchange with the archimandrite of St. Yury's monastery represented three tax units (11. 8%) of his 25.25 tax unit dacha.⁷² Twenty percent or more of the pomestie was acquired by exchange in 29.4% of the cases. Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky's Cherenchitsy manor of fifteen tax units acquired from his exchange with Michael Zamiatnia Vasiliev syn Blagovo and the six tax units in the former hamlets of Anton Kisliakov (Nadmoshie and Paportno) re-

ceived from his exchange with Zamiatnia Samarin represent twenty-one or 65% of his thirty-three tax units.⁷³

The location of most of the parcels acquired by exchange in the same parishes as their other lands shows the pomeshchiks' desire to consolidate their holdings. The same motives influenced the location of the pridachas.

THE LOCATION OF THE PRIDACHAS AND THE MANOR

The pridacha's distance from the lord's manor was considered to determine whether the land's location influenced the decision to grant a particular parcel to a pomeshchik. Each pridacha parcel's distance from the manor was estimated by measuring the versts between the parishes in which the parcel and the lord's manor were located. The parcels' average distance from the lord's manor was calculated because pomeshchiks often received pridachas in different parishes.

Most pridachas included land in the same parish as the lord's manor. Thirteen pomeshchiks received all of their pridachas in the same parish as their manor. The pridacha of five tax units granted to the three sons of Afanasy Parfeniev (Peter, Ivashko, and Iushko), for example, was located in the same Efremovo parish as their residence in the hamlet of Lushkino-on-the-Porusie and nineteen of their twenty-five old tax units.⁷⁴ Nineteen pomeshchiks received part of their pridachas in the same parish as the manor. Vladimir Afanasiev syn Cheglovkov's pridacha of five tax units included 3.5 tax units in the same Belsky parish where he held fifteen old tax units and resided on his manor in the hamlet of Golovino-on-the-Belaia.⁷⁵ The thirty-two lords who received at least some land in the same parish as the manor represent 71% of the forty-five pomeshchiks whose complete pridachas are known.

Ten of the thirteen remaining pomeshchiks received pridachas in neighboring parishes. The average distance of two pomeshchiks' holdings from the manor was less than ten versts. Two of Elizar Erokhov's sons, Ivan and Mitrofan, received pridachas of 2.3 tax units in the Cherenchitsy parish less than ten versts from their manors in Ramyshevo parish.⁷⁶ If the two pomeshchiks are added to the thirty-two pomeshchiks with at least part of their pridacha in the same parish as the manor, the lands of 76% of the forty-five pridatchiks were located near the manor.

Most other pomeshchiks preferred lands near the manor. The average distance of six pomeshchiks' pridachas from the manor was less than twenty versts. Elizar Erokhov's third son Gridia received pridacha parcels in Cherenchitsy and the Okolorusie an average distance of fourteen versts from his Ramushevo parish manor at Zapolek.⁷⁷

Two additional pomeshchiks received pridachas within twenty-five versts from the manor. Gregory Alekseev syn Turov's pridachas in the Cherenchitsy, Chertitsk, and Okolorusie parishes were an average distance of 20.7 versts from his manor in the Resurrection parish hamlet of Matrunino.⁷⁸ Alabush Andreev syn Lazorev's pridachas of four tax units in the former Nativity parish hamlets of Vesniak Nazimov and a half tax unit in the St Nicholas's of Vysotsk hamlet of Volkovo formerly belonging to Istoma Aladin were an average distance of twenty-four versts from his manor in the hamlet of Ustretsyon-on-the-Shelon in the Porkhov area and Our Lady's parish.⁷⁹

Only three of the thirteen pomeshchiks received a pridachas in remote parishes. One of the cases concerns Ivan Esiukov, whose pridacha of 23.5 tax units included land in four parishes. The average distance of the parcels from Ivan's Nativity manor was 47.6 versts since Ruchaisk was seventy, Dubrovno 57.5, the Porkhov area thirty-three, and St Michael's twenty-nine versts to the west. Despite their distance from the manor the four parishes in which the pridacha was located were relatively close to each other. The 9.75 tax units received in Ruchaisk were less than twenty versts from Dubrovno parish. The 1.5 tax units received in Dubrovno parish were less than ten versts from the 8.5 tax units granted in St Michael's parish less than ten versts from the Porkhov area, where Esiukov received 4.5 tax units.⁸⁰

The two remaining cases of remote pridachas concern Osip Rezantsov and Postnik Shcherbinin. Shcherbinin's Degzha pridacha of fifteen tax units was forty-eight versts from his manor in Los parish.⁸¹ Rezantsov's Oblutski pridacha was nearly a hundred versts from the Kolomna parish where he resided on his manor. The location of his original pomestie in the Kolomna parish along the eastern border of Shelonskaia province and the location of the pridacha in the Obluchie parish less than ten versts from Porkhov, the region's main commercial and administrative center, suggests that the more favorable geographic location more than compensated for the distance from the manor.⁸²

SOURCES OF PRIDACHAS

The sources of the pridachas were considered to determine whether the pomeshchiks preferred pridachas from other family members' lands. Thirteen (28%) of the forty-five pomeshchiks with complete returns for their pridachas received some or all of their additional tax units from other family members.⁸³ Although the percentage of tax units received from other family members ranged from six percent to 100%, only four of the thirteen pomeshchiks received less than half of their holdings from other family members. Ivan Ev-

siukov and his brother, for example, received six (26%) of their twenty-three additional tax units from the former maintenance pomestie (*prozhitok*, pl. *prozhitki*) of Andrew Soshka Aleksandrov syn Evsiukov's widow Akulina.⁸⁴

Two of the other nine pomeshchiks received half of their pridachas from other family members' lands. Ilia Andreev syn Selivanov received 2.5 of his five tax unit pridacha from the former lands his brother Boris; 1.5 tax units were located in the Belsky parish while the remaining tax unit was situated in the Pazherevitsy parish.⁸⁵ Semen Ivanov syn Nazimov received two of his four pridacha tax units from Ivan Nekrasov syn Nazimov's former estate in Pazherevitsy parish; the other two tax units came from the former lands of Matvei Volokhov in the same parish.⁸⁶

Five of the remaining seven pomeshchiks received more than 75% of their pridachas from other family member's lands. The case of the six sons of Ivan Ogarov (Ivan, Matvei, Yakov, Gregory, Vasily, and Obrazets), who resided on their father's old Degzha pomestie, is representative. Their pridacha of fifty-five Degzha tax units included sixteen tax units from the former lands of Vasily Ogarov, thirteen from Pavel Ogarov, and another thirteen from Nazar Ogarov.⁸⁷

Two of the five pomeshchiks received all of their pridachas from other family members' lands. Nekliud Ivan syn Moseev and his sons Michael and Lev received a pridacha of eight tax units including seven tax units earlier belonging to Zuk Moseev in the volost of Bogdan Esipov and one tax unit of pochinoks established by Nekliud's father.⁸⁸ Ivan Lopak Ivanov syn Karpov's pridacha consisted of five tax units earlier held by his kinsman Odash Karpov in the same Pazherevitsy parish where he resided on his manor at Porechie.⁸⁹

In addition to the thirteen cases of pomeshchiks receiving pridachas from other relatives' lands, the two sons of Yury Nazimov ("Vasily Bolshoi and his brother") received a pridacha of thirteen tax units in Pazherevitsy parish earlier belonging to their uncle Ivan Nekrasov syn Nazimov. Instead of retaining the enlarged pomestie as a joint possession, the two brothers divided their lands into legally separate estates. Vasily Bolshoi received the entire pridacha in return for recognizing his brother's possession of their old pomestie. Since Vasily paid the same obrok of one altyn per tax unit assessed on the other pridachas, his estate continued to be legally regarded as a pridacha despite its juridical separation from his brother's lands.⁹⁰ If Vasily's pridacha is considered with the thirteen cases discussed above, 31.1% of the forty-five pridachas included lands from the recipient's other family members.

The small percentage of pomeshchiks receiving other family members' lands as pridachas does not refute the thesis that the pomeshchiks considered their estates family land. By 1539 most of the old pomesties had been granted to the sons and grandsons of the original pomeshchiks either at the time of

their original enfeoffment or the death of a close male relative (father, uncle, brother, or cousin).

In 1500 the representatives of twenty-one families held all of the hamlets later granted to the twenty-four *pridatchiki* who did not receive any of their relatives' lands. Ten of the families (the Aladins, Bobrovs, Ilins, Kiselevs, Kobylins, Kositsyns, Miakatins, Osnobishins, Volokhovs, and Zakharovs) who lost land between 1500 and 1539 did not have any known representatives in service in 1539. If the original *pomeshchiki* died without widows or male relatives, their lands escheated to the state, which regranted to unrelated *pomeshchiki* as *pridachas*.

Thirteen representatives from the remaining eleven families held lands in 1500 given to other families as *pridachas* after their death. Although all of the families still had representatives in service in 1539, only two (15%) were sons of the original holder of the *pridacha*. One of the cases concerns the *pridacha* of the three sons of Ivan Samarin-Kvashnin (Mikula, Gregory, and Stepan). While the three brothers received a *pridacha* of three tax units from the former Dolzhino lands of Afanasy Cheglov, Afanasy's son Vladimir only received 1.5 tax units from his father's Dolzhino *pomestie*. The distance of the land from the *pomeshchiki*'s manors explains the division. The Dolzhino *pomestie* was located in the same parish as Samarin-Kvashnin's manor but was more than thirty *versts* from the Cheglov family's old Belsky *pomestie*, which Vladimir had inherited earlier from his uncle Ivan. Since Vladimir received a *pridacha* of two tax units in the same Belsky parish where he resided at Golovino, he probably preferred Belsky to Dolzhino land.⁹¹

The other case of land being granted to someone outside of the family despite the survival of the original *pomeshchik*'s son concerns the *pridacha* of Andrew Surin syn Nazimov. Although Andrew Ivanov syn Volodimerov Ovt-syn left a son Ivan, Nazimov received one of Ovt-syn's thirty-nine Pazherevitsy tax units as a *pridacha*. The grant is surprising since Ivan was still serving from the remainder of his father's old Pazherevitsy *pomestie* in 1539. The reference in Ivan's returns to his *pridacha* of one tax unit earlier belonging to the parish Church of St. Nicholas, however, suggests that Ivan relinquished his claim to one of his father's old tax units for additional land in the same hamlet of Porechie where the parish church and his old manor were located.⁹²

Two of the thirteen representatives had the same Christian name as the original *pomeshchik*. One case concerns Semen Ovt-syn, who had the same Christian name and surname as the former holder of Fedor Denisiev syn Ragozin's *pridacha* of two tax units in the Pazherevitsy parish. In 1539, a Semen Vasiliev syn Volodimerov Ovt-syn was serving from his father's old Snezhsk parish *pomestie*. The omission of Semen's patronymic from the Ragozin returns prevents us from determining whether the Pazherevitsy and

Snezhsk returns refer to the same Semen Ovtsyn. The absence of references to Pazherevitsy land in Semen Vasiliev syn's 1539 returns and his father's omission from the list of Pazherevitsy landholders in the 1500 abridgement of the Pazherevitsy cadaster, however, suggests that the two Semen Ovtsyns were different pomeshchiks.⁹³

The other case of a pomeshchik serving in 1539 with the same Christian name as the original holder of land given to another family as a pridacha concerns Vesniak Nazimov, the former holder of the four Nativity tax units given to Alabysh Andreev syn Lazarev between 1500 and 1539. The 1539 Pazherevitsy cadaster records the old pomestie of a Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov. The omission of Vesniak's patronymic in Lazarev's returns prevents the identification of the Vesniak Nazimov of Nativity parish and the Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov of Pazherevitsy parish as the same landholder. The lack of references to the loss of Nativity land in Vesniak Ivanov syn's 1539 returns, however, suggests that the two Nazimovs were probably different landlords residing in different parishes. The younger Vesniak could have been the elder Vesniak's nephew and therefore his next heir in the absence of male descendants. However, the location of the pridacha of five tax units received by the younger Vesniak in the same Pazherevitsy parish as his manor of Tolokniansa shows his preference for a compact estate consisting of lands near the manor. Since his uncle's land was located in a different parish, he probably relinquished his claims as heir male in order to obtain the additional Pazherevitsy land.⁹⁴

Nine (69%) of the thirteen representatives whose lands were granted as pridachas to other families did not have descendants in service in 1539. Five representatives from the Tatianin, Nazimov, Ogarev, Unkovsky, and Vseslavin families had collateral relatives in the same parish as the original pomeshchik. One of the cases concerns Argun Tatianin. Gavril Khlopov received two and Subbota Shablykin received 5.5 Pazherevitsy parish tax units formerly belonging to Argun Tatianin despite the continuing service of Ivan Andreev syn and Dmitry Ivanov syn Tatianin in the same parish. The reference in Shablykin's returns to the abandonment of the lands after Argun's capture at Oreshek suggests the Tatianins were not interested enough in their cousin's lands to prevent them from escheating to the state.⁹⁵ The Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov, who was serving from his old Pazherevitsy pomestie in 1539, was probably the cousin and not the son of the Ivan Nekrasov syn Nazimov who held the one tax unit in Malodenevo given as a pridacha to Ivan Bolshoi Ivanov syn Pustoshkin between 1505 and 1539. While Ivan Nekrasov syn's nephew Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov received thirteen of his uncle's twenty Pazherevitsy units, Vesniak received nothing. The presence of two Ivan Nazimovs, Ivan Nekrasov syn and Ivan Nazimov Briukhatoi, among the

Pazherevitsy pomeshchiks of 1500 raises the possibility that Vesniak was the latter Nazimov's son. This would account for the bulk of Ivan Nekrasov syn's lands being given to his nephew rather than his son.⁹⁶

Representatives of the Ogarev, Unkovsky, and Vseslavin families were also serving from old pomesties in 1539. Although the Ogarevs lost 7.25 of Pavel Ogarev's former Degzha pomestie to Prince Volodimer Ivanov syn Beloselsky, Ivan Ivanov syn Ogarev and his five brothers (Matvei, Yakov, Gregory, Vasily, and Obrazets) were already serving from their old pomestie in the former crown volost of Bogdan Espiov. By 1539 they had held the estate long enough to receive a pridacha of fifty-five tax units including the thirteen tax units remaining from Pavel Ogarev's Degzha estate.⁹⁷ Iosif Unkovsky's thirteen Nativity tax units were given to Ivan Vasiliev syn Tyrtov and his brothers Yakov and Yury while Yury Aleksandrov syn Unkovsky served from his old Nativity parish pomestie of twenty-eight tax units in the crown volost of Luka Isakov syn Fedotin. The clerks' "old" classification and the absence of a pridacha suggest that Yury Aleksandrov syn was not interested in his relative's Nativity lands.⁹⁸ The four sons of Dmitry Shcherbinin (Postnik, Ivanets, Porosha, and Nazimets) who resided on their manor in the Los parish hamlet of Velikoe Selo were given fifteen Degzha tax units earlier belonging to Fedor Vseslavin although Semen Vasiliev syn Vseslavin was serving from the same Degzha pomestie received from Ivan III before 1500. His advanced age, the absence of male descendants, and the lack of references to a pridacha imply Semen's forfeiture of whatever claims he may have had to his cousin's lands.⁹⁹

Three representatives of the Evreev, Karkmazov, and Terpigorev families were serving in other parishes in 1539 but not in the same parish as the family member whose lands were given to a pridatchik from another family. The first case concerns the alienation of two tax units located in the St Nicholas's of Vysotsk parish formerly belonging to Vlas Mikhailov syn Evreev to Dmitry Chetvertkin. In 1539 Vasily and Gorian, the sons of Boris Evreev, were serving from the old Shniatinsk pomestie earlier held by Elizar Evreev where they resided on their manors in the small village of Goroden and the hamlet of Trugi respectively. Since their manors were more than fifty versts north of the St Nicholas's of Vysotsk parish, Vasily and Gorian may not have wanted their kinsman's lands.¹⁰⁰

The second case concerns the alienation of five tax units of Gregory Kartmazov located in the Obluchie parish to Yakov Osipov syn Rezantsov. In 1539 Semen Ivanov syn Kartmazov and his sons, Timoshka and Andrew were serving from their old Yasno parish pomestie. Semen and his sons also held a pridacha of 2.5 Karachunsk and six Obluchie tax units earlier belonging to Se-

men's "brother Gregory." Since the Rezantsov and Semen Kartmazov Obluchie pridachas came from the same volost of Iulian Plusnin held by Gregory Ivanov syn Kartmazov in 1500, Gregory's lands were divided between Rezantsov and his brother Semen. Semen received six or a third and Rezantsov five or 27.7% of the eighteen tax units jointly held by Gregory and his brother Ignaty, the sons of Ivan Kartmazov, in 1500. Gregory's widow also received a share, for the Rezantsov returns refer to his widow's share in the Obluchie hamlet of Dubrovek in which Rezantsov held a half share; the loss of the widow's returns, however, prevents the historian from determining her share in her husband's estate. The proximity of the widow's share to Rezantsov's pridacha and Gregory death without male descendants raises the possibility of a family relationship between Rezantsov and the widow Kartmazov, perhaps as her son-in-law.¹⁰¹

The third case of a family to lose land despite the service of representatives in other parishes concerns the granting of pridachas from the former lands of Boris Terpigorev to the Nazimovs, Chetverkins, and Tyrtovs while Terpigorevs served in other parishes. Zuk Semenov syn Tyrtov received one Obluchie tax unit in the hamlet of Mukhino, Vasiuk Suvorov syn Nasimov received 4.5 tax units in the Vyshgorod and a half tax unit in Obluchie, and Dmitry Chetvertkin and his four brothers received four tax units in the hamlet of Maksovo in the Pazherevitsy parish. Although Boris died without descendants, Ivan Davydov syn, Fedor, and Kelar Terpigorev were serving from old pomesties in the Yasno parish. Although Ivan Davydov served from his old Yasno pomestie of 28.5 tax units, his kinsmen Fedor and Kelar both received pridachas outside of Yasno parish. Although the other Terpigorevs received pridachas, nine of Kelar's eleven tax units were located in the same Yasno parish as his manor at Molochishcho while two of Kelar's and all five of Fedor's tax units were located in the Our Lady's parish ten versts to the north. The location of the Our Lady's land near the commercial center of Porkhov suggests the Terpigorevs were not interested in their kinsman's lands, which were located in the southern region of the Porkhov district.¹⁰²

The last case concerns the Buzheninovs who lost a tax unit of the Los pomestie of Alexis Buzheninov to Boris Glotov between 1505 and 1539. Although there are no known Buzheninovs in service in 1539, Ignaty Leontiev Buzheninov was serving from his Svinort pomestie of 3.5 and a Shniatinsk parcel of two tax units in 1552. Since the 1539 Shniatinsk and Svinort returns are lost, Ignaty could have been serving from the same land in 1539. Since the pomestie was still new in 1552, however, the alienation of Alexis Buzheninov's Los lands could have taken place before Ignaty left his former position as a sytnik in the royal household and became a pomeshchik.¹⁰³

THE POCHINOK AS A PRIDACHA

The new settlements made in the forest were usually granted to their founder as part of his pridacha. Twenty-six (78.7 %) of the thirty-three landlords who established pochinoks after 1500 retained their settlements. The remaining seven landlords received other pochinoks in addition to their own. The clerks' transference of pochinoks from the original pomeshchiks indicates a pochinok did not legally become part of the founder's pomestie until he received it as a pridacha.¹⁰⁴ The lawsuit between Alfery Vorypaev syn Pleshcheev and Mikita the tinsmith and Luk'ianko the coppersmith over the possession of four pochinoks shows that the clerks' approval was not automatic. The St Michael's returns reveal that Pleshcheev lost the lawsuit and the dues of 339.5 Novgorod dengas paid by the peasants who lived in the four pochinoks occupying three tax units.¹⁰⁵

THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ON THE PRIDACHA

The pochinoks were not completely tax exempt since they were included in the additions to the dacha on which the pomeshchik paid a special tax referred to as an obrok.¹⁰⁶ The assessment, whose rate of one altyn per additional tax unit never varied, is surprising. The Novgorod cadasters from the "new census" distinguish between the crown lands whose peasants paid obrok directly to the grand prince and the pomesties whose peasants paid obrok to the pomeshchik. Unlike the surviving Shelonskaia cadasters, the Vodskaia returns refer to the granting of large tracts of crown land to pomeshchiks, none of whom were required to pay a special assessment per tax unit.¹⁰⁷ The special assessment on the additions to the dacha granted to the Shelonskaia pomeshchiks does not alter the legal character of the pridacha as part of the pomestie. The heading of the last paragraph of each entry refers to the "old pomesties and pridacha." The paragraph itself fails to distinguish between the settlements, peasant households, peasants, bushels of rye, bales of hay, tax units, and income on the old pomestie and the pridacha. This suggests that the clerks considered the entire estate a pomestie.

The cadaster of 1539 refers to two servingmen, Stepan Zviagin syn Sukov and Posnik Ivanov syn Sablin, formerly "without a pomestie (*bez pomestnomu*).¹⁰⁸ Their estates were pomesties because they were classified under the heading "villages and hamlets for deti boiarskie, for pomeshchiks."¹⁰⁹ The last paragraph of each entry refers to their payment "to the grand prince above the *obezhnoe dan'* of an obrok of . . . one altyn per tax unit."¹¹⁰ Since Sukov paid twenty altyns for his pomestie of twenty tax units while Sablin paid five

altyns for his pomestie of five tax units, the obrok was assessed on the entire estate. This suggests the tax was a special assessment charged for new land.

The exact length of time the obrok was paid on the pridacha cannot be determined. The reference to the obrok in addition to the annually paid *dan'* suggests the tax was also an annual assessment. Yet the later returns, which do not distinguish between the old and new sections of the pomestie, fail to refer to obrok, suggesting the quitrent was only paid while the pridacha was considered "new" land.¹¹¹ The Zhedritsy pomestie of Daniel Ivanov syn Poleukhtov Buturlin, which included a pridacha of twenty-five tax units in Yasno parish, is the only Shelonskaia pomestie described in both the 1539 general and 1552 revisionary census.¹¹² The entry is especially interesting since it distinguishes between the old tax units and the pridacha granted around 1539, adding data concerning the quality of the land absent from the 1539 cadaster. The lack of a reference to the obrok of one altyn per tax unit on the pridacha implies the assessment of a decade earlier was no longer paid.

The assessment of obrok on the additions to the Shelonskaia pomeshchiks' dachas suggests that the pomestie was simply another category of crown land. Yet the government failed to assess the obrok on old pomesties and discontinued the assessment on new lands after a certain period of years. In Vod-skaia province, moreover, the government did not assess a fee on additions to the dacha. The reasons for assessing the tax in Shelonskaia and not Vod-skaia province are unclear. It is possible, however, that the tax was related to the quality of the soil and Shelonskaia's more favorable location along the major trade routes.

CONCLUSION

The charters and decrees surviving from the late fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth centuries support the traditional view of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century historians of the pomestie as a conditional estate that could not be alienated from the landlord without the state's prior permission. New pomeshchiks could not even enter their estate without a special entry charter prepared by a state secretary. None of the decrees surviving from this period authorized the sale or exchange of pomesties. Indeed, the tsar did not formally permit the exchange of pomesties until the decree of 1636 later confirmed by the Ulozhenie of 1648. The pomestie also looked conditional because the state's agents surveyed the pomesties and entered the results in the cadastral books immediately after the returns from the obrok-paying crown lands.

The exchanges of pomesties found in the cadasters of 1498 and 1540 do not support the traditional picture of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century pomestie as a conditional tenure. Conditional military tenures separate ownership and possession. Although the servingman has possession of the land as long as he provides military service, the state retains ownership. Since the estate is supposed to support military service, the state has the right to approve or reject the transference of possession from one party to another before the transaction takes place. The permission is customarily given in the form of a written charter to prevent the former landlords from trying to seize their former lands. The absence of references to the state's permission in all but one of the exchanges of pomesties implies the pomeshchik's ability to alienate his lands without the government's prior consent. The government did give written consent in the form of a charter to the exchange of pomesties between Matvei Bundov and Fedor Miakinin. The charter's restoration of new settlements founded by Matvei's father to the Bundov family, however, recognizes the family's interest in the pochinoks founded by its members and does not assert the crown's right to give prior consent to the exchange of pomesties.

The transactions between servingmen, the nonserving petty landowners and the church are especially significant. While the transference of pomesties between servingmen does not affect the total service land fund, the alienation of pomesties to a church, monastery, or petty landowner removes the land from service. Since the monasteries and small landowners gave up fewer tax units than they received from the servingmen, the transactions reduced the pomestie land fund by alienating the land from the crown. The crown's tolerance of this situation suggests that the pomestie was treated like an allod rather than a conditional military fief.

The pomeshchik's acquisition of pridachas from his relatives' lands implies the landlord's possession of a hereditary claim to the lands of deceased family members. Since inheritability is the definitive characteristic of an allod, the pridacha provides additional evidence of the allodial character of the pomestie in unwritten, customary law. However, passage of most estates to the sons, brothers, nephews and cousins of the deceased servingmen discussed in the next chapter furnishes the most convincing evidence of the inheritability of the pomestie.

NOTES

1. *DAI*, I, No. 52, 1555 g., and Samokvasov, I, pp. 142–47.
2. For the text of Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich's decree, see *Pamiatniki russkogo prava*, V (Moscow, 1959), pp. 470–77. The exchange of pomesties for votchinas was not per-

mitted in statutory law until the *Ulozhenie* prepared by the Assembly of the land (*zemskii sobor*) of 1649 authorized the transference of lands between pomeshchiks and votchinniks or between pomeshchiks and monasteries. See M.N. Tikhomirov and P.P. Epifanov, eds., *Sobornoe Ulozhenie 1649 goda* (Moscow, 1961), Chapter Sixteen ("On Pomestie Land"), articles three, four, five, and seven, pp. 179-80.

3. Shapiro, II, p. 198.

4. See Yu. G. Alekseev and A.I. Kopanev, "Razvitie pomestnoi sistemy v XVI v," p. 59.

5. The returns from the census of 1539 are published in *NPK*, IV, 237-529.

6. The distance between the parishes was measured from the central point of the parishes on the map "Novgorodskie piatiny v kontse XV-nachale XVI veka" in the frontispiece of Shapiro, I. On the verst (s. *versta*, pl. *versty*), which represented 0.663 miles or 1.067 kilometers, see Pushkarev, p. 175.

7. Before the exchange with Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov, Lev held twelve tax units in the Dubrovno parish hamlets of Fedor Samsonov's wife Ofrosinia earlier held in pomestie by Stepan Ivan syn Sarachin. These lands included the hamlet of Luka, where Lev had his manor. See *NPK*, IV, 192-93 for Lev Kharlamov's Dubrovno returns. Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov's abridged St Michael's returns are in *NPK*, V, 66.

8. Although Boris Esiukov's returns refer to him as Boris Maniulov syn Esiukov, the *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 25, refers to him as Boris Manukhin syn Esiukov. If "Maniulov" is a typing error or an incorrect transliteration of the sixteenth century Muscovite script, Boris was probably the brother of the Karas Manukhin syn Esiukov with whom he exchanged pomesties. See *NPK*, IV, 203-206 for Boris's returns; *NPK*, IV, 200-203 for Karas's returns.

9. See Daniel Nashchokin's returns in *NPK*, V, 122, and Istoma Nashchokin's returns in *NPK*, V, 124-25.

10. *NPK*, V, 66.

11. Ivan Nikiforov syn Kvashnin received three hamlets. Boriskovskaia included one bondman's household, five peasant households, one bondman, and nine peasants, who sowed twenty-five bushels of rye, on six tax units. Koren had one peasant household and two peasants, who sowed three bushels of rye, on one tax unit, and Koren zhe had two peasant households and four peasants, who sowed three bushels of rye, on one tax unit. See *NPK*, IV, 33. Chernets Paiusov received the share of Konechek (Konechok) consisting of four peasant households and six peasants, who sowed twenty-four bushels of rye, on four tax units. He also received the share of Vustrek consisting of three peasant households and three peasants, who sowed sixteen bushels of rye, on four tax units. See *NPK*, IV, 28-29. The bushels of rye cited above refer to the amount sown in one field. Since the three-field system usually prevailed in sixteenth century Muscovy, the same amount of rye was sown also in the second field.

Although Koren and Koren zhe ("Koren again") are described as separate hamlets, they could have been separate sections of the same hamlet. The absence of the clerks' designation for jointly held hamlets ("vopche"), however, is evidence of the status of Koren and Koren zhe as separate hamlets, with Koren Zhe referring to a former pochinok earlier founded by the residents of Koren.

12. *NPK*, IV, 22–28.
13. For the returns from Gorka, the Dubrovno hamlet received by Lev Kharlamov in exchange with Ilia Vasiliev syn Kvashnin, see *NPK*, IV, 191. Lev's share consisted of half of the hamlet or 1.5 tax units. For the returns from the Opoka parish hamlet of Liutoe (1.5 tax units), which Lev also received from Kvashnin, see *NPK*, 179.
14. *NPK*, IV, 19.
15. *NPK*, IV, 35. The *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 90 omits this reference from the list for Lev Kharlamov.
16. The complete Cherenchitsy returns are in *NPK*, V, 221–22; the complete Efre-movo returns are in *NPK*, V, 233. For the abridged St Michael's returns see *NPK*, V, 51.
17. *NPK*, IV, 191.
18. Kvashnin held 23.5 tax units in Buregi and four tax units in Strupinsk parish, the description of which is lost. Paiusov held thirty-one tax units in Buregi parish and several peasant households in Uzhin parish that became crown land in 1524. See *NPK*, V, 355.
19. *NPK*, IV, 193. For the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century prices, see Shapiro, I, 33.
20. See *NPK*, III, 32 (the Vodskaia cadaster of 1500) for the returns from the crown volost of Boris and Davyd Neradov. The peasants must have paid the government in Muscovite currency. If Novgorodian dengas were used, the poltina would have added fifty-four dengas to the grain obrok of 366 dengas. The 420 Novgorodian dengas would have equaled nearly four rubles of 108 dengas each. On the continuing use of a ruble equal to 216 Muscovite and 108 Novgorodian dengas, see V.L. Ianin, "O metrologicheskikh zakonomernostiakh v razvitii russkikh monetnykh norm XIV-XVII vekov," in *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik* (1958), p.22. For additional examples of the use of a grivna equal to fourteen dengas around 1500 see *NPK*, III, 37; *Vremennik*, XI, pp. 44 and 109; and *PKVP*, p. 171.
21. *NPK*, IV, 191. The obrok included a grivna, two dengas, a ram, two hens, two cheeses, a fifth of flax, and a fourth of the rye harvest (fifty-nine dengas in all).
22. *NPK*, IV, 179, 191.
23. *NPK*, IV, 35.
24. *NPK*, IV, 200–201.
25. *NPK*, IV, 28–29.
26. See *NPK*, IV, 29 for the Paiusov and *NPK*, IV, 33 for the Kvashnin returns.
27. See *NPK*, IV, 200–201 for Podmoshie and *NPK*, IV, 204 for Golkovo.
28. Vorobin is identified in the *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 86 as Dmitry Vorobin Trusov, but the entries in the cadasters refer to him as "Mitia Trusov" in references to other servingmen's pomesties and as "Dmitry Trusov syn Vorobin" in the description of his Buregi parish. See *NPK*, IV, 27–28.
29. On the use of the correlation coefficient to analyze cadastral data, see Shapiro, II, pp. 8–9. Since all Vorobin's hamlets are considered, the coefficients represent population parameters rather than statistics based on a randomly chosen sample.
30. The following data was used to compute the correlation coefficients:
Hamlet-Households-Peasants-Rye-Tax Units

Butovo-1-2-5-1
 Evanovo-2-4-6-2
 Fomkino-1-1-2-1
 Ivantsovo-2-2-3-1
 Katelinina-1-1-2-0.5
 Klimetino-1-2-2-0.5
 Koren-1-3-2.5-1
 Parukhino-1-2-4-1
 Sluchino-1-2-2-1
 Sovkino-1-1-4-1

31. *NPK*, IV, 23.

32. *NPK*, V, 121.

33. *NPK*, V, 124.

34. The following percentages were calculated for the pomesties acquired by exchange before 1500.

Lord-Households-Peasants-Rye-Tax units

Esiukov, B.-10-10-5.5-6.3

Esuikov, K.-3-4.5-4-4.2

Kharlamov, I.M.-nd-nd-nd-37

Kharlamov, L.-nd-nd-nd-44

Kvashnin, F.V.-4-2-5.6-5.5

Kvashnin, I.N.-33-59-37-34

Kvashnin, I.V.-incomplete data

Nashchokin, D.-incomplete data

Nashchokin, I.-incomplete data

Paiusov, Ch.-23-19-30-25

Vorobin, D.T.-9-5.7-2.8-9.4

35. The references to the exchange of pomesties in the cadaster of Gregory Sobakin, published in *NPK*, IV, 238-529, concern the parishes of Belsky, Cherenchitsy, Degzha, Gorodnia, Efremovo, Kotorsk, St Michael's, Okolorusie, Kolomna, Pazherevitsy, Retno, Shchirsk, Shniatinsk, and Vyshgorod. If the two parishes (Kotorsk and Shchirsk) whose returns do not survive are eliminated, the exchanges represent 56.5 percent of all of the parishes with surviving returns.

36. For Zamutsky's returns see *NPK*, IV, 336. What Samarin received from the transactions is unknown since his 1539 returns are lost and Zamutskys returns do not refer to what was given for the additional Belsky lands.

37. See *NPK*, IV, 312 for Michael Chebotaev's returns; Prince Zasekin's 1539 returns are lost.

38. As late as 29 June 1639, Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich issued a decree confirming the prohibition against the transfer of land between Moscow and provincial servingmen; see *PRP*, V, pp. 477-78. For the tsar's decree of 13 August 1647 permitting the exchange of pomesties between boyars, *okolnichie* ("lords-in-waiting," junior members of the Boyar Duma), *diaki* (state secretaries), *zhiltsy*, and other Moscow serving ranks on the one hand and the *gorodovye dvoriane* and *deti boiarskie* (provincial servingmen) on the other, see "Ukaz 1647 Avg. 13" in *Russkii vestnik*, 1842, p. 143. The

decree was affirmed by the Assembly of the Land in 1649; see Tikhomirov and Epifanov, *Sobornoe Ulozhenie*, Chapter Sixteen, article three, p. 179. Despite the prohibition against the transfer of land between Moscow and provincial serving ranks before 1647, the later rigid system of Muscovite ranks did not exist in the late fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth centuries. This is shown by the motley origins of the original pomeshchiks (who included the former unfree servants of disgraced boyars) settled in Novgorod by Ivan III. The exchange between Prince Zasekin and Chebotaev may therefore represent the absence of a rigid system of ranks rather than a change in the crown's policy toward exchanges between Moscow and provincial servitors.

The Zasekin princes were descendants of the royal family of Yaroslavl, who entered the Muscovite grand prince's service in the mid-fifteenth century. The first references to their votchinas concern the sale of Yaroslavl votchinas to the Grand Princess Maria Yaroslavna, which are found in her husband's testament; see the testament of Vasily II (d. 1462) in *SGGD*, I, p. 204. Princes Michael and Ivan, the sons of Prince Ivan Zasekin, were included along with the other Yaroslavl princes (Dmitry Semenovitch Glebov and Ivan Fedorovich Ushatoi and the six sons of Alexander Aleksandrovich Shakovskoi) in the sixty-one princes enfeoffed in the Novgorod land in the 1480s. See the discussion in Veselovsky, *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie*, p. 291. For Prince Michael's Bezhetskaia pomesties, see *NPK*, II, 638-647. On his Shelonskaia pomesties, referred to in the returns for other pomesties, see IV, 252, 312, 568. Although most of their patrimonial lands were surrendered to Vasily II and his son, Ivan III, the family continued to hold votchinas in the Yaroslavl and Pereiaslavl districts before 1550. These were surrendered to the government in return for pomesties in other districts in the third quarter of the sixteenth century; see for example, the charter of Grand Prince Simeon Bekbulatovich to Prince Daniel Ivanovich Zasekin in *AAE*, I, no. 290. On the lineage of the Yaroslavl princes, see A.V. Ekzempliarsky, *Velikie i udel'nye kniaz'ia severnoi Rusi v tatarskii period, s 1238 po 1505g. Biograficheskii ocherki*, II (St. Petersburg, 1891), pp. 113ff; and Rozhdestvensky, pp. 159-61, 169-70.

39. See *NPK*, IV, 365 for Matvei Bundov's returns; Gregory Bundov's 1539 returns are lost.

40. *NPK*, IV, 375 for Andrew Nazimov's returns and *NPK*, IV, 368 for Vesniak Nazimov's returns.

41. The former hamlets of the petty landowner Luka Usov, received by the Turovs from an exchange with their uncle, Fedor Turgenev, included Dementieva and Bor and consisted of three peasant households, four peasants, eight bushels of rye, four tax units. Vorobievo consisted of one peasant household, one peasant, two bushels of rye, one-half tax unit. See *NPK*, IV, 465-66 for the Turov returns; Fedor Turgenev's 1539 returns are lost.

42. See *NPK*, IV, 465. Sergeevo consisted of one peasant household, one peasant, 1.5 bushels of rye, one-half tax unit.

43. On the origins of the *zemtsy*, see Chapter I, n. 3.

44. The share of Klin held by Tretiak and Fedor Kropotov consisted of one peasant household, two peasants, six bushels of rye, 1.5 tax units; see *NPK*, IV, 492. Since

Peter Mikhailov syn Kropotov held the other share of the hamlet, the family's holdings were concentrated in the Shniatinsk parish.

45. See *NPK*, IV, 489. Kropotov received Gremok, Maziltovo, and Dorogusha, consisting of five peasant households occupied by five peasants sowing sixteen bushels of rye on three tax units.

46. Shelonskoe consisted of one peasant household, one peasant, ten bushels of rye, two tax units; see *NPK*, IV, 497.

47. After the acquisition of the additional tax unit, Vasily and Gorian's hamlet of Strugi-on-the-Shelon consisted of the manor, two servants' households, two servants, twenty-five bushels of rye, and five tax units. See *NPK*, IV, 496.

48. See the following passage in *NPK*, IV, 403: ". . . da obzhu prinial derevni Seredki, a druguiu obzhu toe derevni Seredki dal popu nikolskomu, a skazyvaiut, chto dal toe obzhu popu pisets Grigorei Kosholev."

49. "D. Seredka . . . bylo 2 obzhy istari, i pisets Grigorei Koshelev odnu otdal popu k tserkvi, a obzhu bvial otets Dmitreev Ivan k svoemu usadishchu." *NPK*, IV, 405.

50. Although the complete Pazherevitsy returns are lost, the abridged Pazherevitsy cadaster record's Ivan Tatianin's possession of thirty-one tax units in 1498. See *NPK*, V, 61.

51. The hamlets received by the Shcherbinins included Noshkino, Sucheva, Plaskino, Libezhia, Vottskaia, Lugi, Guslitsa, and Konechek (eleven peasant households and eleven peasants who sowed 30.5 bushels of rye, ten tax units. The following passage distinguished the exchange with the grand prince from the pridacha, both of which consisted of the former Degzha hamlets of Fedor Vseslavin. "And to them also were granted in exchange, (for) what had been taken from them in Zalesie in Shelonskaia piatina in the other half in Kotorsk parish, and were given to them in return the hamlets of Fedor Vseslavin in Degzha parish in Shushalovo." ("Da im zhe otdeleno vo obmenu, chto u nikh vzianto v Zalesie v Shelonskoi zhe piatine v drugoi polovine v Kotorskom pogoste, a dany im protivu togo Fedorovskie zhe derevni Vseslavina v Degozhskom zhe pogoste v Shushalove.") See *NPK*, IV, 242. The abridgement of Valuev's cadaster (see *NPK*, V, 59) records Vseslavin's possession of 26.5 tax units on the former lands of the Novgorod boyar Michael Medvedev in 1500. The absence of references to Vseslavin in the 1539 cadaster and the transference of his former hamlets to the Shcherbinins suggest that he died without heirs before 1539. The twenty-five tax units granted to the Shcherbinins either as an exchange or a pridacha represent 94 percent of the Vseslavin pomestie and former Medvedev votchina, suggesting the administrative and economic unity of the Degzha lands of the old estates was recognized by both the government and the landlords.

52. See *NPK*, IV, 488. Although the returns from his manor are lost, the last paragraph of his Retno returns refers to his demesne of three tax units.

53. For the returns from Gorka see *NPK*, IV, 403. For Ptitsa, see *NPK*, IV, 404; for Seredka (Seredki) see *NPK*, IV, 405.

54. The hamlet of Gorka consisted of one peasant household occupied by two peasants who sowed three bushels of rye, one tax unit. See *NPK*, IV, 354. There is a tear in the original cadaster, which begins "za Mikitoiu da za Ondreem da za Ilieiu za Bulgakovymi detmi . . . piatiny." The editors in the *NPK*, Index assume the family

name was Bulgakov and do not connect the Bulgak Timofeev syn Piatin who received Gorka in exchange with Alexis Buzheninov with the Bulgakovs. However, the entry under Gorka states, "Bulgak Timofeev syn Piatin received from Alexis Buzheninov in return for his own hamlet of Sholtskova, which now belongs to Mikita and his brothers." ("... chto vymenil ee protiv svoeiu derevni Sholtskova Bulgak Timofeev syn Piatina u Olesei u Buzheninova, a nyne za Mikitoiu s bratieiu.") Since late fifteenth and early sixteenth century surnames could be changed from generation to generation (the Romanovs were known as Zakharins and then Yurievs, for example), the Bulgakov brothers could have been the sons of the same Bulgak Timofeev syn Piatin who exchanged lands with Alexis Buzheninov. It is also possible that "piatiny" at the beginning of the entry refers to the Piatin family name and not to Shelonskaia piatina, as the *NPK*, Index implies. See *NPK*, IV, 354, for the above passages and the *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 9, 70, for the references to the entries on the Bulgakovs and Piatins.

55. Voronovo consisted of one peasant household, one peasant, two bushels of rye, one-half tax unit. See *NPK*, IV, 466.

56. *NPK*, IV, 339.

57. The returns for Blagovo's estate are lost. The Zamutsky farm in Cherenchitsy parish consisted of the manor, one servant's household, nine peasant households, four cotters' households (*bobylskie dvory*), ten peasants, one servant, and four cotters', and fifteen tax units. The pomestie also included the new settlement (*pochinok*) of Bytets. See *NPK*, IV, 335-37. In 1500, Michael held a Belsky pomestie of thirty-three tax units. It included parcels from the following former votchinas: (1) the hamlets of Anton Kisliakov (5.3 sokhas or sixteen tax units); (2) the hamlets of Ivan Kisliakov (4.3 sokhas or thirteen tax units); and (3) the hamlets of Pavel Pavlov syn Peleshsky (1.3 sokhas or four tax units; see *NPK*, V, 18. Since Michael held 11.5 tax units of Ivan Kisliakov and six tax units of Anton Kisliakov in 1539, he obtained the 15.5 Cherenchitsk tax units by giving up the four Peleshsky tax units, ten tax units of Anton Kisliakov, and 1.5 tax units of Ivan Kisliakov. Since Michael obtained six Belsky tax units on the former votchina of Anton Kisliakov from an exchange with Zamiatnia Samarin, his net loss of Belsky land consisted of 9.5 tax units. Without the complete Valuev cadaster for 1500, however, the possibility remains that the exchange with Samarin occurred before 1500 and that the sixteen former Anton Kisliakov tax units referred to in the abridgement of the Valuev cadaster included the tax units received from Samarin. As a result, Zamutsky may have given up 15.5 rather than 9.5 Belsky tax units in order to relocate in the southeastern section of the province. On Staraia Rusa see Shapiro, I, pp. 127, 129.

58. The 6.5 tax units in Vyshgorod parish that Daniel Shchulepnikov received from Alfery Nazimov included the hamlets of Zagorie, Dubok, Uskaia Guba, and Zaklinie. They were occupied by eleven households of eleven peasants sowing twenty-six bushels of rye in one field. See *NPK*, IV, 486. The Shchirsk pomestie of 6.5 tax units given to Nazimov represented 72% of the nine Shchirsk tax units held by his father Ivan Sakharov syn in 1498. Ivan's hamlets of Raduga and Vzdran, which were located on the former lands of the Novgorod votchinnik Fedor Ostafiev syn Glukhov, and his hamlets of Vorobievo and Paikovo, which were located on the former lands of Gridia

Omeshkin syn Savin, consisted of seven peasant households of nine peasants sowing thirty-five bushels of rye in one field. See *NPK*, V, 113–15.

59. The returns for Matvei Vasiliev syn Bundov's estate indicate that Ostree consisted of one empty peasant household on one tax unit on which three bushels of rye had been sown in one field. See *NPK*, IV, 366. Boris Grigoriev syn Glotov held the hamlet of Riabkovo, "what Grishka Bundov received from an exchange with Matvei Bundov . . ." in 1539. The hamlet was occupied by one peasant household who sowed four bushels of rye in one field on one tax unit. See *NPK*, IV, 474.

60. The four new settlements received back from Miakinin occupied one tax unit and included: (1) Voronino—one peasant household, one peasant, one bushel of rye; (2) Ortiukhovo Podosinie—one peasant household, one peasant, two bushels of rye; (4) Velikii Ruchei—one peasant household, two peasants, two bushels of rye; and (4) Borovina—one peasant household, one peasant, two bushels of rye. See *NPK*, IV, 367.

61. *NPK*, IV, 354.

62. See *NPK*, IV, 496. For the other exchanges in return for contiguous land in the same parish as the lord's residence, see *NPK* IV, 337, 339, 368, and 497.

63. See *NPK*, IV, 458 for the Oboturov and *NPK*, IV, 464, for the Turov returns.

64. See *NPK*, IV, 365 for the Bundov returns and *NPK*, IV, 346, for the Miakinin returns.

65. *NPK*, IV, 339.

66. *NPK*, IV, 337.

67. *NPK*, IV, 339.

68. *NPK*, IV, 337.

69. *NPK*, IV, 368, 376.

70. *NPK*, IV, 496.

71. *NPK*, IV, 497.

72. *NPK*, IV, 489.

73. See *NPK*, IV, 335–337 and the following percentages of pomesties acquired by exchange after 1500 and before 1540.

Lord-Households-Peasants-Rye-Tax units

Aigustov, M.G.-29.6-23.3-36.6-40

Blagovo, M.I.-no data

Bulgakov, N.-2.9-5-3.7-4

Bundov, G.D.-no data

Bundov, M.V.-26.3-26-21-13.3

Buzheninov, A.-no data

Chebotaev, M.-8.8-8.3-7.3-6.6

Erokhov, I.V.-55-54.5-49.5-43.8

Evreev, V.B.-2.9-2.8-7-6.4

Kropotov, P.M.-20-20-13.8-11.8

Kropotov, T.I.-8.3-16.6-8.6-8.95

Miakinin, F.N.-2.2-2.0-2.7-2.5

Nazimov, A.S.-no data

Nazimov, A.S.S.-9.5-9.5-10.9-8.6

Nazimov, V.-11.5-11.5-11.8-9.6
 Oboturov, D.I.-7.1-6.25-5.4-6.8
 Samarin, Z.-no data
 Shcherbinin, P.D.-19.6-19.6-18.26-20
 Shchulepnikov, D.-100-100-100-100
 Tatarinova, E.-no data
 Tatianin, D.I.-2.5-2.2-16-5
 Turgenev, F.-no data
 Turov, G.A.-8.9-9.2-7.7-11
 Vdovin, F.-no data
 Vseslavin, F.-no data
 Zamutsky, M.T.-61.2-58.5-65.4-65.1
 Zasekin, M.-no data

74. See *NPK*, IV, 352, for the Parfeniev returns. The following pomeshchiks received all of their pridachas in the same parish as the manor.

Pomeshchik-Parish-Source
 Beloselsky, Pr. V.S.-Belsky-*NPK*, IV, 432
 Bulgakov (Piatin), N.-Efremovo-*NPK*, IV, 354
 Buturlin, A.I.P.-Bolchino-*NPK*, IV, 410
 Karpov, I.L.I.-Pazherevitsy-*NPK*, IV, 391
 Kvashnin, L.N.-Belsky-*NPK*, IV, 422
 Moseev, N.I.-Degzha-*NPK*, IV, 264
 Nazimov, A.S.-Pazherevitsy-*NPK*, IV, 370
 Nazimov, S.V.-Pazherevitsy-*NPK*, IV, 388
 Parfeniev, P.A.-Efremovo-*NPK*, IV, 352
 Pleshcheev, A.V.-St Michael's-*NPK*, IV, 297
 Pustoshkin, I.B.I.-Pazherevitsy *NPK*, IV, 389
 Ragozin, F.D.-Pazherevitsy-*NPK*, IV, 373
 Samarin-Kvashnin, M.-Dolzhino-*NPK*, IV, 436

75. See *NPK*, IV, 425 for Vladimir Cheglov's returns. The following pomeshchiks received some but not all of their pridachas in the same parish as the manor.

Pomeshchik-Pridacha in Parish of Residence-PTU-% TPTU-MDP-Source
 (Pridacha not in Parish of Residence-PTU-%TPTU)
 (Other Pridachas not in Parish of Residence-PTU-%TPTU)
 Beloselsky, Pr. V.I.-Belsky-2.75-27-12-*NPK*, IV, 419
 (Degzha-7.25-73)
 Chebotaev, M.-Porkhov-14-93-9.59-*NPK*, IV, 311
 (Smolna-1-7)
 Cheglov, V.A.-Belsky-3.5-70-16.7-*NPK*, IV, 425
 (Dolzhino-1.5-30)
 Chetverkin, D.-Pazherevitsy-7.5-56-4.8-*NPK*, IV, 398
 (St Nicholas's of Vysotsk-6-44)
 Glotov, B.G.-Kolomna-3-50-27-*NPK*, IV, 472
 (Chertitsk-2-33)
 (Los-1-17)

Khlusov, I.I.-Los-1-5-28.77-*NPK*, IV, 244
(St Nicholas's of Vysotsk-19-95)
Kolosov, V.I.-Efremovo-4.5-60-7-*NPK*, IV, 347
(Resurrection-3-40)
Kostin, S.D.-Degzha-1-82-9.6-*NPK*, IV, 271
(St Nicholas's of Vysotsk-4.5-18)
Miakinin, F.N.I.-Efremovo-17.5-90-7.19-*NPK*, IV, 343
(Los-2-10)
Nazimov, V.S.-Vyshgorod-4.5-90-7.19-*NPK*, IV, 483
(Obluchie-0.5-10)
Ogarev, I.I.-Degzha-42.5-77-21.1-*NPK*, IV, 247
(St Nicholas's of Vysotsk-6-11)
(Yasno-3-5.5)
(Obluchie-3.5-6)
(Nativity-0.75-0.5)
Selivanov, A.A.-Belsky-2.5-50-19-*NPK*, IV, 427
(Bereza-2.5-50)
Selivanov, I.A.-Belsky-2.5-50-22-*NPK*, IV, 416
(Bereza-1.5-30)
(Pazherevitsy-1-20)
Shablykin, S.I.-Pazherevitsy-6-30-4.8-*NPK*, IV, 382
(St Nicholas's of Vysotsk-14-70)
Shishkin, M.A.-Porkhov area-11.5-79-22-*NPK*, IV, 316
(Dubrovno-0.83-5)
(Opoka-1.67-10)
(Pavy-1-6)
Terpigorev, K.S.-Yasno-9-82-9.59-*NPK*, IV, 446
(Our Lady's-2-18)
Turgenev, S.I.-Los-0.75-7.5-12.78-*NPK*, IV, 237
(Dretno-0.25-2.5)
(Efremovo-9-90)
Tyrtov, I.V.-Degzha-2-13-3.59-*NPK*, IV, 274
(Nativity-13-87)
Tyrtov, Z.S.-Yasno-1-50-5-*NPK*, IV, 453
(Obluchie-1-50)

Key:

MDP: the mean distance in versts of the parcels of pridacha from the parish of the pomeshchik's residence.

PTU: Tax units received as a pridacha in the parish.

% TPTU: Percent of total tax units received as a pridacha.

76. For Ivan Elizarov syn Erokhov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 327-29. For Mitrofan Elizarov syn Erokhov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 330-31.

77. See *NPK*, IV, 329-30 for Gridia Elizarov syn Erokhov's returns. The six pomeshchiks receiving pridachas whose average distance was more than ten and less than twenty versts from the manor included:

Pomeshchik-Residence-MDP-Source

Buturlin, D.I.P.-Zhedritsy-14.38-*NPK*, IV, 514

Erokhov, G.E.-Ramyshevo-14.4-*NPK*, IV, 329

Kvashnin, G.N.-Nativity-19-*NPK*, IV, 283

Kostin, Ya. D.-Degzha-19-*NPK*, IV, 270

Karkmazov, S.I.-Yasno-14.4-*NPK*, IV, 441

Terpigorev, F.S.-Yasno-19-*NPK*, IV, 449

78. *NPK*, IV, 464.

79. *NPK*, IV, 305.

80. *NPK*, IV, 289.

81. *NPK*, IV, 240.

82. *NPK*, IV, 476.

83. Although forty-six pomeshchiks received pridachas, Prince Michael's pomestie is excluded because of the lack of surviving returns for the individual hamlets. The pomeshchiks receiving pridachas from other family members, the former landlord, and the percentage of pridacha tax units from relatives' estates are given below:

Pomeshchik-Residence-Percent TU from Relatives

(Old pomeshchik-pridacha-tax units)

Cheglov, V. A.-Belsky-60%

(Cheglov, A.-Belsky-1.5)

(Cheglov, I.-Belsky-1.5)

Selivanov, I. A.-Belsky-50%

(Selivanov, B.-Belsky-1.5)

(Selivanov, B.-Pazherevitsy-1)

Ogarov, I.I.-Degzha-76%

(Ogarov, V.-Degzha-16)

(Ogarov, N.-Degzha-12)

(Ogarov, P.-Degzha-13)

Moseev, N. I.-Degzha-100%

(Moseev, Z.-Degzha-13)

Kartmazov, S. I.-Yasno-47.5%

(Kartmazov, G. I.-Karachunsk-2.5)

(Kartmazov, G.-Obluchie-6)

Shishkin, M. I.-Our Lady's-6%

(Shishkin, M.-uncle-Our Lady's-1)

Miakinin, F. N. I.-Efremovo-12.5%

(Miakinin, S.-Efremovo-3.5)

Karpov, I. L. I.-Pazherevitsy-100%

(Karpov, O.-Pazherevitsy-5)

Nazimov, S. I.-Pazherevitsy-50%

(Nazimov, I. N.-Pazherevitsy-2)

Erokhov, G. E.-Ramyshevo-85%

(Erokhov, A.-Ramyshevo-2)

Erokhov, M. E.-Ramyshevo-85%

(Erokhov, A.-Ramyshevo-2)

- Evsiukov, I.-Nativity-26%
(Evsiukova, Akulina-Ruchaisk-6)
- Turov, G. A.-Resurrection-54%
(Turgenev, F.-uncle-Okolorusie-5.5)
(Turgenev, F.-uncle-Chertitsk-1.5)
(Turov, G.-Okolorusie-7.5)

84. On Akulina and her late husband see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 24. Ivan Evsiukov's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 289-292.

85. For Ilia Selivanov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 416-18. Although Boris Selivanov's patronymic is not given, the cadaster refers to him as Ilia's "brother." The additional 2.5 tax units included 1.5 tax units in the hamlet of Grishno, in which two other brothers (Alexis and Daniel) held shares, and one tax unit of pochinoks established since the last census.

86. For Semen Ivanov syn Nazimov's returns, see *NPK*, IV, 388-389. Since the returns give "Ivanov" as Semen's patronymic, the Ivan Nazimov who earlier held the pridacha could have been Semen's father. Although Semen's original Pazherevitsy pomestie belonged to Ivashko Nazimov in 1500, Semen only received fifteen of his father's 24.5 Pazherevitsy tax units at the time of his original enfeoffment. The two tax units later received from Ivan Nazimov's estate could have been part of the prozhitok retained by the senior Nazimov after dividing his other holdings between the adult sons who needed their father's lands to support their own military service.

The *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 56, unfortunately confuses Semen Ivanov Nazimov with the Semen Vasiliev syn Nazimov who was a co-holder of his father's Vyshgorod pomestie in 1539; on Semen Vasiliev see *NPK*, IV, 483-489. The references to *NPK*, IV, 375, 388, 389, and 400 cited under "Semen Vasiliev Nazimov" in the *NPK*, Index actually refer to Semen Ivanov Nazimov.

87. *NPK*, IV, 247.

88. *NPK*, IV, 264.

89. *NPK*, IV, 390.

90. See *NPK*, IV, 405-407 for Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov's returns. Although his brother's name is not given, two other sons of Yury Nazimov (Vasily Menshoi and Peter) were serving from their father's old pomesties. Although their estates were separate, both brothers lived in the same hamlet of Dubie and held pomesties of 13.5 tax units. Although Vasily Bolshoi's residence is not given in any of the returns, the absence of a manor on the pridacha from which he served suggests that he continued to live in the manor house with his brothers. For Vasily Menshoi's returns, see *NPK*, IV, 386-87; Peter's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 387-88.

91. For the Samarin-Kvashnin returns see *NPK*, IV, 436. For Vladimir Cheglakov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 425.

92. See *NPK*, IV, 370 for Andrew Nazimov's 1539 returns and *NPK*, IV, 378, for Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov Ovtсын's 1539 returns. Andrew Ivanov syn Volodimerov Ovtсын's abridged 1500 returns are in *NPK*, V, 60.

93. For Fedor Ragozin's 1539 returns see *NPK*, IV, 373-75. Semen Vasiliev syn Volodimerov Ovtсын's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 322-25. The returns of his father, Vasily Ovtsa Ivanov syn Volodimerov are in *NPK*, V, 51 (abridged Efremovo), 54

(abridged Snezhsk), and 230–31 (complete Efremovo). The Semen Ovtsyn mentioned as the former landlord of the Pazherevitsy lands given to Ragozin as a pridacha could have been the son of the Andreiko Ivanov syn Volodimerov who held thirty-nine tax units in Pazherevitsy in 1500. If Andreiko Ivanov syn Volodimerov were the brother of the Vasily Ovtsa Ivanov syn Volodimerov mentioned above, the two Semens would have been first cousins. Since Semen Vasiliev syn was already serving from his father's old pomestie of thirty-two tax units and resided on his Snezhsk manor in the small village of Gapki, he may not have been interested in the additional Pazherevitsy land nearly sixty versts to the south. The absence of a pridacha suggests that Semen, who did not have any adult sons, had enough pomesties to support his family and carry out his service obligation to the crown. For the 1500 abridged Pazherevitsy returns see *NPK*, V, 60.

94. For the 1539 Lazarev returns, see *NPK*, IV, 305. For Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov's 1539 Pazherevitsy returns, see *NPK*, IV, 368–70. Since the abridged 1500 Nativity returns do not mention any Nazimovs, the Vesniak referred to in Lazarev's returns acquired and lost the land after 1500 and before 1539, a recent event which would have been recorded in Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov's 1539 returns if the two Vesniaks were really the same pomeshchik.

95. For Dmitry Ivanov syn Tatianin's 1539 returns see *NPK*, IV, 403; Ivan Andreev syn Tatianin's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 394. Gavril Khlopov's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 415 while Subbota Shablykin's are in *NPK*, IV, 385.

96. The Pustoshkin returns are in *NPK*, IV, 391. Vesniak Ivanov syn Nazimov's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 368–70 while Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 405–407.

97. See *NPK*, IV, 250–51 for Ivan Ivanov syn Ogarev's 1539 returns and *NPK*, IV, 419 for Prince Volodimer Ivanov syn Beloselsky's 1539 returns.

98. For the Tyrtov returns see *NPK*, IV, 274; for the Unkovsky returns see *NPK*, IV, 281.

99. The Shcherbinin returns are in *NPK*, IV, 240; Semen Vseslavin's returns are in *NPK*, V, 59 (1500) and IV, 263 (1539).

100. For the Chetvertkin returns see *NPK*, IV, 398; Vasily Borisov syn Evreev's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 496. On the Evreev family see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 23.

101. For the Rezantsov returns see *NPK*, IV, 476. Semen Ivanov syn Kartmazov's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 441. On the Kartmazov family see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 33.

102. For Zuk Semenov syn Tyrtov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 454; Vasiuk Suvorov syn Nazimov's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 483 while Dmitry Chetvertkin's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 399. The Tyrtovs' returns are in *NPK*, IV, 446–451.

103. For the Glotov returns see *NPK*, IV, 372; for Ignaty Buzheninov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 555.

104. Ivan Fedorov syn Voronov and Semen Vseslavin, whose pochinovs were granted to Matvei Ivanov syn Ogarov, were still serving from their old pomesties in 1539; see *NPK*, IV, 252 ff on Voronov and *NPK* IV, 263ff on Vseslavin.

105. On Pleshcheev v. Mikita the tinsmith and Lukianko the coppersmith, see *NPK*, IV, 300.

106. See, for example, the last sentence of the entry for Gregory Turov's pomestie in *NPK*, IV, 468.

107. For the returns from the crown lands granted to Vodskaia pomeshchiks, see *NPK*, III, passim. The estates are distinguished from other crown lands by the clerks' notation "granted to . . ." ("otdeleno . . .") and the name of the recipient. Since the handwriting of the notations is different than the original cadaster, the grants were made after the "new census" of 1495-1505. See, for example, III, 206, concerning the crown lands granted to the children of Lev Briukhatoi.

108. For the returns from Stepan Sukov's estate, see *NPK*, IV, 301; for those from Posnik Sablin's estate, see *NPK*, IV, 454-55.

109. Ibid.

110. Ibid. The *dan'* was a direct tax paid per tax unit (*obzha*) to the government. The term was originally applied to the tribute paid by the native Slavs to their Rurikide rulers and later used to designate the tribute paid by the Russians to the Khan of the Golden Horde. See Pushkarev, p. 8.

111. For the returns from the census of 1576 that do not distinguish between the old and new sections of the pomestie, see *NPK*, V, 646 (the Yury Vasiliev syn Tyrtov estate); V, 580 (the Fedor Semenov syn Terpigorev estate); V, 574-75 (the Michael Chebotaev estate); and V, 613 (the Ivan Lopak Ivanov syn Karpov estate).

112. See *NPK*, IV, 570-71.

Chapter Three

The Inheritability of the Early Sixteenth Century Shelonskaia Pomestie

INTRODUCTION

Late nineteenth and early twentieth century historians did not consider the late fifteenth century and early sixteenth century pomestie “family land.” S.V. Rozhdestvensky, for example, argued that the pomestie only gradually became hereditary during the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries.¹ The content of the charters by which the crown gave possession to the pomeshchik seemed to support Rozhdestvensky’s thesis. Ivan III’s charter of 1482 granting part of Bogdan Esipov and Ivan Kuzmin’s former votchina to Dmitry Trusov syn Vorobin listed the estate’s villages and hamlets and gave the pomeshchik the right to receive the peasant’s dues, but said nothing about his heirs’ right of inheritance.²

The sources of the new pomesties also seemed to support Rozhdestvensky, for the new lands came from the exiled Novgorod boyars’ former votchinas. The new lands administered by the state were granted to the loyal landless serving princes, gentry, and the formerly unfree servants (*posluzhiltsy*) of the Novgorod boyars in return for military service. The new pomesties resembled the palace land earlier granted by the grand prince in return for service.³ The absence of a decree defining the pomestie as property remaining the serving man’s family as long as his descendants served the crown gave additional support to Rozhdestvensky’s thesis.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century historians who agreed with Rozhdestvensky did not consult the Novgorod cadasters still being edited when he was writing his monograph on service landholding in 1897. A comparison of the names of the pomeshchiks holding each parcel of pomestie in every volost in 1500 and 1539 is necessary to determine the percentage of the

estates retained by the same family. Since the cadasters were juridical documents capable of being cited in court, the rate of turnover shows the Muscovite government's acceptance of the family's retention of the pomestie from generation to generation.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE POMESTIES OF 1539

All but five of the 144 pomesties for which records survive from the census of 1539–41 could be classified as “old,” “new,” or a “maintenance pomestie” (*prozhitok*).⁴ The surviving cadasters were used to compare the names of the pomeshchiks holding each estate in the censuses of 1500 and 1539. The pomesties held by the same family for more than a generation in 1539 were classified “old.” This follows the practice of the Muscovite census-takers, who usually used the term *staroe* (“old”) to refer to such estates in the last paragraph of each entry, where the total hamlets, peasant households, peasants, bushels of rye, bales of hay, tax units, and the lord's income were given.

The census-taker's use of the term to distinguish the original estate (*dacha*) granted at the time of enfeoffment from the later additions (*pridachi*) suggests *staroe* could mean less than a generation. However, the customary interval between the original enfeoffment and subsequent additions caused by the shortage of available arable land settled by dues-paying peasants negates this thesis. Because the state had to divide its limited land fund among more than 2000 servingmen, the new pomeshchik only received enough for military service. Since he began service at fifteen and married around twenty, he normally did not need additional land to support his eldest son's service until a generation later. At the first annual muster and enrollment (*verstanie*) after the eldest son's majority, the proud father would enroll his first son in service and request a *pridacha*. At the time, his name would be placed on the deed to his father's pomestie as co-landlord and negotiations with other gentry families would begin to select a wife.

The application of the term *staroe* to seven estates without *pridachas* confirms its use to refer to an estate held by the same pomeshchik or family during the last census more than a generation earlier. The seven cases include Semen Fedorov syn Gridiukin Meshcherinov and Stepan Vasiliev syn Miachkov of Zhedritsy, Matvei Mikhailov syn Palitsyn and Peter Afanasiev Moseev of Degzha, Yury Aleksandrov syn Unkovsky of Nativity, Prince Vasily Dmitriev syn Zasekin of Porkhov and Our Lady's and Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov Ovtsyn of Pazherevitsy parishes. It is interesting that representatives of the same family only held two of the seven estates in 1500 and 1539. Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov Ovtsyn's father Andreiko also held his Pazherevitsy

pomestie in 1500 while Semen Gridiukhin Meshcherinov served from the same Zhedritsy estate in 1500 and 1539.⁵ A different family, the Rumiantsovs, held Prince Zasekin's pomestie in 1500 while the four remaining estates were crown lands in 1500.⁶ The census-takers considered the seven pomesties without pridachas "old" in 1539 despite different landlords forty years earlier because they had been in the same family for more than a generation.

The forty-year interval between the new census of 1495–1505 and the Shelonskaia census of 1539 is important because of the passage of nearly three generations since the original enfeoffments in the 1480s. The pomeshchiks sent by Ivan III to secure Novgorod were loyal, mature members of the gentry who could be relied upon to maintain productive economies on the former votchinas of the Novgorodian boyars and use the income received from the peasants to support their military service. By the new census of 1500, the first generation of pomeshchiks was probably in its mid-to-late forties and, given the shorter life expectancy of the sixteenth century, nearing the end of its service career. Since cavalrymen were required to serve from fifteen to sixty, the sons of the first pomeshchiks would have been entering service and establishing families by the turn of the century. The use of the diminutive ("Ivashko" for Ivan Meshcherinov, e.g.) in the abridged cadaster of 1500 indicates the youth of many of these pomeshchiks.⁷ By the 1520s, they would have had sons, by the 1540s grandsons entering service.

The criterion of continuous possession by the same family for more than a generation caused the census-takers of 1539 to consider six pomesties with pridachas "old" despite their possession by a different family in 1500. They include the estates of Veshniak Ivanov syn Nazimov, Vasily Suvorov syn Nazimov, Ivan Bolshoi Ivanov syn Pustoshkin of Pazherevitsy, Vasily Ivanov syn Kolosov of Ofremovo, Postnik Dmitriev syn Shcherbinin of Los and Gavril Danilov syn Khlopov of Bolchino parishes. Five earlier landlords (Gavril Terpigorev and Fedor Volokhov of Pazherevitsy, Shikh Miakinin of Ofremovo, Sviaga Sofonov of Los, and Potap Poleukhtov of Bolchino) did not have any known descendants in service in 1539.

One earlier landlord (Andrew Ovtsyn of Pazherevitsy, the former holder of the hamlets of St. Yury's monastery held by Veshniak Nazimov in pomestie in 1539) could have had a son serving from an "old" Pazherevitsy pomestie in 1539. Although the 1500 cadaster does not refer to an "Andrew Ovtsyn," it does record "Andreiko Ivanov syn Volodimerov" as the landlord of the same Lutianov volost in Pazherevitsy parish where Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov Ovtsyn held an "old pomestie" in 1539.⁸ Since Andreiko is the diminutive form of Andrew, Andreiko Volodimerov could have been Andrew Ovtsyn. The problem with this interpretation is the failure of the 1500 returns to include any of the former lands of St. Yury's monastery in Andreiko

Volodimerov's pomestie, all thirteen sokhas of which passed to his son Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov Ovtzyn. Since many Russian surnames were still not standardized in the first half of the sixteenth century, Andrew Ovtzyn and Andrew Volodimerov were more likely to have been members of different families with a common ancestor.⁹ If the Andrew Ovtzyn cited as the earlier landlord of Veshniak Nazimov's Pazherevitsy estate was not Andreiko Volodimerov, none of the earlier holders of the six pomesties with pridachas called "old" by the census-takers despite their possession by a different family in 1500 had descendants serving in 1539.

The uneven survival of the cadasters complicates the classification of the pomesties. The summary of Matvei Valuev's 1500 cadaster contains the only information on several parishes because of the loss of their original cadasters. The names of the pomeshchik and the former Novgorodian landowner are given along with the number of tax units.¹⁰ The omission of village names prevents us from determining the exact location of the pomeshchiks' lands in these parishes. Since the state wanted to prevent the new landlords from accumulating enough land to dominate the parish like their Novgorodian predecessors, the old boyar votchinas were broken up. The new pomesties often included parcels of land from different estates in different parishes. This results in complete records for some and incomplete records for other parcels of land belonging to the same estate.

The case of Piatoi Shablykin, who held a pomestie on the former lands of St. Yury's monastery in Belsky parish, illustrates the difficulty of distinguishing between "old" and "new" pomesties. The estate looks like an old pomestie because of the absence of references to earlier landlords. Receiving the estate shortly after the completion of the 1500 cadaster would have given the Shablykins more than a generation on the land by 1539. The inclusion of the Pazherevitsy parish hamlet of Gorevo is not sufficient evidence to classify the estate as a new pomestie. The hamlet could have been given as a pridacha to supplement the original Belsky estate after Shablykin's eldest son began service. Yet the cadasters of 1539 distinguish between the original pomestie and the later additions for which the pomeshchik paid an obrok of one altyn per tax unit. The absence of any references to the payment of obrok indicates that Shablykin's Pazherevitsy land was part of his original pomestie. Supporting the pomeshchik's sons entering military service after reaching the age of fifteen was the pridacha's most significant function. The lack of references to a pridacha indicates that Shablykin's sons, if any, were still under age. Under these circumstances, the estate has to be classified "new" because the landlord held it for less than a generation.

Neither Belsky parish pomestie of Piatoi's two brothers (Tretiak and Ushak) was considered "old" by the census-takers, who fail to refer to their

father as the former landlord. The three brothers' names are especially significant, for they were the fifth, third, and sixth sons of Ivan Shablykin. Even if Ivan Shablykin had been an "old" pomeshchik whose cadasters were lost, his original estate could not have supported the service of all six sons.¹¹

The case of Saltan Andreev syn Lazorev and his brothers also illustrates the problem of distinguishing between "old" and "new" pomesties. In 1539 the Lazorevs held an estate on the former votchina of Luka Isakov whose administrative center (*bol'shoi dvor*) was located in the region of Porkhov and Our Lady's parish. The pomestie appears "new." The 1539 returns are printed under "St. Michael's parish" in the fourth volume of the *Novgorodskie pistsovyia knigi*. The 1500 returns from the parish do not mention Lazorevs. A comparison of the two cadasters, however, indicates that the editors of the 1539 volume included the returns for Porkhov and Our Lady's parish with St Michael's.¹² The abridgement of the 1495–1505 Porkhov returns refers to Andreiko Danilov syn Lazorev's possession of "six less one-sixth sokhas" (17.5 tax units) in the hamlets of Luka Isakov on the Shelon River belonging to the small village (*sel'tso*) of "Terebezh." If "Terebezh" was the same village as "Kerebezh" located near the Shelon River on the same former votchina of Luka Isakov, the pomestie of Andreiko (the diminutive form of "Andrew") Lazorev passed to his son Saltan.¹³

A comparison of the returns from the censuses of 1500 and 1539 reveals that 128 pomesties were classifiable as "old" or "new." Seventy-seven (60%) estates were held continuously by the same family for more than a generation while the remaining fifty-one estates (40%) granted to pomeshchiks with a different surname than the original lord belonged to the second family for less than a generation. Since the other eleven classifiable estates were maintenance pomesties held by the widows and children of deceased pomeshchiks, the same family retained possession of more than sixty-three percent of the 139 classifiable pomesties.¹⁴

THE OLD POMESTIES

The relationship of the pomeshchiks who held each old pomestie in 1500 and 1539 was compared to determine which family members usually received the pomestie on the death or retirement of the original servingman. The lack of references to earlier landlords in the 1539 cadaster indicates that the original pomeshchiks, who were young landlords just entering service in the early sixteenth century, continued to hold thirty estates considered "old" by the census-takers.¹⁵

Two other estates were probably old because the 1500 and 1539 returns show the same landlord serving from the same volost. In 1539, Semen Vasiliev syn Vseslavin held eight and a half sokhas in the same Degzha parish Medvedev volost where Senka Vasiliev syn Vseslavin held eight sokhas in 1500. Since Senka is the diminutive of Semen, Senka was probably a young pomeshchik in 1500 still serving from the same estate in 1539.¹⁶ Although Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky lived in 1539 on a Cherenchitsy manor obtained by exchange with Michael Zamiatna Vasiliev syn Blagoi, his estate included the Belsky parish hamlets of the former Novgorodian boyars Ivan and Anton Kisliakov held by a Mikhailo Timofeev syn Zamutsky in 1500.¹⁷

Relatives with the same surname held forty-one estates (53%) in 1500 and 1539. The use of the patronymic as the son's middle name makes it possible to distinguish the estates passing to the original pomeshchik's sons from those descending to collateral relatives. Twenty-eight estates passed in direct succession to the original pomeshchik's male heirs, twenty-seven to sons¹⁸ and one to a grandson.¹⁹ Two estates shared by brothers in 1500 passed to one brother's sons and the other's nephews. The Porkhov pomestie of Vasily Shishkin's sons Andrew and Michael (twenty-one and a half tax units or seven and a sixth sokhas) passed to Andrew's sons and Michael's nephews Michael and Mikita, who also received their uncle's Pavsky parish hamlets in the Fedor Desnichkov volost.²⁰ Semen and Vasily Turgenev received the seven sokhas jointly held by their father Yakimets and uncle Gridia in Los parish in 1500.²¹ Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov received the pomestie of his "uncle" Ivan Nekrasov syn Nazimov in the Pazherevitsy parish after ceding his share of his father's pomestie to his brother.²²

Three estates passed to the original pomeshchik's brothers. Ivan Ivanov syn Kobylin received the Ramyshevo parish hamlets earlier held by his brother Kuzma.²³ Fedor Neveia Ivanov syn Miakinin and his two sons Yakovets and Ivanets held the same sixteen tax units (five and a third sokhas) in the Semen Svinukhov, Ivan Demidov Parfin and Ignaty Parfin volosts of Ofremovo parish as Neveia Ivanov syn Miakinin in 1500.²⁴ Ivan Davydov syn Terpigorev held twenty-eight and a half tax units in the same Yasno parish volost of Ivan Zakharin Ovinov jointly held with his brother Ostash in 1500.²⁵

Three "old" pomesties passed to the original pomeshchik's more distant relatives. The former hamlets of St. Yury's monastery in Belsky parish held by Ivan Cheglovkov passed to his relative Vladimir, the son of Afanasy Cheglovkov.²⁶ Boris Evreev's sons Vasily and Gorian received the Skniatinsk parish pomestie earlier held by Elizar Evreev while Ivan Ivanov syn Zverev received the former Resurrection parish pomestie of his kinsman Dmitry.²⁷ None of the earlier pomeshchiks had sons in service in 1539.²⁸

The loss of the beginning of the returns, where the pomeshchik's full name was recorded with the hamlets held in each volost, conceals the relationship between Ivan Evsiukov and the earlier holder of his "old" Nativity parish pomestie. The 1500 Nativity returns record Filia E(v)siukov as the holder of five and a third sokhas in the same parish. Since the census-taker called Ivan's estate "old" and Filia was the only Evsiukov in the parish in 1500, he was probably the earlier pomeshchik. His relationship to the Ivan Evsiukov is unknown because of the lack of reference's to the latter's patronymic.²⁹

The passage of pomesties to collateral relatives indicates that both the pomeshchik and Muscovite government regarded the pomestie as the family's possession as long as the adult males served in the cavalry. Despite the passage of pomesties to cousins, the state regarded the passage of an estate from father to son as the norm. Ivan IV's charter of 12 January 1546 N.S. cites the death of the former pomeshchik without a wife and children as the justification for his grant of a Nizhny Novgorod pomestie to Ivan Zhedrinsky.³⁰

The pomesties for which complete returns survive from 1500 and 1539 were compared to determine the percentage of the lord's "old" pomestie granted to his relatives. The returns for the "old" estates for which records survive from both the censuses of 1500 and 1539 were compared to determine how the "old" pomesties were divided among the heirs at law (sons, brothers, uncles, and cousins) of the former pomeshchik. The division of the Yasno pomestie of Semen Semenov syn Terpigorev, who held thirty-two tax units (10.67 sokhas) on the former votchina of Ivan Zakharin syn Ovinov in 1500, shows that sons did not always receive equal shares of their father's estate. Fedor Semenov syn received sixteen tax units, consisting of nine hamlets; his brother Kellar received fifteen tax units, consisting of the remaining eight hamlets and one hamlet (Grokhotovo), half of which was also held by his brother.³¹ Although Kellar's share of the Yasno pomestie was smaller than his brother's, the small Dubrovno pomestie of five tax units held by Semen Semenov syn on the former lands of Fedor Ievlev in 1500 more than compensated for the difference. Kellar therefore received twenty of his father's thirty-seven tax units.³² Both brothers also received pridachas on the former lands of the St. Nicholas of the Nerev End monastery in Our Lady's parish, but Fedor's pomestie of 23.5 tax units provided him with a considerably smaller income (1211 dengas) than Kellar received from his 35.5 tax units (1855.5 dengas).³³

Since Kellar Semenov syn received the larger share of his father's pomesties, his brother's retention of their father's manor at Gostino is surprising. Since Semen Semenov syn held his estate with an unnamed brother in 1500, we do not know which son was older. It would seem on the surface that the elder son would receive his father's manor while the younger son would

establish his own manor somewhere else on the estate. Yet an older son entering service before his younger brother would require a pomestie sooner. After marriage the elder son would establish his own manor while the younger, unmarried son, remained on his father's manor. By Semen's death or retirement, Kelar may have already been established on his manor at Molochishcho. The larger size of his pomestie and establishment of a separate manor may therefore indicate his status as an elder son who already had a wife and large family to support.

Peter and Vasily Menshoi Yuriev deti Nazimov, the sons of Yury Kulikov syn Nazimov, also received unequal shares of their father's estate. Peter Yuriev syn received 12.5 tax units of the 24.5 tax units of his father's pomestie in the Kuzma Kiprianov volost of Pazherevitsy parish. Peter also received his father's tax unit on the former land of the Novgorod boyar Karp Kisliakov in Slavetinsk parish.³⁴ Yury is remaining 11.5 Pazherevitsy and two Slavetinsk tax units were given to the other son, Vasily Menshoi. Although both sons received an equivalent number of tax units from their father's estate, the number of hamlets, peasant households, peasants, bushels of rye, bales of hay, and income were unequal. Peter received twelve hamlets in which eighteen peasants occupied eighteen peasant households, sowing 62.5 bushels of rye in one field, mowing 580 bales of hay, and paying dues of 797.8 dengas.³⁵ Vasily Menshoi, on the other hand, received nine hamlets in which fourteen peasants occupied fourteen peasant households, sowing fifty-four bushels of rye, mowing 570 bales of hay, and paying dues of 685 dengas.³⁶

Although Peter and Vasily Menshoi Nazimov administered their pomesties as separate units, the census-takers recognized that the brothers were sharing the same estate, their father's former pomestie, by noting in their returns that each pomeshchik held his land "*vopche*" with his brother.³⁷ Both held half of the hamlet of Dubie, where they had their respective manors. Unlike their father, who had administered his smaller Slavetinsk pomestie as a separate estate, the Nazimov brothers consolidated their Pazherevitsy and Slavetinsk lands into one pomestie administered from their Pazherevitsy manors. Their brother Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov served from the former pomestie of his uncle, Ivan Nekrasov syn Nazimov. The beginning of the entry states that the thirteen tax units were originally given as a pridacha to Vasily and an unnamed brother, both of whom were then serving from part of their father's "old" pomestie. After the grant of the pridacha it was decided that Vasily Bolshoi would serve from the pridacha while his brother would serve from their father's pomestie. Although Vasily Bolshoi served alone from the pridacha, he continued to pay the customary obrok of one altyn per tax unit assessed pridachas and lands given new pomeshchiks. The designation "Bolshoi" implies

that Vasily Bolshoi was the elder brother of Vasily Menshoi. It is therefore probable that Vasily Bolshoi and his brother Peter entered service earlier than Vasily Menshoi. Since they were approximately the same age and probably either unmarried or without a large number of dependent children, they were able to serve from the tax units later held by Peter alone. By Yury's death, Peter may have established a larger family and required more land than either brother needed. Vasily Menshoi therefore received the remaining 13.5 tax units of his father's pomestie while his elder brother received a pridacha of thirteen tax units providing an income of 742 dengas.³⁸

The estate of Dmitry Semenov syn Kostin, who held twenty-nine tax units in the former hamlets of Grigory Moseev syn Babkin and Mikita Moseev in Degzha parish in 1500, was divided between his two elder sons by his first wife and his two younger sons by his second wife, Uliana.³⁹ The two elder sons, Yakov and Semen, each received 7.5 tax units while Uliana and her two sons, Sergeiko and Ivanko, received 6.5 tax units. Yakov shared the hamlet of Novinko, the location of his father's manor, with his stepmother and her two sons. The *vopche* hamlet, in which Yakov and Uliana had their manors, was divided equally between the two households; each received two tax units on which ten bushels of rye were sown and 150 bales of hay were mowed.⁴⁰ The location of Semen Dmitriev syn's manor in the hamlet of Ostrog apart from the manors of his brother and stepmother suggest that he entered service before Yakov and established his own residence before his father's death. Semen nevertheless preferred to hold lands near his relatives. His pridacha of 4.5 tax units was located in the same St Nicholas's of Vysotsk parish where his brother Yakov also received a pridacha of 5.5 tax units.⁴¹ Only sons did not necessarily receive all of their father's pomesties. Gridia (the pejorative form of "Grigory") Semenov syn Glotov held 28.5 tax units (9.5 sokhas) on the former lands of Paul and Ivan Mikhailov deti Makarin and Paul Matfeev syn Bychkov in 1500. His son Boris, however, only received twenty tax units or 70.1 percent of his father's Kolomna pomestie.⁴²

The unequal division of the pomeshchik's estate between his heirs at law and the granting of less than the lord's estate to a sole heir at law suggests that the crown did not recognize a right of inheritance solely derived from a father, brother, uncle, or cousin's possession of a certain piece of land. The family was permitted to retain possession of their lands as long as the adult males fifteen years of age and over served in the grand prince's cavalry or in the government (two pomeshchiks serving in 1539 were clerks). However, the government did not allow the family to retain more land than its adult males needed to support their military or administrative service.

THE NEW POMESTIES

New provincial families, who did not have any known representatives in the cadaster of 1500, received forty-one or 76 percent of the “new” pomesties. Old provincial families without earlier representatives in the parish received the remaining thirteen estates or 24% of the new pomesties.

The loss of the pomeshchiks’ marriage records makes it impossible to determine whether the new pomeshchiks’ in-laws earlier held the fourteen estates. Because younger servingmen probably married the daughters of older local servingmen, in-laws may have held some of the new pomesties received by representatives of “old” Shelonskaia families. Since the annual muster and enrollment of new pomeshchiks (*verstanie*) was also the year’s major social event, marriage alliances between families of provincial servingmen were probably made at that time.⁴³ The pomeshchiks’ desire to hold lands near other family members is indicative of the strength of family ties. A young servingman beginning his career, whose father and older brothers were already serving from the family’s lands, had an incentive to marry the daughter of a servingman without sons, since he could expect to receive the share of his father-in-law’s lands that would have gone to an adult son. This suggests that those pomeshchiks who received new lands in the same parish as other family members may have married the daughters of other local gentry. Consider the case of Ivan Suvorov syn Nazimov, a Pazherevitsy pomeshchik who received the former pomestie of Matvei Volokhov. In 1539 there were seven Nazimovs serving from “old” pomesties in other volosts located in the parish, while the other Shelonskaia Nazimov served from a pomestie in Vyshgorod parish.⁴⁴ The absence of Volokhovs in the cadaster of 1539–41 suggests that the former pomeshchik died without sons. Ivan’s marriage to Matvei Volokhov’s daughter would have preserved the “family” character of the land.

Although approximately 43% of the new lands came from old pomesties, the majority of the new estates were created from either crown or monastic land. Nineteen new pomesties (35%) were created from the land retained by the crown after the exile of the Novgorod boyars and confiscation of their votchinas after the revolt of 1478. Twelve estates (22% of the new pomesties) were created from clerical land. Although one pomestie was created from the former lands of the Archbishop of Novgorod, eleven estates consisted of lands formerly belonging to the St Yury, Nativity, and Prechistye monasteries. The lands of St. Yury’s monastery were concentrated in Belsky parish while the Nativity lands were located in the Degzha and Ramyshevo parishes and the lands of the Prechistye monastery of Shchylov were located in the Retno parish. The new pomesties created from clerical land were divided

equally between the old and new families, for each category received about twenty percent of its new land from clerical estates. Old families received a higher percentage of their new pomesties (46% v. 41.5%) from old estates not previously held by the family while new families received proportionally more new land (36.6% v. 31%) from the former obrok-paying crown lands.⁴⁵

Representatives of six old families (the Ogarevs, Turgenevs, Nazimovs, Moseevs, Nekliudovs, and Shchulepnikovs) received lands earlier held by a pomeshchik from another family. Only two of the families earlier holding these estates still had representatives serving in 1539. Michael Afanasiev syn Moseev had a Nativity pomestie earlier held by Ivan Bolshoi and Michael Evreev. Vasily Borisov syn Evreev, the only member of the family referred to as a servingman in the cadaster of 1539–41, held his father's old pomestie in Shniatinsk parish.⁴⁶ Daniel Ivanov syn Shchulepnikov held a Vyshgorod pomestie earlier belonging to Alfery Suvorov syn Nazimov. The earlier Nazimov was probably not survived by any adult sons, for none was mentioned in the cadaster of 1539–41. Although Alfery's brother (Vasily) was serving from an "old" Vyshgorod pomestie, most of the family served from the same Pazherevitsy lands held since 1500.⁴⁷

Nine of the seventeen (52.9 percent) old families whose estates were granted to new families did not have any representatives serving from Shelonskaia pomesties in 1539. Two of the nine were represented by widows who occupied maintenance pomesties created from their deceased husband's pomesties.⁴⁸ Six of the remaining eight families had collateral relatives of the old pomeshchik serving from old pomesties in other parishes.⁴⁹ Another family, the Evreevs of Shniatinsk parish, shared their former Shniatinsk estate with Matvei Filipov syn Molchanov.⁵⁰ The only instance of an old pomestie passing to a different family while the former lord's nephew or cousin served from a new pomestie in the same Resurrection (*Voskresensky*) parish involved Peter Yuriev syn Zverev. Peter Yuriev syn served from the former lands of the Nativity monastery while Ivan Golodnoi, whose family does not appear among the Shelonskaia pomeshchiks of 1500, served from the old pomestie of Gridia Zverev. The possibility exists that Peter, who was serving with six adult sons in 1539, entered service before the retirement or death of Gridia Zverev and was given some of the land confiscated from the Nativity monastery because of the lack of availability of old pomesties.⁵¹

THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE POMESHCHIK

The old pomeshchiks' significantly higher average annual income (1516.76 dengas, slightly more than twice the new pomeshchiks' average of 754.67

dengas) suggests greater economic security. To test this thesis the landlord's income derived exclusively from the dues paid by the peasants residing on his estate was correlated with the number of landlords sharing the estate. The correlation between the lords and income was significantly higher on the old pomesties, 0.5073 for the old instead of 0.02 for the new pomesties.

The correlations suggest that the old pomeshchiks were in a better position than the new to discharge their military service obligation. A comparison of the average income with the number of lords per estate on the old and new pomesties supports this thesis.⁵² Although the landlords' per capita income fell on both estates (from 1123.41 to 595.87 on the old and 743.3 to 393.33 dengas per year on the new), the rate of decline was more pronounced on the new than the old pomesties. The average annual per capita income fell from 743.39 for single landlord estates to 362.49 for two landlord estates on the new estates, a deficit of 380.90 dengas. On the two landlord old pomesties the decline represented a mere 52.04 dengas. The new pomesties' lower average per capita income (576.08) is additional proof of their inferior economic position. The old estates had a 149% higher average annual per capita income of 852.11 dengas.

The income differential in favor of the old pomeshchiks suggested by the data given above is not surprising. By 1539 most of the older landlords (forty-six or 59.7%) had received pridachas to enable them to support the military service of their newly enrolled sons. The newer estates were given to young servingmen with wives and small children who could not be supported by their families because their fathers were still in service. Since the new pomeshchiks would eventually inherit their father's lands and did not have adolescent sons about to enter service, they did not receive pridachas. The limited amount of arable land cultivated by dues-paying peasants prevented the state from giving pridachas until the new pomeshchiks' adult sons were ready to enter service fifteen or twenty years later (approximately the period between the censuses).

The constraints on the state's ability to support the pomeshchik's military service (which caused Ivan III and his son Vasily III to confiscate monastic land) did not prevent it from providing the new landlord with a sufficient income. The per capita income (743.39) of the forty-two new pomeshchiks living on single landlord estates (representing 82% of the fifty-one new pomesties and 62.6% of the sixty-seven new pomeshchiks) exceeded the per capita income of fifty-nine old pomeshchiks (representing 43% of the 137 old landlords). Twelve old pomeshchiks (20%) earned average annual incomes of 657.60 dengas while thirty-nine (66%) received an average of 595.87 dengas and eight (14%) an average of only 392.12 dengas per year. The lack of cadastral references to the failure of pomeshchiks (*netchiki*) to

attend the annual muster and enrollment, where their equipment was examined and preparations were made for the spring and summer campaign in wartime, show the landlords' ability to serve as well as their loyalty to the motherland.

LOCATION AND THE RATE OF TURNOVER

The old and new pomesties were compared to determine which were closer to commercial or administrative centers. Since the peasants paid part of their dues in money and the lords purchased weapons and supplies in the towns, estates near commercial or administrative centers were probably more desirable than those located further away. Servingmen with old pomesties in these parishes had an incentive to retain their old estates while new pomeshchiks had a reason to request land near important towns. The percentage of old pomesties in each parish was compared to the parish's distance from Novgorod, the region's major administrative and commercial center. Lacking other data, the location of the sixteenth century parishes was computed from the map "The Novgorodian Fifts at the End of the Fifteenth and Beginning of the Sixteenth Century" (*Novgorodskie piatiny v kontse XV-nachale XVI veka*) in the frontispiece of the first volume of the Shapiro's *Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii* (Agrarian History of Northwestern Russia).⁵³

After the distance of the twenty-three parishes from Novgorod (which ranged from 62.53 and 153.44 versts) was calculated, the results were compared to the percentage of old pomesties. The simple correlation coefficient (0.4759) calculated from the data suggested the turnover was higher on the estates closer to Novgorod since the percentage of old pomesties rose as the distance of the parish from Novgorod increased. This is surprising in view of the peasants' need to earn money from the sale of their produce on the open market.

A comparison of the percentage of old pomesties with the parish's distance from Novgorod in each of five categories separated by approximately twenty versts each confirmed the higher percentages of old pomesties in the more remote districts of the province.⁵⁴ Only 43% of the pomesties were old in category one (the six closest parishes within 62.53 and 80.912 versts of Novgorod) while 77.5% were old in category three (the four parishes within 111.53 versts of Novgorod). More than 80% were old in the fifth category, which included the four most distant parishes (Yasno, Pazherevitsy, Vyshgorod, and Zhedritsy), all of which were more than 136 versts from Novgorod. All pomesties were old in the most remote parish (Zhedritsy), 153.44

versts from Novgorod, while all were new in the closest parish (Svinort), only 64.83 versts from Novgorod.

A comparison of the distance of the parishes from Porkhov and Pskov supports the conclusion that the old pomesties were closer to commercial and administrative centers despite their distance from Novgorod.⁵⁵ All but one of the parishes in the third category, where more than seventy-seven percent of the pomesties were old, were located near Porkhov, the administrative center of the Porkhov district. Belsky and St Michael's parishes, whose lands had belonged to St. Yury's monastery in Novgorod times, were only 9.59 and 19.18 versts from Porkhov. The seven parishes in the last two categories whose percentages of old pomesties were 0.66 and .8025 respectively included the area around the town of Porkhov and Our Lady's parish, two parishes less than twenty, two less than thirty, and two more than thirty but less than forty versts away.

The late fifteenth century Muscovite census-takers must have understood the desirability of the Porkhov area as a location for pomesties, for the district had a higher percentage of pomesties than other regions of the province in the new census at the turn of the sixteenth century.⁵⁶ Part of the district's desirability can be traced to its location near the old trade route that ran from Pskov through Porkhov to Novgorod. The location must have been especially favorable to the pomeshchiks who needed to obtain weapons, for all eighteen artisans mentioned in the cadasters of the period lived in the vicinity of the town.

Porkhov was a less desirable destination for the Retno parish pomeshchik having to purchase armor, weapons or a horse and the peasant interested in selling his grain. Although Porkhov was only 47.935 versts to the south and Novgorod more than eighty versts to the north, the distance by water to Novgorod was about the same. To reach Porkhov required traveling ten versts by land to the Shelon River and then forty versts down the Shelon to the Udokha, another twenty-two versts down the Udokha and then overland to Porkhov. The journey was almost as long as and surely less convenient than direct travel by boat eighty versts up the Shelon River to Novgorod.

Some parishes were more conveniently located near Kursk, the administrative center of Derevskaia province. Kolomna and Los, where all pomesties were old, are excellent examples. Kolomna was located on the Lovat River only ten versts from Kursk, nearly a hundred from Porkhov, and 103.19 versts from Novgorod. Los was less than thirty versts from Kursk and sixty-seven versts from Porkhov by land. A journey by water from Los to Novgorod was even longer, sixty-seven versts up the Polist River to Lake Ilmen and then another sixty versts across Lake Ilmen to Novgorod.

The comparison of the percentage of old pomesties with each parish's distance from the nearest town shows the old pomesties' proximity to administrative and commercial centers. The correlation coefficient of -0.2612 is indicative of a higher percentage of old pomesties in parishes near the fortified towns of Porkhov, Staraia Rusa, and Kursk. The division of the twenty-three parishes into five categories of thirteen versts each based on their distance from the nearest town illustrates the decline in the percentage of old pomesties as the distance between the parish and nearest administrative center increased.⁵⁷ The mean percentage of old pomesties (0.77) in the parishes found in the first category (0 to 12.934 versts from the nearest town) was significantly higher (35%) than the mean percentage (0.57) in the second category (12.934 to 25.868 versts). The mean percentage of old pomesties (0.63) in the third category (25.869 to 38.8 versts) was also lower (19%) than category one but higher (10.5%) than category two. This may reflect the inclusion of Zhedritsy parish, the most distant southern parish from Novgorod (153 versts to the north), in category three. The parish's three old estates only represent 3.8% of the seventy-seven old and 2.3% of the 128 classifiable pomesties. Removing Zhedritsy reduces the mean percentage of old pomesties per parish to 0.598, only 4.9% higher than category two and 22.33% lower than category one. The lowest mean percentages of old pomesties are found in the last two categories (0.46 and 0.50 respectively) representing the five most remote parishes from the three administrative centers. Their four old pomesties only account for five percent of the old and a mere three percent of all 128 classifiable pomesties.

The percentage of old was compared to the percentage of new pomesties near a major town.⁵⁸ The fifteen new and twenty-five old pomesties less than twenty-six versts from Porkhov, Kursk, or Staraia Rusa represent 29% of the fifty-one new and 32% of the seventy-seven old estates. The forty-two new and seventy-three old pomesties less than forty versts from these towns account for 82.3% of the new and 94.8% of the old estates. These percentages show that most pomeshchiks, whether old or new, preferred to be located as close to a commercial and administrative center as possible.

REGRESSION AND CORRELATION ANALYSIS

The percentage (60%) of old estates remaining in the same family for more than a generation during the first half of the sixteenth century shows the family's interest in retaining their lands after a relative's death or retirement. The old pomesties were compared to the new to determine the factors responsible for the low rate of turnover.

Although the high percentage of pomesties near major administrative and commercial centers indicates the importance of geographic location, additional factors could have influenced the rate of turnover. The lord's dependence on the pomestie's income-producing ability to support his family and military service could have been a factor. Since the peasants paid their dues in kind as well as money, the commodities received by the landlord were converted to their monetary equivalent on the basis of the prevailing prices in the towns of the Novgorod region. The problem is minor on the estates where the peasants paid a specific amount (*posp*) of rye, wheat or barley since the price level did not change significantly between 1500 and 1541.⁵⁹

The problem of converting dues in kind to their monetary equivalent is more complicated on the estates where the peasants paid a particular percentage (*izdolie*) of the crop to the pomeshchik. Determining the exact amount of grain represented by a fourth, a third or a half of the harvest requires information on yields unavailable before the "harvest and threshing books" (*uzhinye i umolotnye knigi*) of the later sixteenth century.⁶⁰ Bezhetskaia province's *Threshing Book of 1572* recorded a rye harvest of 4.85, but M.M. Gorsky found a lower harvest of 3.9 on the Beloozero monastery's plowland.⁶¹ The more detailed evidence of subsequent centuries reveals even lower yields. E.I. Indova found a normal rye yield of three in the second half of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁶²

The variance in the level of the harvest from year to year and the possibility of crop failures are important. V.I. Pashuto's study of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth century chronicles found references to the lack of a harvest every seven and a half years.⁶³ The Shapiro symposium found that sixteenth century peasants suffered a crop failure every seven years.⁶⁴ Since years of yields of four could be followed by years of three or less, the average yield may have been three or less. This suggests that the mean tax rate per tax unit on peasants paying a percentage of the harvest approximated the rate levied on those paying a specific amount of grain.⁶⁵

Other indices of the estate's income-producing ability can be constructed from the total peasant households, bushels of rye and tax units given in the last paragraph of each cadastral entry. The number of peasant households on an estate may have been significant, for the government and pomeshchik thought that the flight of the peasants and the abandonment of and reduction in cultivated land during the last half of the century justified the enserfment of the peasantry. The rye sown on an estate was important since all of the landlords received at least part of their dues in rye. The census takers' failure to record the amount of other crops sown demonstrates rye's position as the region's most important crop. The assessment of the peasants' dues by tax unit suggests that the number of tax units on an estate was also significant.

The practice of granting estates to several adult servingmen indicates the number of landlords sharing an estate needs to be considered too.

Other factors could have influenced the rate of turnover. The exchange of more remote parcels for land closer to the manor is evidence of the pomeshchiks' preference for more compact estates. The location of the *pridachas* in the same parish as the manor or a neighboring parish supports this theory. The significance of the landlord's preference for compact estates was assessed by comparing the rate of turnover to the fragmentation of the estate, the mean distance of the parcels located in other parishes from the lord's manor.

The location of other family members' lands could have influenced the rate of turnover of the *pomestie*. The original pomeshchiks were enfeoffed in the same parishes as other family members; the Nazimovs of Pazherevitsy and the Shablykins of Belsky are two examples. Their descendants may have considered retention of the fathers' *pomesties* preferable to relocation in a remote parish far from relatives. Nine of the ten Nazimovs and four of the five Shablykins serving in 1539 continued to reside in the two parishes.

The future availability of additional land in the same or a neighboring parish could have influenced the rate of turnover. Since the pomeshchiks met every year at the annual muster and enrollment, married into other gentry families, and maintained social relations with their neighbors, they were in a position to know whether and when additional land would become available. Because of the expense of relocation, which involved establishing a new manor in another parish, retaining old *pomesties* in an area where additional land would be available later for a *pridacha* was reasonable. Since the *pridacha* was usually always located in the vicinity of the manor, it was used as the index of the availability of additional land.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to describe the relationship between the factors (independent variables) influencing the rate of turnover (the dependent variable *Y*, where one designates the old estates held for a generation or more and two for the new *pomesties* held less than a generation). Ten independent variables were tested for inclusion in the regression model. They included the number of landlords sharing the estate (*X1*), the landlord's income (*X2*: the peasants' dues, *obrok*), the manor's distance from Novgorod (*X3*), the manor's distance from other major towns (*X4*: Porkhov, Staraia Rusa, and Kursk), and the fragmentation of the estate (*X5*: the average distance of the parcels from the lord's manor). Also tested were the number of family members holding nearby *pomesties* (*X6*, where zero designated none, one represented family in the province but not the parish, and two represented family in the same parish), the availability of additional land (*X7*: the existence of a *pri-*

dacha), the total number of tax units (X8: *obzhi*), the total number of peasant farms (X9: *dvory*), and the total bushels of rye sown (X10).

The potential independent variables were correlated with one another using the simple Pearson correlation coefficient to identify and eliminate multicollinearity. This was necessary because models using closely related independent variables are biased and the resulting coefficients invalid. The correlations between farms and rye (0.94), farms and tax units (0.91), farms and income (0.92), rye and income (0.94), rye and tax units (0.94), and income and tax units (0.92) were all above ninety percent. The correlations involving peasant farms, bushels of rye sown, income, and tax units were so close to unity that the lord's income was the only one of the four variables used in the final model.

The multicollinearity uncovered by testing the ten potential independent variables shows the existence of norms recognized by the state secretaries and their assistants who supervised the pomestie system through their management of the Pomestie Chancery. The correlation of 0.94 between rye and farms and 0.92 between farms and income indicates that each peasant household was expected to sow a specific quantity of rye enabling it to pay its dues at the end of the agricultural year around St. George's Day (26 November). The correlation of 0.91 between income and tax units indicates that each tax unit was expected to provide the lord with a specific income (which was exclusively derived from the peasant's dues). The government's collection and use of this information to support the pomeshchiks' military service is important evidence of the competence of the sixteenth century Muscovite civil servant.

After three multicollinear variables (farms, rye, and tax units) were removed from the list of independent variables, the remaining seven independent variables were correlated with the rate of turnover. This was necessary to determine the existence of a significant enough relationship to justify the variable's inclusion in the final regression model. Comparing the rate of turnover to each of the remaining seven independent variables yielded the following correlation coefficients: turnover, landlords (Y, X1), -0.2072; turnover, lords' annual income (Y, X2), -0.4388; turnover, distance from Novgorod (Y, X3), -0.3561; turnover, distance from other towns (Y, X4), 0.1455; turnover, fragmentation of the estate (Y, X5), -0.0535; turnover, other family member's lands (Y, X6), -0.0976; and turnover, availability of additional land (Y, X7), -0.5658.⁶⁶ The multiple correlation coefficient (0.6713) computed from the final regression model showed the strong relationship between the seven independent variables and rate of turnover. The coefficient of determination (0.4506) indicated the linear regression equation's ability to account for nearly half the variation in the rate of turnover.⁶⁷

The linear regression coefficients computed from the 128 pomesties with complete cadastral records were used to find the partial correlations between the dependent variable and each independent variable. The partial correlations were preferred to the simple Pearson correlation coefficient because they measure the strength of the relationship between the dependent and independent variable by holding the other variables constant. The Pearson coefficient can only indicate the existence of a relationship without describing its strength because the influence of the other independent variables is ignored.

Four of the partial correlation coefficients computed from the linear regression equation were too weak to have statistical significance because they were less than 0.10. They included the partial correlation between the rate of turnover and other relatives' lands (Y, X6: -0.071), the turnover and distance of the pomesties from other towns (Y, X4: 0.0863), the turnover and number of landlords (Y, X1: 0.099), and turnover and fragmentation (Y, X5: -0.0148). The stronger, negative correlation (-0.21) between the rate of turnover and distance from Novgorod, however, is additional evidence of the higher incidence of new pomesties near Novgorod.

The negative correlation of -0.3295 between the rate of turnover and lord's income shows the greater income-producing ability of the older estates. Since the pomeshchiks depended on the peasants' dues to support their family and fulfill their military service obligation, the income received from the peasants significantly influenced the rate of turnover.

The even stronger correlation (-0.4731) between the rate of turnover and the possession of a pridacha shows the old pomeshchik's interest in securing additional land near the manor to support the service of his adult sons. Because state service was the pomeshchik's reason for existence, he had to plan for his sons' entry into service when they reached their majority. To keep the immediate family together the landlord had to retain his old pomestie and secure pridachas in the same or a neighboring parish.

CONCLUSION

Comparing the abridged cadaster of 1500 with the complete records of 1539 proves that most pomesties remained in the same family from generation to generation. The seventy-seven "old" estates represent 60% of the 128 pomesties with complete surviving returns and 58% of the 133 estates supporting military service in 1539. If the eleven maintenance pomesties retained by the pomeshchiks' widows are considered, the old estates represent nearly 64% of the 139 pomesties with complete records and 61% of all 144 known estates.

The percentages of old and new pomestie were based on the classification system of the census-takers who conducted the census. Since the census-takers considered pomesties "old" if the same family retained the land for a generation or more, seven "old" estates were originally granted to different families. If they are subtracted from the seventy-seven old estates and the thirty-two new pomesties created from clerical or crown land held by the first pomeshchik for less than a generation before 1539 are added, 102 or 79.6% of the 128 pomesties in service were still in the original family's possession in 1539. If the eleven maintenance pomesties are considered, 113 or 78% of the 144 Shelonskaia pomesties still belonged to the same family as the first pomeshchik.

The low rate of turnover of the original pomesties between 1480 and 1550 indicates that the families of the first pomeshchiks retained their lands as long as the adult males fifteen years of age and older served the state. The passage of old pomesties to collateral relatives after the demise of a pomeshchik without sons shows the family's interest in retaining the lands of its retired or deceased servingmen. Since most estates remained in the original pomeshchik's family, the Muscovite government and the local landlord regarded the pomestie as the family's possession. The fact that most former landlords of new pomesties either died without male heirs or had collaterals serving from old estates in other parishes confirms this.

Economic considerations significantly influenced the rate of turnover of the Shelonskaia pomestie. The relatively high correlation between income and turnover follows from the pomestie's function as the cavalryman's principal means of support. The old families whose lands were capable of supporting their military service did not need to take on the inconvenience and expense of relocation to new pomesties.

Transferring old pomesties to new families would not have served the state's interest. The Muscovite government had to provide its servingmen with a sufficient income to support their wives and children and purchase the horses, weapons, and armor needed for military service. Since the state lacked the financial resources to pay monetary salaries, it had to rely on the dues paid by the peasants living on the pomeshchiks' land to support their service. The enfeoffment of new families on older crown land or newly confiscated monastic land is evidence of a severe shortage of suitable arable land cultivated by dues-paying peasants. The relocation expenses caused by the reassignment of old pomeshchiks to another estate and uprooting of the original families would have weakened the state's ability to support its servingmen. Because a stable gentry was essential for the defense of the Novgorod region threatened by Sweden and the Livonian Order that owed allegiance to Poland, the government preferred to increase the holdings of its old landowners with

additional land near the family seat when necessary to support additional servingmen.

The Muscovite government did not fear the inheritance of the pomestie by the original pomeshchik's relatives. Most of the original pomeshchiks were from the middle service class of central Muscovy that had proven its loyalty to the state. The location of the pridachas and the government's permission to exchange more remote parcels for an equivalent amount of land near the manor shows the state's confidence in the pomeshchiks' loyalty. The government did not expect them to develop regional loyalties like the Novgorodian boyars who revolted twice in the 1470s (or the Percies, Nevilles and other northern magnates of medieval England).

The conclusions reached from the study of the early sixteenth century Shelonskaia cadasters show the pomestie as a hereditary tenure in customary if not written law. The records of the revisionary census of 1552–53 discussed in the next chapter provide additional evidence of the degree to which the transference of old pomesties to the former landlord's heirs at law became customary before 1550.

NOTES

1. Rozhdestvensky, pp. 367–68.
2. See Samokvasov, I: 124–25.
3. Despite the similarity between the pomestie and palace land, the two tenures were administered by separate departments in the sixteenth century. The *dvortsovaia izba* headed by a majordomo (*dvoretskii*) managed the crown lands while the *s"ez-zhaia izba* headed by a lord lieutenant (*namestnik*) managed the pomesties. The latter was divided into the *razriadnyi stol*, which supervised the pomeshchik's service, and the *pomestnyi stol*, which directly administered the pomestie system. See Samokvasov, I: 122–24.
4. On the classification of the pomesties by parish see Appendix B, "The Shelonskaia Pomesties of 1539." For the names of the pomeshchiks holding the estates in 1539 and the earlier landlords, see Appendix C, "The Shelonskaia Pomeshchiks, 1539."
5. For the Ovtsyn returns see *NPK*, IV, 378 (1539) and *NPK*, V, 60 (1500). For the Gridiukhin Meshcherinov returns see *NPK*, IV, 517 and V, 63.
6. For the returns from Prince Zasekin's pomestie see *NPK*, IV, 313. The returns for the original pomeshchik, Mitia Aleksandrov syn Rumiantsov, are in *NPK*, V, 65.
7. *NPK*, V, 63.
8. The 1539 returns for Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov Ovtsyn's estate refer to the placement of abandoned lands (*pustoshi*) "earlier granted to his father" into tax units. See *NPK*, IV, 378. For the reference to his father in the 1500 cadaster, see *NPK*, V, 60.

9. The changing surnames used by the Romanovs, descendants of the boyar Andrew Ivanovich Kobyla, c. 1347, is an excellent example of the lack of standardization of sixteenth century surnames. At the beginning of the century they were known as Koshkin-Zakharins, then Zakharin-Yurievs, Zakharin-Romanovs, and finally, at the end of century as the Romanovs. See Peter Grebelsky and Alexander Mirvis, ed., *Dom Romanovykh*, 2nd. Edition, (St. Petersburg, 1992), pp. 7–8.

10. The case of Ratman Pleshcheev, a Belsky pomeshchik whose estate was surveyed in 1539 (see *NPK*, IV, 434ff), illustrates the abridgement's importance as a supplement (printed in *NPK*, V, 1–68) to the Valuev cadaster. Since the returns for the Belsky pomeshchiks from the census of 1495–1505 do not survive, the two censuses cannot be compared. The abridgement of the Valuev cadaster, printed in V, 17–20, however, lists the pomeshchiks, volosts, and tax units for each estate. The absence of a reference to the Pleshcheevs in the abridgement suggests his estate was a “new” pomestie.

11. Although Piatoi Shablykin's estate was probably “new,” it was located near the lands of collateral Shablykins. Despite the failure of the returns surviving from the census of 1495–1505 to mention the Shablykin family, the 1539 returns for the estate of Subbota Yuriev syn Shablykin and his brothers, Menshoi and Urman, refer to their “old” pomestie on the Pazherevitsy lands of the former Novgorod boyar Alexander Timofeev syn Danilov. Since the Danilov tax units were “old,” they were probably held earlier by Yuri Shablykin. For Subbota's 1539 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 382ff. On the other Shablykins see the returns for (1) Shestoi in IV, 430ff, (2) Tretiak in IV, 421ff, (4) Ushak in IV, 429ff, and (5) Piatoi in IV, 418ff.

12. See, chapter two, n. 33.

13. The only entry for “Terebezh” is found in *NPK*, V, 66, in the returns for Andreiko Lazorev's pomestie (see the *NPK*, Index, 207); the only entry for “Kerebezh,” is found in IV, 306, in the returns for Saltan Lazorev, who had his manor in the village. It is possible that the sixteenth century Muscovite script was misread, so that “Terebezh” and “Kerebezh” referred to the same village. This thesis is supported by the inclusion in Saltan's pomestie of land in other parishes held by Andreiko Lazorev in 1500. The pomestie included five Dubrovno tax units located in the hamlets of Raki (on the former votchina of Ivan Kuzmin syn Savelkov, three tax units), Ivantsovo (on the former votchina of Andrew Avramiev, one tax unit), and Kromsino (on the former pomestie of Mikula Evsiukov, one tax unit). See *NPK*, IV, 306–309. The Dubrovno returns from the “new census” indicate that Andreiko Lazorev held Ryk (Raki), Ivantsovo, and Kromsino in 1500. See *NPK*, IV, 186.

14. See below, Appendix B, which gives the percentage of “old,” “new,” and “maintenance” pomesties by parish. The pomesties of a “Prince Michael” and a “Bogdanok” could not be classified because only the last paragraph of their respective entries, giving total peasant households et al, has survived. For Prince Michael's pomestie, see the returns for Zhedritsy parish in *NPK*, IV, 522ff. For Bogdanok's pomestie see the returns for Kolomna parish in IV, 476.

15. The thirty “old” estates held by the original pomeshchik in 1539 include:

Landlord-Parish-*NPK* Volume

Beloselsky, Prince Vasily Slitok-Belsky-IV, 432

- Beloselsky, Prince Vladimir Ivanovich-Belsky-IV, 419
 Buturlin, Andrew Ivanovich-Bolchino-IV, 410
 Chetverkin, Dmitry-Pazherevitsy-IV, 398
 Erokhov, Gridia Elizarov-Ramyshevo-IV, 329
 Erokhov, Ivan Elizarov-Ramyshevo-IV, 328
 Erokhov, Ivan Vladimirov-Cherenchitsy-IV, 339
 Erokhov, Mitrofan Elizarov-Ramyshevo-IV, 330
 Karkmazov, Semen Ivanov-Yasno-IV, 441
 Karpov, Ivan Lopak Ivanov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 390
 Khlusov, Ivan Istomin-Los-IV, 244
 Kriukov, Afanasy Vasiliev-Mustsa-IV, 502
 Kvashnin, Likach-Belsky-IV, 422
 Miachkov, Stepan Vasiliev-Zhedritsy-IV, 519
 Moseev, Peter Afanasiev-Degzha-IV, 278
 Moseev, Nekliud Ivanov-Degzha-IV, 264
 Nazimov, Andrew Shirshik Surin-Pazherevitsy-IV, 375
 Nazimov, Andrew Surin-Pazherevitsy-IV, 370
 Ogarov, Ivan Ivanov-Degzha-IV, 247
 Palitsyn, Matvei Mikhailov-Degzha-IV, 261
 Parfeniev, Peter Afanasiev-Ofremovo-IV, 352
 Pleshcheev, Alfery Vorupaev-St. Michael's-IV, 297
 Ragozin, Fedor Denisiev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 373
 Rezantsov, Yakov Osipov-Kolomna-IV, 476
 Selivanov, Alexis Andreev-Belsky-IV, 427
 Selivanov, Ilia Andreev-Belsky-IV, 416
 Shablykin, Subbota Yuriev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 382
 Turov, Grigory Alekseev-Resurrection-IV, 464
 Tyrtov, Zuk Semenov-Yasno-IV, 453
 Unkovsky, Yury Aleksandrov-Nativity-IV, 281
 16. See *NPK*, IV, 262 and V, 59.
 17. *NPK*, IV, 336 and V, 18.
 18. The twenty-seven estate inherited by the sons of the original pomeshchik include:
 Landlord-Parish-*NPK* Volume)
 Buturlin, Daniel Ivanov Poleukhtov-Bolchino-IV, 410
 Glotov, Boris Grigoriev-Kolomna-IV, 472
 Khludenev, Michael Chebotaev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 311
 Khludenev, Yury Botaev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 321
 Kostin, Semen Dmitriev-Degzha-IV, 271
 Kostin, Yakov Dmitriev-Degzha-IV, 270
 Kvashnin, Grigory Nikiforov-Nativity-IV, 283
 Lazorev, Alabysh Andreev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 305
 Lazorev, Fedor Ivanov-St. Michael's-IV, 292
 Lazorev, Saltan Andreev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 306
 Meliukov, Fedor Saikov-Ofremovo-IV, 349

Meshcherinov, Semen Fedorov Gridiukhin-Zhedritsy-IV, 517
Nazimov, Peter Yuriev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 387
Nazimov, Semen Ivanov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 388
Nazimov, Vasily Menshoi-Pazherevitsy-IV, 386
Ovtsyn, Ivan Andreev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 378
Ovtsyn, Semen Vasiliev-Snezhsk-IV, 322
Piatin, Nikita Bulgakov-Okolorusie-IV, 365
Riapolovsky, Prince Semen Golitsyn-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 305
Samarin-Kvashnin, Mikula Ivanov-Dolzhino-IV, 436
Snazin-Mikulin, Fedor Grigoriev-Nativity-IV, 268
Tatianin, Dmitry Ivanov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 403
Tatianin, Ivan Andreev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 394
Terpigorev, Fedor Semenov-Yasno-IV, 449
Terpigorev, Kelar Semenov-Yasno-IV, 446
Tyrtov, Yury Vasiliev-Degzha-IV, 274
Zverev, Andrew Ivanov-Okolorusie-IV, 358

19. In 1539 the Vyshgorod parish volost of Paul Matveev syn Bychkov was held by Princes Andrew and Vladimir, the sons of Prince Vasily Ivanovich Tulupov; see *NPK*, IV, 478. In 1500 the same volost was held by Prince Ivan Dmitrievich Tulup, the grandfather of Princes Andrew and Vladimir; see *NPK*, V, 62.

20. *NPK*, IV, 316–18 and V, 65.

21. *NPK*, IV, 237–40 and V, 53.

22. See *NPK*, IV, 405–406 for Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov's returns. Although Vasily Bolshoi's returns do not name the brother with whom he originally shared his father's pomestie, two brothers (Vasily Menshoi and Peter) were serving from their father's "old" pomestie in 1539. See *NPK* IV, 385–6. On their father Yury (Yushko) and uncle Ivan (Ivashko), see *NPK*, V, 60–61.

23. Ivan Kobylin's returns (*NPK*, IV, 334) refer to his possession of a share of the Kolomna parish hamlet of Rakhitsy "with his father." Although the Kolomna returns do not mention any Kobylins, the senior Ivan Kobylin's returns could be lost since only fragments of the parish's 1539 returns survive. The only Kobylins mentioned in the abridged 1500 Kolomna returns are "Kuzma and Ivashko, the sons of Kobyla Moksheev" (*Kuzma da Ivashko Kobylin deti Moksheev*) in *NPK*, V, 49.

24. *NPK*, IV, 343–47 and V, 50.

25. *NPK*, IV, 451–53 and V, 69.

26. *NPK*, IV, 425–27.

27. On the Evreevs see *NPK*, IV, 496 and V, 40. On Ivan Ivanov syn Zverev see *NPK*, IV, 460. Although the 1539 cadaster cites Dmitry Zverev as the former landlord, an Ivashko Ivanov syn Zverev held one and two-thirds sokhas in the same Vasily Markov volost included in Ivan Zverev's estate in 1539. See *NPK*, IV, 460 and V, 52.

28. One of the earlier pomeshchiks was still serving (without any known descendants) in 1539. Ivan Vladimirov syn Erokhov held the same old pomestie in the neighboring Cherenchitsy parish hamlets of the former Novgorodian boyar Yakov Fedorov in 1539 as Ivashko Volodin syn Erokhov. Since Ivashko and Volodin are the diminutives

of Ivan and Vladimirov, Ivashko and Ivan Erokhov were probably the same pomeshchik. See *NPK*, IV, 339–40 and V, 48.

29. *NPK*, IV, 289 and V, 58.

30. G. Vernadsky, *Source Book*, 162, and Kalachev, *Akty*, I:139.

31. In 1500 Semen Semenov syn Terpigorev held seventeen hamlets, thirty farms, forty-four peasants, 144 bushels of rye, 1330 bales of hay, and thirty-two tax units in Yasno parish; *NPK*, IV, 154–55 and V, 69.

32. In 1500 Semen Semenov syn Terpigorev held two hamlets consisting of three farms, six peasants, twenty-three bushels of rye, 150 bales of hay, and five tax units in Dubrovno parish; see *NPK*, IV, 188. Although Semen administered the land as a separate pomestie, his son, Kelar Semenov syn, administered his Yasno and Dubrovno lands as one unit from his Yasno manor. See IV, 446–49.

33. Fedor Semenov syn's total Yasno pomestie had twelve hamlets, six tax-exempt new settlements, thirty-four farms, thirty-five peasants, 115.5 bushels of rye, 675 bales of hay, 23.5 tax units; see *NPK*, IV, 449–51. Kelar Semenov syn Terpigorev's pomestie consisted of eighteen hamlets, two new settlements, thirty-four farms, thirty-five peasants, 160 bushels of rye, 1148 bales of hay, and 35.5 tax units; see IV, 446–49. The grant of a larger number of tax-exempt new settlements to Fedor may also indicate his status as a younger son who would not require the income from the new settlements until the establishment of a family.

34. On Yury Nazimov's pomesties, see the abridgement of the Valuev cadaster in *NPK*, V, 54, (Slavetinsk) and 60 (Pazherevitsy).

35. The returns for Peter Yuriev syn Nazimov's pomestie are printed in *NPK*, IV, 387–89.

36. The returns for Vasily Menshoi Yuriev syn Nazimov's pomestie are printed in *NPK*, IV, 386–87. The estate was surveyed again in 1576; see V, 616.

37. See *NPK*, IV, 386, 387. Since the Peter and Vasily Nazimov administered their estates as separate units, the term “*vopche*” resembles “tenancy in common,” where both parties each hold half of the property, rather than “joint tenancy,” where both parties hold all of the property. Like tenants in common, the authority of a “*vopche*” hamlet's lord was not subject to the approval of the holders of the other sections of the hamlet.

38. *NPK*, IV, 405–406. Although the elder brother received fewer tax units, the difference between Vasily Bolshoi's annual income of 742 dengas and Vasily Menshoi's annual income of 685 dengas indicates that the elder brother's tax units were more productive. The difference income may also indicate the elder brother had a larger family to support.

39. Dmitry Semenov syn Kostin's returns are in *NPK*, V, 255–56.

40. Yakov Dmitriev syn Kostin's returns are found in *NPK*, IV, 270–71. Uliana Dmitrievskaia zhen Kostina's returns are in IV, 273–74.

41. Semen Dmitriev syn Kostin's returns are found in *NPK*, IV, 271–72.

42. On Gridia Semenov syn Glotov, see *NPK*, V, 49. The returns from 1539–41 for his son Boris's pomestie are in IV, 472ff.

43. Unfortunately the records of the enrollments have not survived; on the verstanie, see Rozhdestvensky, pp. 288–301.

44. See the returns from the census of 1539–41 for Pazherevitsy parish in *NPK*, IV, 367–407. The Nazimovs holding Pazherevitsy land in 1539 included: (1) Andrew Shirshik Surin syn, IV, 370; (2) Andrew Surin syn, IV, 370; (3) Peter Yuriev syn, IV, 386; (4) Semen Vasiliev syn, IV, 388; (5) Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev syn, IV, 405; (6) Vasily Menshoi Yuriev syn, IV, 386; (7) Veshniak, IV, 368. Vasily Suvorov syn Nazimov held Vyshgorod lands; see IV, 483.

45. The percentages of new pomesties received by old and new families from each source are given below:

Source-Old Families (%) - New Families (%)

Clerical-3 (23%)-9 (21.9%)

Crown-4 (31%)-15 (36.58%)

Old pomesties-6 (46%)-17 (41.46%)

46. On Vasily Borisov syn Evreev, see *NPK*, IV, 496.

47. On Vasily Suvorov syn Nazimov, see *NPK*, IV, 483.

48. See the returns for Fetinia, widow of Shik Miakinin, in *NPK*, 327, and Ovdotia, widow of Matvei Rumiantsev, in IV, 309.

49. The six old families with representatives serving in other parishes included the Tatianins, the Poluekhtov Buturlins, Terpigorevs, Evreevs, Zverevs, and Lazorevs. Ivan Andreev syn Tatianin was serving in 1539 from his father's Pazherevitsy pomestie; see IV, 394. Part of P. Poluekhtov's 1500 estate was granted to Gavril Danilov syn Khlopov, who also received part of the former estate of Andrew Tatianin; see IV, 414. Andrew Ivanovich Poluekhtov syn Buturlin was serving from a Bolchino pomestie in 1539; see *NPK*, IV, 410. The only other Poluekhtov Buturlin mentioned in 1539 was Daniel, who served from his father's old Zhedritsy pomestie; see IV, 514). Three Terpigorevs were serving in Yasna parish in 1539. The eldest, Ivan, was completing a service career that had begun before 1500; Fedor and Kellar were serving from their father's old pomestie, on whom, see above. The Lazorev pomestie located in the Porkhov area and Our Lady's parish was given to Stepan Zviagn syn Sukov, a new "landless," pomeshchik. The lack of references to any "Grigoriev deti" Lazorevs in the 1539 cadaster suggests Gridia was not survived by any adult sons. The other Lazorevs alive in 1539 were serving from their fathers' old pomesties. See IV, 292, on Fedor Ivanov syn; IV, 306, on Saltan Andreev syn; IV, 305, on Alabysh Andreev syn Lazorev.

50. On Matvei Filipov syn Molchanov, see *NPK*, IV, 500; on Boris Evreev, the former holder of Matvei's pomestie, see the abridgement of the "new" census's returns for Shniatinsk parish in *NPK*, V, 40.

51. See the returns for the pomestie of Ivan Fedorov syn Golodnoi in *NPK*, IV, 471. Peter Ivanov syn Zverev's returns are in IV, 461.

52. The mean income by number of landlords per pomestie is given below:

Type-Cases-Lords-Mean Income-Per capita income-Minimum income-Maximum income

Old/New Income: per capita-minimum-maximum

Old-45-1-1123.41-1123.41-314-2480

New-42-1-743.39-743.39-123-2377.5

O/N: 1.51-1.51-2.55-1.043

Old-14-2-2142.75-1071.37-846-5301

New-6-2-724.97-362.49-379-930.5

O/N: 2.95-2.95-2.232-5.69

Old-13-3-1787.61-595.87-1034-2480

New-2-3-1180-393.33-731-1628

O/N: 1.514-1.51-1.41-1.52

Old-2-4-1568.5-392.12-1121-2016

New-0-4

Old-1-5

New-0-5

Old-2-6-3945.61-657.60-2889.91-5001.3

New-0-6

Old-0-7

New-1-7

The income figures were calculated from the total dues paid by the peasants recorded by the census-taker at the end of each estate's returns. The figures represent the early sixteenth century denga.

53. The map in the frontispiece of the Shapiro symposium's first volume does not give the scale. A comparison of measurements of the distance from Novgorod to Pskov, Porkhov, and other towns in the region with those on the map of the "Western Soviet Union" in the *Rand McNally Readers World Atlas* (New York, 1956), however, enabled us to determine 4.5 inches on the Shapiro map represented 114.6 statutory miles, the distance between Novgorod and Pskov. The distances between each parish and Novgorod were then found according to the scale where one inch on the Shapiro map represents 25.44 miles. The distances were converted to kilometers and versts using the conversion factors given in Pushkarev, p. 175. One *versta* (pl. *versty*) represented 500 *sazheni* or 0.663 miles or 1.067 kilometers. As a result one inch in Shapiro represented 38.36 versts.)

54. The parishes located in each category based on their distance from Novgorod and the percentage of old pomesties are given below.

I. 62.53 to 80.912 versts

Svinort-0.00

Mustsa-1.00

Okolorusie-0.20

Resurrection-0.25

Ramyshevo-0.80

Shniatinsk-0.33

Mean: 0.43

II. 80.912 to 99.294 versts

Retno-0.00

Cherenchitsy-0.40

Ofremovo-0.83

Dolzhino-0.50

Snezhsk-0.50

Los-1.00

Mean: 0.538

III. 99.294 to 117.676 versts

Kolomna-1.00

Belsky-0.50

St Michael's-1.00

Nativity-0.60

Mean: 0.775

IV. 117.676 to 136.058 versts

Degzha-0.60

Bolchino-0.50

Porkhov/Our Lady's-0.88

Mean: 0.66

V. 136.058 to 153.44 versts

Yasno-0.71

Pazherevitsy-0.83

Vyshgorod-0.67

Zhedritsy-1.00

Mean: 0.8025

Summary:

Mean % Old Pomesties per parish: 0.61

Mean Distance from Novgorod per parish: 102.53 versts

55. The distance of the parishes in categories three, four, and five from Porkhov in versts is given below:

Category-Parish-Distance

III-Kolomna-95.68

III-Belsky-19.18

III-St Michael's-9.59

III-Nativity-33.57

IV-Degzha-38.36

IV-Bolchino-18.19

IV-Porkhov/Our Lady's-0.00

V-Yasno-19.18

V-Pazherevitsy-27.29

V-Vyshgorod-27.29

V-Zhedritsy-32.01

56. Shapiro, I, pp. 133, 150–52, 163, and *NPK*, IV. The percentage of tax units held in pomestie in Porkhov area after the confiscation of Novgorod votchinas by Ivan III was 57% compared to 46.3% in the neighboring Staraia Rusa district.

57. The following list compares the percentage of old pomesties to each parish's distance from the nearest administrative center (Porkhov, Kursk, or Staraia Rusa):

Parish-Nearest Town-Percent Old-Distance

I. 0 to 12.934 versts (17.4%)

Kolomna-Kursk-1.0-9.57

St Michael's-Porkhov-1.0-9.59

Okolorusie-Staraia Rusa-0.20-0.00

Porkhov/Our Lady's-Porkhov-0.88-0.00

Means: 0.77-4.79

II. 12.935 to 25.868 v. (13%)

Bolchino-Porkhov-0.50-18.19

Belsky-Porkhov-0.50-19.18

Yasno-Porkhov-0.71-19.18

Means: 0.57-18.85

III. 25.869 to 38.8 v. (47.8%)

Cherenchitsy-Kursk-0.40-27.29

Ofremovo-Kursk-0.83-27.29

Los-Kursk-1.00-27.29

Resurrection-Staraia Rusa-0.25-28.75

Pazherevitsy-Porkhov-0.83-27.29

Vyshgorod-Porkhov-0.67-27.29

Svinort-Staraia Rusa-0.00-38.36

Ramyshevo-Kursk-0.80-38.36

Degzha-Porkhov-0.60-38.36

Zhedritsy-Porkhov-1.00-32.01

Nativity-Porkhov-0.60-33.67

Means: 0.63-31.45

IV. 38.81 to 51.736 v. (17.4%)

Mustsa-Staraia Rusa-1.00-47.935

Shniatinsk-Porkhov-0.33-47.935

Retno-Porkhov-0.00-47.935

Snezhsk-Porkov-0.50-47.935

Means: 0.46-47.935

V. 51.74 to 63.67 v. (4.3%)

Dolzhino-Kursk-0.50-63.67

Percent: 1.2%-1.9%

58. The number of old and new pomesties per parish are compared to the parish's distance from a major commercial center below:

Parish-Commercial Center-Old Estates-New Estates

Percent: Old-New

I. 0 to 12.934 versts (17.4%)

Kolomna-Kursk-2-0

St Michael's-Porkhov-2-0

Okolorusie-Staraia Rusa-1-4

Porkhov/Our Lady's-Porkhov-7-1

Percent: 16%-10

II. 12.935 to 25.868 v. (13%)

Bolchino-Porkhov-2-2

Belsky-Porkhov-6-6

Yasno-Porkhov-5-2

Percent: 17%-19.6%

III. 25.869 to 38.8 (47.8%)

Cherenchitsy-Kursk-2-3

Ofremovo-Kursk-5-1

Los-Kursk-3-0

Resurrection-Staraia Rusa-2-6

Pazherevitsy-Porkhov-15-3

Vyshgorod-Porkhov-2-1

Svinort-Staraia Rusa-0-4

Ramyshevo-Kursk-4-1

Degzha-Porkhov-9-6

Zhedritsy-Porkhov-3-0

Nativity-Porkhov-3-2

Percent: 62%-52.9%

IV. 38.81 to 51.736 (17.4%)

Mustsa-Staraia Rusa-1-0

Shniatinsk-Porkhov-1-2

Retno-Porkhov-0-5

Snezhsk-Porkhov-1-1

Percent: 3.8%-15.6%

V. 51.74 to 63.67 (4.3%)

Dolzhino-Kursk-1-1

Percent: 1.2%-1.9%

59. A.G. Mankov argued in *Tseny i ikh dvizhenie v Russkom gosudarstve XVI v* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1951), pp. 7–9, and 39, that the price of grain steadily rose after 1500. G.V. Abramovich observed in Shapiro, II, pp. 20–22, however, that the price of Novgorod grain did not rise significantly before the late 1540s. The use of the price of grain prevailing in 1500 by the census-taker Grigory Volosatyi in converting Shelonskaia grain obrok into monetary dues in 1524 supports Abramovich; see *NPK*, V, 398.

60. See Samokvasov, II, p. 512.

61. See M.M. Gorsky, “Urozhainost’ zernovykh kul’tur v tsentral’noi chasti Russkogo gosudarstva v kontse XVI-nachale XVII v” in *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy*, 1961g. (Riga, 1963), pp. 148–50.

62. See the results of E.I. Indova’s research, presented at the Fourth Conference of Soviet and English Historians, in *Agrarnyi stroi v Rossii v XVII v. IV-a sovetsko-angliiskaia konferentsiia istorikov, 15–22 sentiabria, 1966 g.* (Moscow, 1966), p. 14.

63. See V.T. Pashuto, “Golodnye gody v Drevnei Rusi” in *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy*, 1962g. (Minsk, 1964), p. 65.

64. See Shapiro, I, 37 and n. 77.

65. Since sixteenth century Muscovy usually used the three-field system of agriculture (with two fields under cultivation and the third fallow), the figures for bushels of sown rye given in the last paragraph of each cadastral entry only refer to one field. This is doubled to obtain the number of bushels sown on one tax unit. The product of the number of bushels of rye sown on each tax unit and the yield less seed represents the amount of grain available for the payment of the dues.

66. The variables included in the regression equation are given below with their means and standard deviations.

Variable-Mean-Standard Deviation

Turnover-1.4-0.49

Lords-1.59-1.10

Income-1213.11-853.61

Distance (Novgorod)-109.64-26.74

Distance (other towns)-27.35-13.48

Fragmentation-17.01-23.95

Other family lands-0.91-0.91

Land availability (pridacha)-0.35-0.48

67. The linear regression coefficients were computed from the data for Shelonskaia province given in Appendix F. Since all 128 pomesties with complete returns from the census of 1539–1541 were included in the regression, the resulting coefficients describe the parameters of the population of surviving cadasters and are not estimates obtained from a random sample. They were calculated using *SPSS 6.1 for Windows* (Prentice-Hall, 1994).

Chapter Four

The Revisionary Cadaster of 1552 and the Mid-Century Shelonskaia Pomestie

INTRODUCTION

The revisionary cadaster of Alexis Zherebtsov contains records of fifty-four pomesties, fifty of which are complete.¹ The pomesties with complete records include two maintenance pomesties, the estates of Gregory Karmazov's widow Ofimia and Gavril Kropotov's widow Agrifina.² They also include the estate of Ignaty Vasiliev syn Shamardin that escheated to the crown after his death without heirs in 1550.³ The pridacha granted to the sons of Vasily Rumiantsov (Zhikor, Tikhon, and Mikifor) was recorded as a separate pomestie.⁴ All but two of the remaining forty-six pomesties with complete returns could be classified old or new, depending on the length of time the same family continuously held the original pomestie.

The revisionary cadaster of 1552 enables the historian to test the conclusions reached earlier by comparing the cadasters of 1500 and 1539. Since pomeshchiks began military service at fifteen and retired at sixty, the sons of the first generation enfeoffed in 1480 were at or near retirement while their grandsons and great-grandsons were already in or about to enter military service. The census-takers were interested in the changes within the pomeshchik's family. The information on the date and circumstances of the former pomeshchik's death and the relationship between the current and former lord provides additional information on the succession of the pomestie within the landlord's family. Their references to the exchange of pomesties without the crown's prior permission and the granting of pridachas from other family members' lands supplement our earlier evidence on the treatment of the pomestie as allodial rather than conditional property.

THE EXCHANGE OF POMESTIES

The practice of exchanging pomesties continued to be widespread, for the cadasters of the revisionary census contain twenty-two references to the exchange of pomesties in the returns from eight of the nine parishes with surviving records. The seventeen pomeshchiks whose returns refer to the exchange of pomesties belong to sixteen of the thirty-seven (43%) families from which the 1552 returns survive for at least one representative. One of the lords, Yury Semenov syn Dubrovsky, exchanged lands in different parishes with four other pomeshchiks in separate transactions.⁵ Another, Daniel Shishmarev, also participated in three exchanges, one of which was with Yury Dubrovsky.⁶

The twenty-two references refer to seventeen transactions, five of which involved a pomeshchik with a non-pomeshchik. The returns for Peter Kropotov's sons (Mitka, Vasiuk, and Ivanets) refer to unspecified Retno parish tax units received by their father through an exchange with the archimandrite of the Yuriev monastery.⁷ Two of the five transactions involved pomeshchiks exchanging land with petty landowners. The returns for Ivashko Semenov syn Chikhachev, for example, refer to his father's exchange of an unspecified number of Retno tax units with Kolup Viaskovitsky, a petty landowner.⁸

The remaining two transactions with non-pomeshchiks concerned the exchange of land with the crown. The returns for Semen Vasiliev syn and his nephew, Nechai Vasiuk syn Nazimov, refer to three hamlets earlier received by their father and grandfather from an exchange with the crown. The new hamlets were located in Obluchie parish, less than ten versts from Vyshgorod parish, where the family had taken up residence on their manor at Rakochino after 1500 and before 1539. The parish where the lands received by the crown were located is not given, but the returns do refer to the distance of the land from Vyshgorod, 150 versts. Nazimov's desire to consolidate his holdings near the manor probably caused him to ask the crown to exchange his more remote pomesties for the three Obluchie hamlets.⁹ Fedor Shchekin the Cupbearer exchanged his lands in Obonezhskaia province in return for the crown's grant of a pomestie in Shniatinsk parish.¹⁰

The twelve remaining transactions concern exchanges of pomesties between pomeshchiks. Unfortunately, the records survive for only one party in the case of seven transactions since the other party resided in parishes without surviving returns. Daniel Chubarov syn Shishmarev's exchange of pomesties with Luka Karpov is an example. The 1552 Svinort parish returns refer to the hamlets of Vereteia, Zagliadovo, Radulia, and Gorodok, four tax units, received by the Shishmarevs from an exchange with Luka and Zloba, sons of Ivan Karpov. What the Karpov brothers received in return is unknown

since their records do not survive.¹¹ Yury Dubrovsky's acquisition of the hamlet of Mezhek, 1.5 tax units, from an exchange with Prince Dmitry Beloselsky is another example. Dubrovsky probably wanted to consolidate his holdings since he already held 4.5 Bolchino tax units. Prince Beloselsky's motive is unknown since his returns do not survive.¹²

Some of the exchanges recorded in the 1552 cadaster actually occurred before 1539. Comparing the 1552 and 1539 returns shows that five transactions definitely occurred before 1539 because references to the same transaction are found in both censuses. The exchange between Peter Kropotov and the Yuriev monastery, for example, occurred before the last census because Peter's 1539 returns refer to the exchange of three tax units with the archimandrite.¹³ The exchanges between Yury Dubrovsky and Ignaty Buzhaninov, Yury Dubrovsky and Semen Lapenkov, Daniel Shchulepnikov and Alfery Nazimov, and Semen Nazimov and the crown also occurred before 1539.¹⁴

Two additional exchanges may have been carried out before 1539. The reference to "exchanged tax units" in Fedor Kropotov's 1552 returns does not give the other party to the transaction; but it probably refers to the exchange of 1.5 tax units with the petty landowner Ulian cited in his 1539 cadaster since there are no references to other exchanges in either return.¹⁵ Ivan Turgenev's 1552 Zhedritsy returns refer to two Vyshgorod parish hamlets, three tax units, received by exchange with Princes Andrew and Volodimer Vasiliev deti Ivanovich Tulupov. Prince Tulupov's 1552 returns also refer to the transaction, but do not reveal the number of tax units received from Turgenev.¹⁶ Prince Tulupov's 1539 returns do not mention the transaction, but they are fragmentary and the transaction could have been recorded on the lost sheets. Turgenev's 1539 returns are missing because they were recorded on the lost sheets of the Zhedritsy cadaster.¹⁷

The loss of both parties' 1539 returns prevented the date of three transactions from being established. One of the cases involves Daniel Chubarov syn Shishmarev's exchange of 3.5 Ilemno tax units with his cousin, Istoma Bovykin syn Shishmarev, referred to in Daniel's 1552 Svinort returns. Although the 1539 Svinort returns survive, Daniel was not mentioned because he was then residing in the Ilemno parish. Since all the pomeshchik's holdings were recorded with the returns from the parish of his residence, Daniel's 1539 returns were part of the lost Ilemno cadaster. The absence of references to Istoma in the 1539 cadaster indicates that his earlier returns were lost also.¹⁸

The other cases of undated exchanges concern the transactions between Se-meika Bachin and Istoma Tatarinov on the one hand and Vasily Kalitin and Fedor Shafrov on the other. The Bachin and Tatarinov exchange could not be precisely dated because the only pomestie returns from the Smolna parish,

where pomeshchiks resided on their manors, date from 1552. The 1524 returns from the Smolna crown lands, however, reveal that the hamlet of Shchilino later received by Tatarinov from Bachin was then divided into shares held by the crown and the Lazorev cousins, Gridia Danilov syn and Gridia Koshkin syn. Since Bachin was not mentioned in the 1524 cadaster, he received his share after 1524 and could not have exchanged it with Tatarinov before the late 1520s or early 1530s.¹⁹ The Kalitin and Shafrov exchange probably did not occur before the 1540s because the Kalitin pomestie was still “new” in 1552. The crown held the land in 1524 before granting it first to Gridia Tatianin and later to Vasily Kalitin.²⁰

The date of the exchange between the Strupinsk parish pomeshchiks Stepanko Povarov and Vasily Borisov syn Ezhov can be established despite the loss of the 1539 returns.²¹ Although neither pomeshchik’s return dates the transaction, Ezhov did not become a pomeshchik until his retirement as granary steward (*zhitnichnye kliuchnik*). The former landlord Afanasy Mikhailov syn Babkin served in the same position. Although the 1539 returns for his pomestie do not survive, Babkin is referred to as a shareholder in the Strupinsk hamlet of Uгла in the 1539 returns for Mikita Kurtsov, a Yasno pomeshchik who also had a share.²² The absence of references to Babkins in the 1552 returns makes it reasonable to assume that Afanasy Mikhailov syn died intestate after 1539. The escheated pomestie was later assigned to another steward, Ezhov. The evidence therefore suggests that Ezhov became a pomeshchik and later exchanged land with Povarov after 1539.

A comparison of the surviving 1539 and 1552 cadasters shows that the six remaining transactions took place after 1539. The 1539 returns for Retno parish record Semen Chikhachev’s possession of a share in the hamlet of Borovnia, where the petty landowner Kolup Viaskovitsky also held land, but does not refer to any exchanges between the two. The 1552 parish returns, however, refer to Chikhachev’s acquisition of an unspecified number of tax units from an “exchange with Kolup Viaskovitsky.” The widespread tendency of the Novgorodian pomeshchiks to consolidate their holdings suggests the exchange was made so Chikhachev could obtain the Viaskovitsky tax units adjacent to his own Borovnia land.²³

Other pomeshchiks exchanging land after 1539 also wanted to consolidate their holdings. Yury Dubrovsky’s acquisition of Mezchnik from Prince Dmitry Beloselsky gave him an additional 1.5 tax units in the same Bolchino parish where he already held 4.5 tax units.²⁴ The motive behind Zaleshanin Bobrov’s exchange of his Shchepetsk lands for Bogdan Rzhanikov’s Karachunsk tax units is not as clear. Since Bobrov’s 1552 and 1539 returns do not survive, his other holdings are unknown. Andrew Surin syn Nazimov’s 1539 return, however, mentions Bobrov as a shareholder in the same Pazherevitsy hamlet of

Zakhonie as Nazimov.²⁵ Although Bobrov did not live in Pazherevitsy, the reference in Nazimov's returns proves that he did have land there in 1539. Since Shchepetsk parish was more than a hundred and Karachunsk only thirty versts from Pazherevitsy parish, Bobrov wanted land closer to his other holdings.

The equivalency of the exchanges can only be determined in two cases. Daniel Shishmarev's 1552 returns refer to his acquisition from Yury Dubrovsky of one tax unit in the unrecorded pochinok of Pup, which was located in Svinort parish. The Dubrovsky returns indicate that he received the Strupinsk parish hamlet of Vezhishcha, also one tax unit, in return for Pup. Although both pomeshchiks exchanged the same number of tax units, the quality of the land was not equivalent. Shishmarev gave up one tax unit of average land in return for one tax unit of poor land. Since the pochinok was located in the same Svinort parish as his other holdings, Shishmarev was actually purchasing land closer to the manor with the difference between the higher yield of the average land he was giving up and the lower yield of the poor land he was receiving.²⁶

Semeika Bachin and Istoma Tatarinov are another example of pomeshchiks exchanging an equivalent number of tax units of different quality land. Although both Smolna pomeshchiks exchanged and received 3.5 tax units, Tatarinov received 3.5 tax units of poor land in return for giving Bachin 2.5 tax units of average and 1.5 tax units of poor land. Tatarinov's lost income represents the purchase price of his share in the hamlet of Shchilino received from Bachin.²⁷

New pomesties were involved in two of the six exchanges definitely occurring after 1539. Fedor Shchekin's pomestie, which he received after exchanging his land in Obonezhskaia province with the crown, was held by Gavril Kropotov in 1539 and was therefore "new" in 1552. The Shchekins appear to have been a family of court servingmen without strong local roots. Another Fedor was the Korostynia administrator in 1524 while Login Semenov syn was a state secretary. The Fedor Ivanov syn receiving the Shelonskaia province pomestie in return for his Obonezhskaia estate was a retired cupbearer who probably only held his Obonezhskaia land a short time before the exchange with the crown.²⁸ Bogdan Rzhaninov's Strupinsk pomestie, which included Shchepetsk lands received from an exchange with Zaleshanin Bobrov, was also new. The 1552 returns cite Gavril Moreno as the former pomeshchik while the 1500 abridged returns assign the land to Pakh the kliuchnik.²⁹

Since the Ezhov and Kalitin estates discussed above were also new, four of the seven new pomesties found in the 1552 cadaster were involved in exchanges. This suggests that the holders of new were more likely than the

holders of old pomesties to exchange land. This thesis is supported by the fact that the exchanges referred to in the returns for eight old pomesties occurred before 1539, during the first generation of the family's possession. The four new and eight old pomesties represent seventy percent of the seventeen estates that included lands obtained by exchange.

THE PRIDACHA

References to pridachas are found in twelve returns. Eleven are complete while those for Yakov, an Obluchie parish pomeshchik whose surname is unknown, are incomplete.³⁰ Comparing the 1539 and 1552 cadasters enable the historian to determine whether the five pomesties with returns from both censuses received their pridachas before or after the last general census, 1539. Daniel Ivanov syn Buturlin (who held a pomestie of forty-eight tax units in Zhedritsy parish with his son, Ivan) and Semen Nazimov (who held twenty tax units in Vyshgorod parish with his nephew, Nechai) received their pridachas before 1539.³¹ Veshniak and Alexis Dubrovsky received their pridacha of 7.5 tax units after inheriting their father Yury's land.³² In 1539 Matvei Ivanov syn Kropotov held three tax units and his manor at Liubitovo in Shniatinsk parish and one tax unit in Retno parish; in 1552 Kropotov held an additional 3.5 tax units in the same parishes.³³ Yakov Savin syn Pervoi also received a pridacha of 1.75 tax units after 1539.³⁴

Whether the six pomeshchiks without 1539 returns received their pridachas before or after 1539 can only be determined in the four cases where the census-taker recorded the previous landlord's year of death or the pridacha included new settlements (*pochinki*) "founded in the forest since the last census." The sons of Vasily Kuleshin (Ivan and Semen) received a pridacha of thirteen tax units after their father's death in 1546.³⁵ The date of Vasily Rumiantsov's death is unknown, but the returns for his sons (Zhikor, Tikhon, and Mikifor) refer to a pridacha of sixteen tax units received after their father's death including pochinoks established by the three brothers after 1539.³⁶ The returns for Timothy Levshin and his sons, Matvei and Fedko, refer to a new settlement founded after 1539 and later granted as a pridacha.³⁷ The pridacha received by the five sons of Yakov Tatarinov and their nephew Zhdanko included a pochinok established by Chubar Shishmarev after the last census.³⁸

The two remaining pomesties included pridachas that could have been granted before 1539. One case concerns the pomestie of Vasily Levshin and his three sons (Nenarok, Gavrilko, and Ignatko) whose returns record a pridacha formerly belonging to Iosif Unkovsky. The only other reference to Iosif

Unkovsky is found in the 1539 returns for Ivan Tyrtov, a Degzha pomeshchik holding fifteen tax units earlier belonging to Unkovsky. Since the returns do not refer to an exchange, Tyrtov received the land after Unkovsky's death. Since Unkovsky died before 1539 and there are no references to the land being held by the crown before passing to the Levshins, the pridacha was probably received before 1539.³⁹

The other case concerns the pridacha of eleven tax units granted to the three sons of Peter Turgenev (Ivan, Vasily, and Luchanin). Since the old parcels belonged to Peter Turgenev in 1500, his sons could have succeeded to the estate and received a pridacha between 1500 and 1539.⁴⁰ Eight of the tax units came from the former Zhedrity pomestie of Potap Ivanov syn Buturlin, whose father, Ivan, held fifty-five tax units in the parish in 1500. Since the 1539 Zhedrity returns are incomplete, Potap could have succeeded his father after 1500 and died without descendants before 1539.⁴¹ The five Nativity pochynoks formerly belonging to Prince Vasily Zasekin, however, could have been granted to Turgenev after 1539. The census-takers' omission of the notation "founded since the last census" suggests that the pochynoks were founded before 1539. Prince Zasekin's 1539 returns, however, omit the pochynoks, only mentioning three pochynoks founded in the Okologorod since the "new census." If the Nativity pochynoks had passed to Turgenev before 1539, the transaction would have been noted in Zasekin's 1539 returns.⁴²

The three pomesties with returns from both censuses whose pridachas were received after 1539 and the six pomesties with only 1552 returns supplement the data compiled from the census of 1539, which showed that forty-six of the 141 pomesties with surviving records received pridachas.⁴³ The location of the nine pridachas was compared to the original pomestie to determine whether the pomeshchiks preferred lands near the manor. Six pomesties had pridachas located in the same parishes as the original pomestie. Yakov Savin syn Pervoi, for example, received a half tax unit in Shniatinsk parish, where he already held 1.5 tax units, and a quarter tax unit in Retno parish, where he held twelve old tax units and resided on his manor at Boltovo.⁴⁴ Five of the seven tax units received by the sons of Yakov Tatarinov after 1539 were located in the same Smolna parish where the family resided on their manor.⁴⁵ Eight of the eleven tax units received by the three sons of Peter Turgenev were located in the Zhedrity parish where the family resided on their manor.⁴⁶ Seven of the sixteen tax units received by the Rumiantsovs as a pridacha were located in the same Strupinsk parish as their old pomestie of 24.5 tax units.⁴⁷⁴

The Rumiantsovs were one of the two families receiving lands in the same parishes as their original pomestie who also received parcels elsewhere. 8.5 of their additional tax units were located in the Slaviatinsk parish, forty versts to

the southeast from Strupinsk. The remaining half tax unit was located in Svi-nort parish, about ten versts to the south.⁴⁸ Three of the Turgenev brothers' eleven additional tax units were located outside of Zhedritsy parish, half in Pazherevitsy parish eighteen versts to the east and half in Nativity parish fifty versts to the northeast.⁴⁹

Only three pomesties received pridachas restricted to lands located outside of the parishes where the pomeshchiks already held land. All but one of Timothy and Matvei Levshin's pridacha of 8.5 tax units was located in Yasno parish, fifteen versts to the north of their family seat in Zhedritsy parish. The remaining tax unit was located in St Nicholas's of Vysotsk parish twenty-seven versts to the northeast.⁵⁰ The Kuleshin brothers (Ivan and Semen), who were also Zhedritsy pomeshchiks, had a pridacha of thirteen tax units in St Nicholas's of Vysotsk parish.⁵¹ The pridacha of the thirteen tax units granted to the Zhedritsy pomeshchik Nenarok Levshin was located in Nativity parish, forty-seven versts to the northeast.⁵²

Seven of the pomeshchiks received pridachas from other pomesties. Only one pomeshchik received the former lands of a relative. After his brother Gavril's death in 1547, Matvei Ivanov syn Kropotov received the hamlets of Glubokoe and Radokhovo, 1.5 tax units, earlier held by his brother in the Retno parish.⁵³ The remaining pomeshchiks received pridachas from lands earlier held by unrelated pomeshchiks. Vasily Kuleshin's pridacha, for example, consisted of thirteen tax units formerly held by Vasily Vasiliev syn Pushkin.⁵⁴ The Rumiantsov brothers' Strupinsk pridacha, which included seven tax units earlier held in pomestie by Chubar Shishmarev and Prokofy Konovnitsyn, is another example.⁵⁵

The practice of granting lands outside of the family appears to violate the principle that the pomeshchik's lands should remain in the family. However, it is important to consider that all but one of the pomeshchiks whose lands were granted as pridachas to members of other families died without known descendants. Iosif Unkovsky, whose thirteen Nativity tax units were granted to the sons of Vasily Levshin, died intestate before 1539. The only other Unkovsky mentioned in the cadasters and still living in 1539 was Yury Aleksandrov syn, a cousin who resided alone on his old Nativity pomestie.⁵⁶ The absence of references to Vasily Pushkin or his descendants, if any, in the 1539 cadasters indicates that he also died intestate.⁵⁷ The remaining pomeshchiks whose lands were given after their death without descendants as pridachas to members of other families include Nikita Kurtsov, Prokofy Konovnitsyn, Fedor Kolachev, Alexis and Nekliud Shamardin, Anton Misinov, and Potap Ivanov syn Buturlin.⁵⁸

Chiubar Shishmarev was the only pomeshchik with land passing out of the family who died with a known descendant. His son Daniel was living in Svi-

nort parish in 1552.⁵⁹ The 1552 returns refer to two parcels of Shishmarev land granted to pomeshchiks outside of the family. The three sons of Vasily Rumiantsov received a pridacha including seven tax units located in the Strupinsk parish earlier held by Chiubar Shishmarev and Prokofy Konovnitsyn.⁶⁰ Although the 1539 returns for the pomestie are lost, the 1500 Strupinsk abridged returns list Chiubar Shishmarev as the holder of 4.5 tax units.⁶¹ The lack of references to the Konovnitsyns indicates that the other 2.5 tax units were probably part of the crown lands also described in the abridged returns. Since the 1552 Rumiantsov returns fail to distinguish between Shishmarev and Konovnitsyn's earlier tax units, the Shishmarev land may have passed to Konovnitsyn before being granted as a pridacha to the Rumiantsovs. If so, the land probably passed outside of the Shishmarev family before his son Daniel became old enough to serve. The only other reference to Konovnitsyn is found in the 1539 returns of Michael Andreev syn Shishkin, who held the hamlet of Yazva in the Opoka parish earlier held by Konovnitsyn.⁶² The absence of references to an exchange suggests Shishkin received the land after Konovnitsyn's death, which had to occur before 1539.

The five sons of Yakov Tatarinov received 2.5 Retno tax units earlier belonging to Chiubar Shishmarev.⁶³ Since the 1539 returns for the pomestie are lost, the date of the land's transference to the Tatarinovs is unknown. If Chiubar did retain the small Retno parcel until his death, his son may have rejected the land because of its location. Daniel Shishmarev's removal of the family seat and administrative center of his pomestie from the Ilemno to the Svinort parish nearly thirty versts to the northeast suggests that he preferred land closer to Novgorod. The Retno parcel was more than twenty versts to the south of Svinort and ten versts to the east of Ilemno parish. The absence of references to pridachas in his returns, moreover, suggests that Daniel and his son Mitka had enough pomesties to serve without the Retno land. The inconvenience of having to administer the small parcel may have outweighed the marginal benefit of the additional income.⁶⁴

The pochinok continued to be an important source of pridachas, for seven of the eleven pomeshchiks (63.6%) with complete 1552 returns received the new settlements as pridachas.⁶⁵ Five of the seven pomeshchiks received their own pochinoks. Three of the five only received the pochinoks that they or other relatives had established. The sons of Yury Dubrovsky received all of the pochinoks founded by their father between 1539 and his death in 1546.⁶⁶ Timothy Levshin received the pochinok of Lukovishche that he had established earlier in the forest in Yasno parish, where he also received seven tax units formerly belonging to Nikita Kurtsov.⁶⁷ Yakov Savin syn Pervoi received all the pochinoks that he founded since 1539. He also received the settlement of Kamenka that he had founded before 1539, which had not been

placed in a tax unit.⁶⁸ The census-takers' failure to assign Kamenka to Levshin's estate before 1552 shows that the mere act of establishing a *pochinok* was not sufficient to give the *pomeshchik* legal title to the newly settled land.

Two *pomeshchiks* received *pochinoks* founded by other landlords in addition to their own new settlements. After receiving the *pochinoks* that they had established in the forest since the last census, the sons of Vasily Rumiantsov received five additional *Slaviatinsk pochinoks* founded by Ivan Mikiforov syn Trusov and Kirei Baranov.⁶⁹ The sons of Yakov Tatarinov received Peter Kropotov's former *pochinok* of Klimovy Sukinovinka besides their own *pochinoks*.⁷⁰ The two remaining *pomeshchiks* only received *pochinoks* founded by members of other families. The three *pochinoks* received by Nenarok Levshin were founded by Iosif Unkovsky while the Nativity *pochinoks* received by the sons of Peter Turgenev were founded by Prince Vasily Zasekin.⁷¹

Three of the *pomeshchiks* whose *pochinoks* were transferred to other families died without known descendants. Although the Trusovs and Baranovs were old *Slaviatinsk* families, neither had descendants living in 1552. Kirei Baranov and his father Tretiak held twelve tax units in the parish in 1500, but there are no references to any descendants in the sixteenth century cadasters.⁷² The only reference to Ivan Trusov is found in the 1552 Rumiantsov returns although a relative, Mitia Trusov syn Vorobin held 6.5 *Slavetinsk* tax units in 1500. It is therefore reasonable to assume that at least some of Mitia Trusov's lands passed to his relative Ivan Nikiforov syn, who later died without sons.⁷³

Whether Prince Vasily Zasekin left descendants is unknown. In 1539 he was living on his manor at Sknevo-on-the-Polona in Our Lady's parish.⁷⁴ Since the 1552 parish returns are lost, the possibility that Prince Vasily or a descendant was still serving from the *pomestie* cannot be excluded. *Pochinoks* could be assigned to another *pomeshchik* while the founder was still in service or transferred to another family after the founder's death because the *pomeshchik* did not legally acquire the land on which the *pochinok* was established until the crown placed the settlement in a tax unit. Peter Kropotov, whose *pochinok* of Klimovy Sukinovinka was given to the Tatarinovs, left three sons (Mitka, Vasiuk, and Ivanets) who served from his *pomestie* after his death in 1542.⁷⁵

THE TURNOVER OF POMESTIES AFTER 1539

The 1552 returns were compared to the 1539 and 1500 returns to determine the changes in possession that occurred after the 1480s, when Ivan III created

the pomestie system. The pomesties remaining in the same family for a generation or more were considered old, those less than a generation, new. If the 1539 returns were lost, a pomestie was considered old if the same family held the land in 1500 and 1552. If different families held the land in 1500 and 1552, an estate without 1539 returns was only considered old when the census-taker referred to it as an "old pomestie" since the term was reserved for lands continuously held by the same family for at least a generation. The number of censuses in which the same family held each estate was calculated to determine the length of time the land remained in the family. The number of families holding each estate in succession was calculated as an index of the turnover of parish families.

Two of the three pomesties held by servingmen with incomplete returns were old in 1552. Ivan Kostin syn Mikhailov held the Zhedritsy pomestie earlier held by his father.⁷⁶ Although the returns for Yakov's estate do not give his surname, the census-taker referred to it as his "old pomestie."⁷⁷ The pomestie of the brothers Zakharko, Mikula, and Gavriilo, however, could not be classified. The first paragraph of the returns and the beginning of the summary of the total tax units and income, where the census-taker referred to the pomeshchiks' "old pomesties," if any, are lost while the brothers' surname and the names of earlier pomeshchiks are unknown.⁷⁸

Two of the forty-six pomesties with complete returns could not be classified because they were held by the crown in 1524. They include Semen Ivanov syn Bachin's twenty-five tax units in the Smolna parish volost of Alfery Ivanov syn Afanasov and Daniel Ivanov syn Levshin-Brukhatoi's 9.75 tax units in the Zhedritsy parish volost of Ivan Afanasov.⁷⁹ Since both pomeshchiks were the original landlords and the 1539 returns do not survive, the length of time the estates were held by their respective pomeshchiks cannot be determined. By 1552 the pomesties would have been old if received shortly after 1524 and new if received around 1539.

Seven of the remaining forty-four pomesties were classified new because the same family held them for less than a generation. This represents 16.9% of the forty-four estates. Only one (5%) of the twenty pomesties located in the parishes with complete returns from all censuses was new. An estate located on the former lands of the Novgorod boyar Alexis Naumov in the Shniatinsk parish was granted to Fedor Ivanov syn Shchekin, one of the tsar's cupbearers. Gavril Kropotov is the only former pomeshchik mentioned in the 1552 returns. The entire estate was obtained in exchange for Dmitry Aksakov's lands in the neighboring Obonezhskaia province. It is unclear whether Kropotov and Aksakov *or* Shchekin and Aksakov made the exchange. The passage reads "the cupbearer . . . for him, what had been Alexis Naumov's, and was assigned to Gavril Kropotov in pomestie, and was given to him in the year

7055 [1547], in exchange for his hamlets, what was taken from him, according to the sovereign's charter, in Obonezhskaia province and given to Dmitry Aksakov and children."⁸⁰ Although the 1539 Kropotov returns do not mention Obonezhskaia pomesties, Kropotov could have received the land after 1539 and then exchanged it with Aksakov in 1547 to obtain Shniatinsk lands closer to his manor. Other returns, however, indicate that Kropotov died around 1547. In 1547 Gavril's brother Matvei received two hamlets earlier held by Kropotov in the Retno parish.⁸¹ His widow Agrafina received a *prozhitok* of one tax unit on the former pomestie of Gavril Muranov in 1547/48.⁸² It is therefore probable that Gavril Kropotov died around 7055 without male descendants and that Shchekin received a share of his Shniatinsk lands by charter after giving up his parcels in Obonezhskaia province to Dmitry Aksakov.

The new pomestie may have been given to Shchekin because of his position as head of the department (*sytnyi dvor*) of the royal household responsible for the sovereign's drink.⁸³ Other court officials also held Shniatinsk land before 1546. Gavril Muranov, a clerk, earlier had the Shniatinsk hamlets of Pizdoshnino, Yushnika, and Karushkino, a tax unit each, taken by the state and distributed to other pomeshchiks after his death.⁸⁴

It is apparent from the census-takers' practice of recording the names of earlier lords outside of the pomeshchik's family that six of the twenty-four pomesties (25%) without returns from the 1539 census were still new in 1552 because their landlords had served from the land for less than a generation. Two Smolna pomesties fall into the new category. The sons of Ivan Kalitin, Vasily and Iosif, held a small village (Skugra) and six hamlets in the volost of Alfery Afanasov earlier held by Gridia Tatianin. Since the earliest returns for the lands survive from 1524, when the volost was held as crown land, Tatianin received the pomestie after 1524. The lands may have passed from Tatianin to Kalitin before 1539. The returns from Michael Chebotaev's pomestie in Our Lady's parish refer to Vasily and Iosif Kalitin as shareholders in the Smolna hamlet of Zakhonie where the Chebotaevs also held a share.⁸⁵ Yet, the census-takers' failure to call the Kalitin pomestie "old" suggests that the Kalitins probably received the land shortly before 1539 and therefore had not held the estate long enough for it to be considered old. The other new Smolna estate was held by Prince Michael Konstantinov syn Zasekin and consisted of the former hamlets of the Novgorod boyars Fedor Veriazhsy and Alfery Ivanov syn Afanasov that Nechai Shcherbinin had held in pomestie. Since the volost was crown land in 1524, Shcherbinin also received the land after 1524. Even if Prince Zasekin had received the estate before 1539, he could not have held it long enough for the land to be considered old in 1552.⁸⁶

Three new pomesties were located in the Strupinsk parish. Ragoza Bulgakov held a new pomestie in the volost of Ivan Kisliakov and Karp Esipov earlier held in pomestie by Gavril Sintsov. Since the former pomeshchik died in 1551, Bulgakov only had the land for a year before the 1552 census.⁸⁷

Former officials of the sovereign's court served from two of the three new Strupinsk pomesties. Vasily Borisov syn Ezhov held the estate earlier belonging to Afanasy Mikhailov syn Babkin. Like his predecessor, Ezhov was a granary steward in the royal household; his returns record the government's order to relinquish his post and serve from the Strupinsk pomestie.⁸⁸ Since the clerk Stepan Buzhaninov had the pomestie in 1500, officials of the royal household continuously held the land between 1480 and 1552.⁸⁹ Bogdan Rzhanikov, another steward removed from his department, was ordered to serve with his brother Andriushka from a Strupinsk pomestie located in Bogdan Esipov's volost. The earlier holder of Rzhanikov's pomestie was also a court official, for the 1500 returns assigned the estate to Pakh the Steward.⁹⁰

The only remaining new pomestie recorded in the 1552 cadaster was found in the Zhedritsy parish, where Yury Kartmazov held a new pomestie on lands belonging to Dmitry Turgenev before his death in 1548.⁹¹ Since the only Turgenevs mentioned in the 1552 cadaster are Dmitry's brothers, Dmitry probably died without sons. Since his brothers did not have any sons, they may have had sufficient land for service and did not need their brother's lands. Yet the practice of granting pomesties to brothers in the absence of sons and the Turgenev family's unbroken possession of this pomestie since the 1480s suggests there may have been a family relationship between the Turgenevs and Kartmazovs. Granting the land to a landless son-in-law of serving age would have been preferable to giving the land to the deceased older pomeshchik's childless brothers.

The Kartmazovs were one of the four old provincial families receiving new pomesties. Gregory Kartmazov held the same Obluchie pomestie on the former lands of the Novgorod boyar Yulian Plusnitsyn in 1500 that his widow Ofimia held as a prozhitok in 1552.⁹² The Shchekins of Shniatinsk were an old provincial family. Gridia Semenov syn Shchekin held part of the hamlet of Michael Berdenov in the Korostynia parish in 1500; Loginko Fedorov syn Shchekin, one of Vasily III's state secretaries, held a pomestie in the same parish in 1524.⁹³ The Bulgakovs were another old family; Nikita Bulgakov held an old Efremovo pomestie in 1539.⁹⁴ The Princes Zasekin also held old Shelonskaia pomesties in 1539. Prince Vasily Dmitrievich Zasekin held an Our Lady's pomestie in 1539. Although the census-taker classified the pomestie (which did not include a pridacha) as old, Dmitry Rumiantsov had held the land in 1500, indicating that Zasekin received his land shortly after 1500.⁹⁵

Although the Kalitins were not an old Shelonskaia family, they had representatives in the neighboring Vodskaia province as early as 1500, when Loba Kalitin held a pomestie in the Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov parish.⁹⁶ The Ezhovs and Rzhanikovs were the only two families without representatives in the two provinces before 1552. Both new pomeshchiks were recently dismissed state officials receiving lands continuously held by state officials since the 1480s.

In at least two censuses, state officials held all three of the new pomesties with different landlords in 1500, 1539, and 1552. Both earlier holders of the steward Bogdan Rzhanikov's pomestie (Gavril Muranov and Pakh the *Kliuchnik*) were stewards in the royal household.⁹⁷ Both earlier holders of Vasily Ezhov's pomestie were also state officials; Afanasy Babkin had been Ezhov's predecessor as granary steward (*zhitnichnoi kliuchnik*) while Stepan Buzhaninov had been a clerk.⁹⁸ Both Ragoza Bulgakov and Gavril Sintsov, who held the pomestie assigned to Yakov Rumiantsov in 1500, were clerks.⁹⁹ These cases suggest that these estates belonged to a special category of pomesties including crown lands set aside to support former household officials. Their high rate of turnover between 1500 and 1552 therefore does not refute the thesis that the pomestie tended to remain in the family from generation to generation as long as the male heirs were capable of serving the crown.

Thirty-seven (84%) of the forty-four pomesties capable of being classified old or new because they were not held as a *prozhitok* or a *pridacha* were classified old because they were held by the same family for more than a generation. The records from 1552 were compared with those from 1539 and 1500 in the case of the nineteen estates with surviving returns from all three censuses. Although the returns from the 1539 census do not survive for the remaining eighteen pomesties, a comparison of the 1552 returns with the surviving returns from 1500 and 1524 revealed that these estates were also held by the same family for more than a generation.

Fourteen (73.6%) of the nineteen pomesties with returns from 1539 were continuously held by the same family after the original grant of pomesties. Five of the estates were granted in pomestie before 1500. Prince Andrew Vasilievich Tulupov held 121.5 tax units in the Vyshgorod parish belonging to his father Prince Vasily in 1500.¹⁰⁰ Vasily Borisov syn and his nephew Mosei Gorianov syn Evreev jointly held forty-nine tax units in the Shniatinsk parish belonging to Vasily's father and Mosei's grandfather, Boris Vasiliev syn Evreev in 1500.¹⁰¹ Daniel Chiubarov syn Shishmarev's Svinort estate had belonged to his father, Chiubar in 1500.¹⁰² In 1552 Daniel Ivanov syn Buturlin was still serving from the same old pomestie in the Zhedritsy parish volost of Fedor Ievlev held by his father Ivan Poleuktov syn Buturlin in 1500.¹⁰³ Semen Fedorov syn Gridiukin also continued to serve from the same

old Zhedritsy parish pomestie held by his father Fedor Grigoriev syn Gridiukin Meshcherinov in 1500.¹⁰⁴

The nine remaining pomesties consisted of crown land granted to and continuously held as pomesties by the same family after 1500. Five of the nine were held by the same lord in 1539 and 1552. Yakov Savin syn Pervoi, for example, held the same 15.25 tax units in the former crown volost of Mikifor Svinort in the Retno parish in 1552 granted to him before 1539.¹⁰⁵ Fedor Miachkov held the same 15.5 tax units in the Shniatinsk parish volost of St Michael's of Skovorodka in 1552 and 1539 earlier recorded as crown land.¹⁰⁶ Different members of the same family held the remaining pomesties in 1539 and 1552. Sometime after 1500 and before 1539, the former Retno parish crown volost of Alfery Shimsky and the Shniatinsk parish volost of the Arkazhsky Prechistyiia monastery were granted to Fedor and Tretiak Kropotov, the sons of Ivan Kropotov. After Tretiak's death in 1550, his son Ivanets took his place and served from this pomestie with his uncle Fedor.¹⁰⁷ The former crown land in the Shniatinsk parish volost of Alexis Manuilov granted to Peter Mikhailov syn Kropotov before 1539 was held by his three sons, Mitka, Vasiuk, and Ivanets, in 1552.¹⁰⁸ Yury Semenov syn Dubrovsky's Svinort pomestie passed to his two sons, Alexis and Vesniak, after his death in 1551.¹⁰⁹

Five of the nineteen (26.4%) old pomesties with complete returns from 1539 and 1552 were held by a representative of the same family in 1539 and 1552, but not 1500. Vasily Terpigorev's former pomestie in the Vyshgorod parish volost of Vasily Kostelev is an example. The pomestie was granted to Vasiuk Suvorov syn Nazimov and his son Semen before 1539. After Vasiuk's death Semen continued to hold the pomestie with his own son, Nechai.¹¹⁰ Only one of the families who lost their pomesties between 1500 and 1539 still had representatives in the same parish in 1552. Sometime after 1500 but before 1539 Matvei Filipov syn Molchaninov received twenty tax units, ten of which were located in the Shniatinsk parish volost of Stepan Struzhsky earlier held by Boris Evreev. After Matvei's death in 1543, his son Ivanets continued to serve from his father's pomestie. In 1552 Boris Evreev's son Vasily and grandson Gorian were serving from forty-nine tax units, twenty-two of which were located in the same volost of Stepan Struzhsky earlier held by their father.¹¹¹

Nine of the eighteen pomesties without surviving 1539 returns were held by the same family in 1500 and 1552. In the Strupinsk parish, for example, Pasynok Povar held six tax units in the volost of Gregory Arbuzov and Vasily Tiutriumov in 1500; his son Stepan Pasynkov Povarov, a "nonserving" and therefore probably retired pomeshchik, held the same tax units in 1552.¹¹² The three sons of Vasily Rumiantsov also held the same Strupinsk land in 1552 held by their father in 1500.¹¹³ The Buturlins, Gridiukins, Terpigorevs,

Turgenevs, Tyrtovs, and Vdovins of Zhedritsy parish all held estates in 1552 belonging to other family members in 1500. Mikita Terpigorev's 26.5 Zhedritsy tax units, for example, were located in the same volost of Alfery Lukin held by his father Andrew Senov syn in 1500.¹¹⁴

Seven pomesties recorded as crown land in 1524 but continuously held by the same family of pomeshchiks thereafter were classified as old in 1552. Six were held as pomesties by at least two members of the family in direct succession. Two cases were found in Smolna parish. After Shavia Timofeev syn Bachin passed away in 1548, his twenty tax units passed to his two sons, Svoitin and Tretiak.¹¹⁵ When Subbota Yakovlev syn Tatarinov died at Kazan in 1550, his son Zhdanko received his father's share in the pomestie of thirty-one tax units in the volost of Alfery Afanasov jointly held by the seven sons of Yakov Tatarinov.¹¹⁶

The remaining four cases were found in Zhedritsy parish, where the lands of the Kuleshins and four branches of Levshins remained in the family after the death of the family head. When Vasily Kuleshin died in 1546, his 20.5 tax units in the volost of Alfery Afanasov passed to his two sons, Ivan and Semen.¹¹⁷ After Alexis Afanasiev syn Levshin died in 1546, his brother Gridia received his pomestie.¹¹⁸ The sons of Andrew Ivanov syn Levshin and his brother Vasily both received their respective father's pomesties.¹¹⁹ Although Timothy Ivanov syn Levshin continued to hold the pomestie in the Zhedritsy parish volost of Alfery Ivanov syn Afanasov received after 1524, the census-taker classified the estate as "old" in 1552 and recorded a pridacha of 8.5 tax units probably received when Timothy's sons Matvei and Fedor attained service age.¹²⁰

Two pomesties without 1539 returns may have been old despite their possession by different families in 1500 and 1552. In both cases the first pomeshchik from the second family passed the estate to his relatives. After Prince Dmitry Rostovsky died in 1547, his son Prince Ivan Dmitrievich served from his father's pomestie in the Strupinsk parish volost of Marfa Isakova; Yakush Rumiantsov, who held the estate in 1500, died later without known descendants.¹²¹ After Malbuga Andreev syn Lazarev retired from state service, his cousin Gridia Menshikov syn Lazorev served from his estate while continuing to support Malbuga. In 1500, Lazorev's twelve tax units were part of Ivan Poleuktov syn Buturlin's pomestie of fifty-five tax units in the volost of Alfery Ievlev of the Zhedritsy parish.¹²² Since Ivan's son Daniel was serving in 1539 and 1552 from the same twenty-three Zhedritsy tax units earlier held by his father (and there is no mention of Ivan Poleuktov syn after 1500), the elder Buturlin died and Lazorev (who was already retired in 1552) received his share shortly after 1500.¹²³

Twenty-four of the thirty-seven old pomesties, nearly seventy percent, passed from father to son in direct succession. Twenty cases involved the

transfer of single estates. In the Retno parish, for example, Ivashko Semenov syn Chikhachev received his father's old estate of seventeen tax units in the volost of Alfery Shimsky.¹²⁴ Four cases involved the son's inheritance of his father's share of pomesties jointly held by his father and uncles. The descent of the pomesties of the Tatarinovs of Smolna parish is representative. Zh-danko Tatarinov received the tax units earlier held by his father Subbota (who died at Kazan in 1550) with his six uncles (Istoma, Grisha, Bogdanets, Ivanets, Petrusha, and Grisha Bunia).¹²⁵

Other relatives could receive the lands of a deceased kinsman who died without direct heirs or with heirs who already had enough pomesties to serve. Alexis Levshin was succeeded by his brother Gridia as a joint holder of the family's 14.5 tax units in Zhedritsy parish.¹²⁶

Although most lands remained in the family from generation to generation, an unrelated servingman could receive part of the pomesties of a deceased pomeshchik with surviving sons if those sons either had enough pomesties to serve or preferred new lands elsewhere. It is important to recall that Ivan Poleuktov syn Buturlin's Zhedritsy land was divided between his son Daniel and Malbuga Andreev syn Lazorev: Daniel received twenty-three tax units and the family manor at Barsovo; Malbuga received twelve tax units shortly after 1500. Both pomeshchiks were still holding the same parcels in 1552.¹²⁷ The possibility that Malbuga was the elder Buturlin's son-in-law cannot be dismissed since this is one of the few cases in the cadasters where the lord's surviving adult male relatives did not receive all of his estate. Usually the land was divided between the sons or between sons and brothers of the deceased, depending on whether the deceased's land was held alone or jointly. Retiring at age sixty around 1550, when his cousin was ordered to serve from his estate and take care of him, Lazorev must have entered service shortly after 1500. Since there were no Lazorevs in Zhedritsy parish in 1500, he came to the area later, perhaps to marry Ivan Buturlin's daughter and Daniel Buturlin's sister. Since Ivan Buturlin had a large pomestie of more than fifty tax units but only two sons, it would be reasonable for the crown to permit the son-in-law to receive a share of his father-in-law's land, especially if Lazorev's own father didn't have enough pomesties to support his son's service.

CONCLUSION

The 1552 returns are an important supplement to the 1539 cadaster. The percentage of estates remaining in the original pomeshchik's family (fourteen of the nineteen estates, 73.6%) obtained by comparing the 1500, 1539, and 1552 returns is statistically equivalent to the figure (75%) found by comparing the

1500 and 1539 cadasters. If the twenty-four pomesties without 1539 returns are also considered, then the original pomeshchik's family continuously held thirty of the forty-four pomesties of 1552 (68.2%). The low rate of turnover (eighteen old, six new) of the 1552 pomesties without 1539 returns shows that the 1539 cadaster was representative of the entire province.

The 1539 and 1552 returns prove that most pomesties passed to the sons and the grandsons of the pomeshchiks of 1500. When a pomeshchik died without direct male heirs, his lands passed to brothers or cousins. In the absence of brothers or cousins the land would escheat to the crown to be re-granted to another family. The government preferred to grant the escheated land to old provincial families; five of the seven new pomesties were given to representatives of the old families who had been residing in Shelonskaia since the 1480s. The fact that only two of the thirty-six families mentioned in the 1552 cadaster were new shows the stability of the mid-sixteenth century pomestie. Since the pomestie remained in the original pomeshchik's family as long as the male members served the crown, the tenure resembled the allodial *votchina* more than a conditional fief.

The pomeshchik's ability to exchange his land without the crown's prior permission is another attribute of allodial landholding. The exchanges with non-pomeshchiks are especially significant. Whether the transactions were equivalent or not, the exchanges between pomeshchiks did not diminish the state's service land fund by removing the land from service. An unequal exchange with a monastery or small landowner did remove the land from service. The church was exempt from providing military servingmen while the petty landowners were exempt from service before the Service Decree of 1556/56 because their lands were held as *votchinas*. Although *votchinniks* as a category were no longer exempt after 1556, the petty landowners did not have enough land to serve.

When a pomeshchik exchanged two tax units of average land for one tax unit of average and one tax unit of poor land with the church or a petty landowner, the land fund was deprived of the extra income provided by the lost tax unit of average land. Although the equivalency of the pomeshchiks' transactions with the Yuriev monastery and the petty landowners could not be determined from the cadastral evidence, both exchanges whose equivalency could be compared were unequal. The ability to enter into unequal exchanges is legally significant because the income lost by exchanging higher quality for lower quality land resembles the purchase price paid for the location of the land near the manor. Unlike allodial land, conditional land can neither be bought nor sold.

The concept of the pomestie as allodial land was supported by the sources of *pridachas* uncovered in the cadaster of 1539. Most of the tax units granted

as pridachas came from the lands of other members of the pomeshchik's family. This sharply contrasts with 1552, when only one of the seven pomeshchiks receiving pridachas was given the lands of a relative. Since all but one of the earlier pomeshchiks had died intestate, however, the 1552 cadaster does not refute the thesis that pridachas usually came from the land of deceased relatives.

Pochinoks could be given as pridachas to pomeshchiks from other families, even while the founder was still in service. However, the pochinok was a new settlement established on previously unsettled land. Since all unsettled land belonged to the crown before being granted as votchinas or pomesties, establishing a pochinok did not give the founder legal title to the land. However, the opening up of new lands increased the pomeshchik's ability to serve by providing additional income. Since the crown did not want to discourage new settlements, most pochinoks were given to their founders as soon as they produced enough new income to justify their placement in a tax unit.

NOTES

1. See *NPK*, IV, 530–84 for the pomestie returns recorded in the Zherebtsov cadaster. Although the beginning is lost, the individual sheets were validated with Alexis Zherebtsov signature. On this see *NPK*, IV, ii. The returns for the petty landowners and monasteries were recorded after the pomesties. The fragments of the cadaster of Ivan Beleutov and Alexis Zherebtsov with the returns for the obrok-paying crown lands were published in *NPK*, V, 315–32.

2. On the maintenance pomesties with complete records, see the Kartmazova returns in *NPK*, IV, 529–30; and the Kropotova returns in *NPK*, IV, 545. Fedosia, the widow of Gregory Vdovin, received part of her late husband's estate in 1545, but her returns are incomplete; see *NPK*, IV, 582–83.

3. For the complete returns from the escheated Shamardin pomestie, see *NPK*, IV, 570.

4. *NPK*, IV, 562. The cadaster gives the number of hamlets and tax units, but not the peasants' dues, for each brother's estate, then for their jointly held pridacha. This information is followed by the total hamlets, tax units, and peasant obrok for all the brothers' lands, whether held individually or collectively, implying that the family's lands were still considered a unit.

5. See *NPK*, IV, 553–54 for the Dubrovsky returns. The two exchanges occurring before 1539 are in *NPK*, IV, 510–13.

6. The Daniel Shishmarev returns are in *NPK*, IV, 556–58.

7. *NPK*, IV, 543–44 (1552) and IV, 488–90 (1539).

8. The 1552 returns for Ivashko Semenov syn Chikhachev are in *NPK*, IV, 537–38. Semen Ilin syn Chikhachev's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 494–95. Fedor and Tretiak Kropotov also exchanged lands with a zemets, Ulian; see *NPK*, IV, 542–43 for the

1552 returns of Fedor Kropotov and his nephew, Ivanets Tretiakov syn. The 1539 returns for this pomestie, which was then held by Fedor and his brother Tretiak, are in *NPK*, IV, 492–93.

9. For the 1552 returns of Semen and Nechai Vasiuk syn Nazimov, see *NPK*, IV, 532–34; their 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 483–86.

10. Fedor Shchekin's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 544–45. Gavril Kropotov held the estate in 1539; see *NPK*, IV, 493. On the *sytmik*, the cupbearer who managed the household department responsible for the tsar's beverages, see Pushkarev, 156, and D'iachenko, *Polnyi tserkovno-slavianksii slovar'* (Moscow, 1993), 698.

11. See *NPK*, IV, 556–58, for Daniel Shishmarev's 1552 returns. The Ilemno parish returns from 1539 are lost.

12. For Yury Dubrovsky's 1552 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 553–54. The only returns for Prince Dmitry Beloselsky survive from 1539, when he held a pomestie of 18.5 tax units in Bolchino parish including the hamlet of Mezhiik. He was probably a minor at the time since the pomestie was assigned to his mother, the "widow Katherine of Prince Ivan Shafrov Beloselsky and her children Prince Dmitry and Prince Ivan." See *NPK*, IV, 408–10.

13. *NPK*, IV, 543–44 (1552) and IV, 488–90 (1539).

14. For the Dubrovsky returns, see *NPK*, IV, 553–54 (1552) and IV, 510–13 (1539). The Shchulepnikov returns are in *NPK*, IV, 533–34 (1552) and IV, 486 (1539). The Nazimov returns are in *NPK*, IV, 532–34 (1552) and IV, 484–86 (1539).

15. *NPK*, IV, 542–43 (1552) and IV, 492–93 (1539).

16. Prince Andrew Tulupov's complete 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 532. His fragmentary 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 478–83.

17. For Ivan Turgenev's 1552 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 573–74.

18. *NPK*, IV, 556–58.

19. For Semen Ivanov syn Bachin's returns, see *NPK*, IV, 564–65. For Istoma Tatarinov's returns, see *NPK*, IV, 567–68.

20. The returns for Vasily Kalitin's Smolna pomestie are in *NPK*, IV, 566. The returns for the Shafrov estate are lost.

21. Vasily Ezhov's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 560–61. Stepan Pasyukov syn Poyarov's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 563.

22. *NPK*, IV, 457.

23. *NPK*, IV, 537–38 (1552) and IV, 494–95 (1539).

24. *NPK*, IV, 554.

25. See the reference to Bobrov's possession of a share in Zakhonie in Andrew Surin syn Nazimov's 1539 returns in *NPK*, IV, 371.

26. See *NPK*, IV, 557, for the reference to Pup. The reference to Vezhishcha is in *NPK*, IV, 554.

27. See Semen Ivanov syn Bachin's 1552 returns in *NPK*, IV, 564–65. Also, see the reference to Shchilino in Istoma Tatarinov's 1552 returns in *NPK*, IV, 567.

28. Fedor Shchekin's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 544–45. For the reference to the Korostynia administrator (*prikashchik*) of the same name, who was living on a farmstead on the grand prince's land in 1524, see *NPK*, V, 388. Loginko Fedorov syn Shchekin, a state secretary, was also living on Korostynia crown land in 1524; see

ibid. A relative, Gridia Semenov syn Shchekin, lived in Korostynia parish in 1500; see *NPK*, IV, 114.

29. See *NPK*, IV, 559–60 (1552) and V, 15 (1500). Only the fragmentary returns from Gavril Muranov's pomestie survive from the 1539 Strupinsk cadaster; see *NPK*, IV, 513–14.

30. See *NPK*, IV, 529, for Yakov's returns.

31. For Daniel Buturlin's returns see *NPK*, IV, 570–71 (1552) and IV, 514–17 (1539). For Semen and Nechai Vasiuk syn Nazimov's returns see *NPK*, IV, 532–34 (1552) and IV, 483–86 (1539).

32. See *NPK*, IV, 553.

33. For Kropotov's 1552 returns see *NPK*, IV, 541; the 1539 returns are in IV, 500.

34. One unit of Pervoi's pridacha was located in the hamlet of Mikhailovshchino, in the Okolorusie. The remaining lands were located in the Shniatinsk (0.5 tax units) and Retno (0.25 tax units) parishes where Pervoi's old pomesties were found. See *NPK*, IV, 536–37 (1552) and IV, 490–92 (1539).

35. The entire estate (33.5 tax units after the pridacha) also had to support Ivan and Semen's mother and their third, underage, brother. See *NPK*, IV, 576–77.

36. *NPK*, IV, 561–62.

37. *NPK*, IV, 580–81.

38. See *NPK*, IV, 567–68 for the Tatarinovs' 1552 returns. Since the old parcels of the Tatarinov pomestie were crown land in 1524, they were received between 1524 and 1539. See *NPK*, V, 381, for the 1524 returns.

39. When Vasily died in 1550, his share passed to his sons, all three of whom were already co-holders of the pomestie before their father's death. See *NPK*, IV, 575, for the 1552 Levshin returns. For the reference to Iosif Unkovsky in the 1539 returns of Ivan Tyrtov, see *NPK*, IV, 275.

40. See *NPK*, IV, 573–74 for the Turgenev brothers' 1552 returns. The abridged returns of their father, Peter Mikhailov syn Turgenev, from the census of 1500 are in *NPK*, V, 63.

41. There are no other references to Potap Ivanov syn Buturlin or his descendants, if any, in the surviving cadasters. Ivan Mikhailov syn Buturlin's abridged 1500 returns are in *NPK*, V, 63. His other son (Daniel) held forty-eight Zhedrity tax units in 1539 and 1552. See *NPK*, IV, 514–17 (1539) and 570–71 (1552).

42. See *NPK*, IV, 313–16.

43. See Hammond, "History," 153.

44. *NPK*, IV, 536–37.

45. The Tatarinovs also received an earlier pridacha in the same Svinort parish. The pomestie of thirty-one tax units inherited by Yakov Tatarinov's sons included an unspecified number of "tax units held as a pridacha" in Svinort parish. See *NPK*, IV, 567–68.

46. *NPK*, IV, 573–74.

47. See *NPK*, IV, 562 for the Rumiantsov returns. The remaining cases include Yury Dubrovsky and Matvei Kropotov. 5.75 of his 7.75 additional tax units were located in the same Svinort parish where he resided on his manor. The remaining two tax units were located in Bolchino parish, where he already held 1.5 tax units. See

NPK, IV, 553–55. All of Matvei Kropotov's pridacha was located in the same parishes as his old pomestie. See *NPK*, IV, 541.

48. Ibid

49. *NPK*, IV, 573–74.

50. *NPK*, IV, 580–81.

51. *NPK*, IV, 576–77.

52. *NPK*, IV, 575.

53. Matvei Ivanov syn Kropotov's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 541; his 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 500. His brother Gavril's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 493–94.

54. For the Kuleshin's 1552 returns see *NPK*, IV, 576–77. The only reference to Vasily Pushkin, the previous holder of the Kuleshin pridacha, is found in the 1552 Kuleshin returns. See *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 70.

55. *NPK*, IV, 562.

56. For Yuri Aleksandrov syn Unkovsky's 1532 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 281. For the references to the Unkovsky family in the published cadasters see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 88.

57. Vasily Pushkin's father (Vasily) held seventeen tax units in the Opoka parish in 1500 and lived on his manor in the hamlet of Demeshkino. At the end of the 1500 returns the census-taker refers to additional pomesties in the volost of Vasily Isakov syn Fedotin, which was located in St Nicholas's parish of Vyshgorod district. See *NPK*, IV, 171–72. The only son of Vasily mentioned in the published cadasters is the Vasily Vasiliev syn referred to in the 1552 Kuleshin returns. An Ignaty Vasiliev syn Pushkin lived in 1500 on his manor in the hamlet of Nesushi in the Sabelsk parish of Vodskaiia province; see *NPK*, III, 122–27.

58. Nikita Kurtsov's seven Yasno tax units were granted to Timothy Levshin, whose returns are in *NPK*, IV, 580–81. The Levshin returns contain the only known reference to Kurtsov in the 1552 cadaster. Nikita's 1539 returns (see *NPK*, IV, 456) list his brothers Kostia and Daniel as co-holders of the Yasno pomestie. The absence of other references to the brothers suggests that all of them died intestate; see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 44. On Prokofy Konovnitsyn, see below, n. 59, and the *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 38. Fedor Kolachev, five of whose Slaviatinsk tax units were given as a pridacha to the Rumiantsovs, held six Resurrection and 12.5 Slaviatinsk tax units in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 52, 54 and *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 37. On the Shamardins, whose five Smolna tax units were given to the Tatarinovs, see *NPK*, Index, I-Vi, 93. The only other Shamardin referred to in the cadasters was Ignaty Vasiliev syn, whose lands escheated to the crown after his death in 1550; see *NPK*, IV, 570. On Anton Misinov, whose Retno abandoned lands (pustoshi) also were given as a pridacha to the Tatarinovs, see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 52. Misinov held twenty-three tax units in the parish in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 39. The only other references to Misinov concern the lands formerly held by him and subsequently granted to other pomeschchiks; see *NPK*, IV, 487 (1539) and IV, 534, 539, and 567 (all 1552 returns). On Potap Ivanov syn Buturlin, whose eleven Zhedritsy tax units, were granted as a pridacha to the sons of Peter Turgenev, see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 10. The Buturlins were an old Zhedritsy family; Potap's father Ivan held forty-eight tax units in the parish in 1500; see V, 63. Potap's brother, Daniel, and nephew, Ivan, held share of Ivan's lands in 1539 and 1552; see *NPK*, IV, 514–17 (1539) and 570–71 (1552). Since it was customary for parish lands to remain in the

family, Daniel's failure to inherit his brother's lands suggests an unknown familial relationship between Potap and the Turgenevs. If one of the Turgenev sons had married Potap's daughter and did not have enough land to serve, it would be reasonable for the crown to grant the land to the son-in-law rather than Potap's brother and nephew, who did have enough service land.

59. *NPK*, IV, 556–58.

60. *NPK*, IV, 562.

61. See *NPK*, V, 34, for the abridged returns from the Strupinsk parish crown land.

62. See *NPK*, IV, 319, or Michael Andreev syn Shishkin's returns.

63. For the Tatarinov returns, see *NPK*, IV, 567–68.

64. Daniel Chubarov syn Shishmarev's lands were concentrated in three parishes. The largest share consisted of the 8.5 Svinort tax units, followed by the seven St Nicholas's of Vysotsk tax units and the five Ilemno tax units. Although Shishmarev had an even small parcel (a half tax unit) than the Retno parcel in the Shniatinsk parish, Shniatinsk was less than ten versts from Svinort. See *NPK*, IV, 556–58.

65. The Dubrovskies (*NPK*, IV, 553–55), Pervois (*NPK*, IV, 536–37), Timothy Levshins (*NPK*, IV, 580–81), Nenarok Levshins (*NPK*, IV, 575), Rumiantsovs (*NPK*, IV, 562), Tatarinovs (*NPK*, IV, 567–68), and Turgenevs (*NPK*, IV, 573–74) received *pridachas* including *pochinoks*.

66. *NPK*, IV, 553–55.

67. *NPK*, IV, 580.

68. *NPK*, IV, 536.

69. *NPK*, IV, 562.

70. *NPK*, IV, 567–68.

71. See *NPK*, IV, 575, for the Nenarok Levshin returns and *NPK*, IV, 573–74, for the Turgenev returns.

72. For Tretiak and Kirei Baranov's 1500 abridged Slaviatinsk returns, see *NPK*, V, 54. On the lack of references to any of Kirei's descendants, see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 5.

73. *NPK*, V, 54, and *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 14, 86.

74. *NPK*, IV, 314.

75. For Peter Kropotov's 1539 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 488–90. His sons' 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 543–44.

76. *NPK*, IV, 584.

77. *NPK*, IV, 529.

78. *NPK*, IV, 583.

79. See *NPK*, IV, 564–65 for the Bachin returns, IV, 575, for the Levshin-Brukhatoi returns.

80. *NPK*, IV, 545. The passage in Fedor Shchekin's returns from 1552 contains the only reference to Dmitry Aksakov in the published cadasters; see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 1.

81. *NPK*, IV, 541.

82. For Agraфина Kropotova's returns from 1552, see *NPK*, IV, 545. Agraфина's *prozhitok* was taken from the land of the late clerk Gavril Muranov, on whom see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 54, and *NPK*, IV, 513–14 (the 1539 returns for his Strupinsk *pomestie*). He should not be identified with Agraфина's late husband, Gavril Ivanov syn

Kropotov, whose returns from 1539 were recorded under Retno parish in *NPK*, IV, 494–94.

83. On the *sytник* see above, n. 10.

84. *NPK*, IV, 513–14.

85. See *NPK*, IV, 566, for Vasily Kalitin's 1552 returns. See *NPK*, V, 381, for the returns surviving from the 1524 revisionary census. For the 1539 returns for Michael Chebotaev's Our Lady's pomestie, see *NPK*, IV, 313.

86. Prince Michael Zasekin's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 568–70. See *NPK*, V, 381, for the 1524 returns.

87. See *NPK*, IV, 561, for Ragoza Bulgakov's 1552 returns. For the 1500 returns assigning this volost to Yakov Rumiantsov, see *NPK*, V, 35.

88. See *NPK*, IV, 560–61, for Vasily Ezhov's 1552 returns.

89. *NPK*, V, 35.

90. Bogdan Rzhanikov's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 559–60.

91. For Yuriy Semenov syn Kartmazov's 1552 returns, see IV, 582. Although the pomestie was held by Dmitry Turgenev before his death in 1548, his father Peter Mikhailov syn Turgenev held it in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 64. Although the returns from 1539 have not survived, the pomestie was probably old in 1539 since a Turgenev held the land in 1500 and 1548.

92. Gregory Kartmazov's abridged 1500 returns are in *NPK*, V, 62. His widow's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 529–30.

93. Gridia Semenov syn Shchekin's 1500 Korostynia returns are in *NPK*, IV, 114–15. Loginko Fedorov syn Shchekin's 1539 Korostynia returns are in *NPK*, V, 388.

94. *NPK*, IV, 354.

95. For Prince Vasily's 1539 returns see *NPK*, IV, 313–16. For Dmitry Rumi-antsov's abridged 1500 returns, see *NPK*, V, 65.

96. See *NPK*, III, 464–65, for Loba Kalitin's 1500 Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov returns; the 1539 returns are in *PKVP*, 99–100. Kalitin also held additional Vodskaiia land in the St Andrew's at Gruzinsk parish; see *NPK*, III, 21, for the 1500 returns and *PKVP*, 92, for the 1539 returns.

97. *NPK*, IV, 559; V, 35.

98. *NPK*, IV, 560; V, 35.

99. *NPK*, IV, 561.

100. *NPK*, IV, 531–32 (1552); IV, 478ff (1539); and V, 62–63.

101. *NPK*, IV, 539–41 (1552); IV, 496–500 (1539); V, 40 (1500).

102. *NPK*, IV, 556–58 (1552); IV, 507–509 (1539); V, 38.

103. *NPK*, IV, 570–71 (1552); IV, 514–17 (1539); V, 63, 69 (1500).

104. *NPK*, IV, 572 (1552); IV, 517 (1539); V, 63 (1500).

105. For Yakov Savin syn Pervoi's 1552 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 536–37; his 1539 returns are in IV, 490–92. For the 1500 returns for this crown land, see V, 38.

106. *NPK*, IV, 573 (1552); IV, 520–21 (1539); V, 63 (1500).

107. *NPK*, IV, 542–43 (1552); IV, 492–93 (1539); V, 39–40.

108. *NPK*, IV, 543–44 (1552); IV, 488–90 (1539); V, 39 (1500).

109. *NPK*, IV, 553–54 (1552); IV, 510–13 (1539); V, 36–38 (1500).

110. *NPK*, IV, 532–34 (1552); IV, 483–86 (1539); V, 63 (1500).
111. For the Molchaninov returns, see *NPK*, IV, 541–42 (1552), and IV, 500–502 (1539). Also see Boris Evreev's abridged Shniatinsk returns from 1500 in V, 40. For Vasily Evreev's 1539 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 496–500; his 1552 returns are in IV, 539–41. Vasily's remaining tax units came from the lands of his "uncle Elizar Evreev," who was also serving in 1500 from Shniatinsk land. See *NPK*, IV, 40.
112. *NPK*, V, 35 (1500) and IV, 563 (1552). The term "maintenance pomestie" (*prozhitok*) was restricted to land retained by the widows, mothers, and underage children of a deceased pomeshchik. Retired pomeshchiks were called "nonserving" lords and their lands were called pomesties rather than *prozhitoks*.
113. For the 1552 returns from the pomestie of Zikhor, Tikhon, and Mikifor Rumiantsov, see *NPK*, IV, 561–62. Their father's 1500 abridged returns are in V, 35.
114. *NPK*, V, 63 (1500) and IV, 579 (1552).
115. *NPK*, IV, 565 (1552) and IV, 381ff (1524).
116. *NPK*, IV, 567–68 (1552) and IV, 381ff (1524).
117. *NPK*, IV, 576–77 (1552) and V, 375ff (1524).
118. *NPK*, IV, 579 (1552) and V, 375ff (1524).
119. For the pomesties inherited by Andrew Ivanov syn Levshin's sons in 1549, see *NPK*, IV, 581. For the lands received by Vasily Ivanov syn Levshin's sons after his death in 1550, see IV, 575.
120. *NPK*, IV, 580–81.
121. *NPK*, IV, 559 (1552); V, 34–35. See *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 73, for the references to the Rumiantsovs in the published surviving cadasters.
122. *NPK*, IV, 577–78 (1552).
123. Ivan Buturlin's abridged 1500 returns are in *NPK*, V, 63. His son Daniel's 1539 returns are in IV, 514–17; Daniel's 1552 returns are in IV, 570–71.
124. *NPK*, IV, 536–38 (1552) and IV, 494–95 (1539).
125. Zhdanko succeeded his father despite the fact that he was too young to serve; see *NPK*, IV, 567–68. On the Tatarinovs see above, n. 45.
126. *NPK*, IV, 579.
127. On Ivan Buturlin's Zhedritsy pomestie see the abridged 1500 returns in *NPK*, V, 63, and the fragmentary complete 1500 returns in V, 259–61. His son Daniel's 1539 returns are in IV, 514–17. Daniel's 1552 returns are in IV, 570–71; Malbuga Lazorev's 1552 returns are in IV, 577–78.

Chapter Five

The Cadaster of 1571 and the Shelonskaia Pomesties of Novgorod District

INTRODUCTION

The period between the revisionary census of 1552 discussed in the preceding chapter and the census of 1571 represents a generation during which old landlords died or retired while new landlords began their military service at the age of fifteen. By the 1570s, the pomestie system had existed in Shelonskaia for nearly a century, longer than anywhere else in the Muscovite state, and long enough for the development of the unwritten legal norms characteristic of customary law. The cadaster of Yanush Muraviev,¹ which includes the returns for 129 parcels of pomesties, twenty-six parcels of former pomesties and eleven prozhitoks, shows the operation of the pomestie system in eight parishes of Novgorod district.

The uneven survival of the cadasters complicates the problem of classifying the parcels. The loss of the 1539 Novgorod district cadaster leaves us with the abridged returns from the census of 1500. Since they only record the landlord's name and tax units per volost, the possession of the hamlets cannot be traced from generation to generation. This reduces the number of parcels capable of definitely being classified as old or new to the twenty-one residential² and eighteen nonresidential parcels whose returns refer to the former landlord.

The presence of the same families in the same parish in 1500 and 1571 permits the tentative classification of their parcels as old pomesties. However, other estates could have been old. The seventy-one year interval between the two censuses was more than enough time for the possession of the estates received after 1500 to descend to the original landlord's son, grandson, and great-grandson. There was also enough time for several generations of a sec-

ond family to retain possession of estates received from the crown after the original landlord's death without heirs.

THE EXCHANGE OF POMESTIES

Sixteen of the 166 returns (9.6%) contain references to the exchange of pomesties representing seventeen transactions involving thirty parties. The returns from the 12.5 tax units of Bystreevsk crown land earlier held by Gam Tyrtov's sons Mir and Fedor record two exchanges involving three parties. Mir's four tax units in the hamlet of Belsko Bolshovo were alienated to his nephew Dmitry Fedorov syn while his five tax units in the hamlet of Zavotskoi Konets were alienated to Andrew Osokin in separate exchanges. Both parcels escheated to the crown after the death of their landlords despite the former landlord's survival.³ Zavotskoi Konets' escheat to the crown after Osokin's death without heirs suggests that Mir's status as the former landlord did not give him a residual interest entitling him to reclaim the land if the other party to the exchange died without heirs.

The lack of interest in Belsko Bolshovo displayed by Dmitry Tyrtov's heirs (his brother Fedor and uncle Mir) probably caused its escheat to the crown. Since Belsko Bolshovo was abandoned, its acquisition would have added nothing to a new landlord's income. Since Mir and Fedor had abandoned land of their own, they probably were interested more in using their financial resources to attract new settlers to their own abandoned residential parcels.⁴ If the same considerations caused Mir to refuse Zavotskoi Konets, which was abandoned also, the escheat of Andrew Osokin's land to the crown does not disprove the former landlord's possession of a residual interest entitling him to reclaim exchanged pomesties if the other party to the transaction died without heirs.

The other fifteen returns record the exchange of land still held as pomesties in 1571. One refers to three transactions involving four parties. Levontei Ivanov syn Porkhovskiy's Lositsk returns refer to three tax units obtained from an exchange with Posnik and Rusa Saburov, six tax units received from Ivan Molchianinov syn Ereemeev, and 4.5 tax units received from Vasily Vysheslavtsov. All were abandoned before 1571.⁵ Eight returns refer to eight separate transactions between sixteen pomeschchiks. Although seven returns name both parties, only one party's returns survive. They include the transactions between Stepan Bobrov and Istoma Shchogolev, Vasily Ereemeev and Afanasy Tushin, Bogdan Loshakov and Fedor Kachialov, Zhdan Ovtsyn and Andrew Dubensky, Ivan Parsky and Nechai Parsky, and Vasily Parsky and Stepan Tushin.⁶ Sotnik Pustoshkin's returns, which refer to his acquisition of the Lositsk hamlet of Iukhnovo by exchange, do not mention the other party.⁷

Vasily Popadin syn Vysheslavtsov's two returns, which record separate exchanges of nonresidential pomesties in different parishes, also fail to refer to the other party.⁸ All but six of the 12.5 tax units located in Belsky parish and 2.5 of the 3.5 tax units located in Liadtsk parish were abandoned before 1571. Vasily could have acquired one of the parcels from an exchange with Levontei Ivanov syn Porkhovsky, who received 4.5 abandoned Lositsk tax units from a Vasily Vysheslavtsov.⁹ If so, Vysheslavtsov probably obtained the smaller Liadtsk parcel from the transaction since the Belsky parcel was nearly three times as large as the 4.5 tax units received by Porkhovsky. Although the Lositsk parcel ceded to Porkhovsky was a tax unit larger than the Liadtsk parcel obtained by Vysheslavtsov, one of the Liadtsk and none of the Lositsk tax units were still under cultivation. The location of the Lositsk parcel could have been responsible for Porkovsky's decision to participate in the transaction because he already held fourteen tax units in the same parish.

The possibility remains that neither of Vasily Popadin syn Vysheslavtsov's parcels were obtained from Levontei Porkhovsky. Since Porkhovsky's returns eliminate Vasily's patronymic, the Vasily Vysheslavtsov mentioned there could have been the Vasily Fedorov syn Popadin Vysheslavtsov¹⁰ who held nine abandoned nonresidential tax units in Lositsk parish or a third, unknown Vasily Vysheslavtsov whose returns are lost. Although Vasily Fedorov syn's returns do not refer to the exchange of pomesties, the loss of returns from his residential parcel raises the possibility that he exchanged Lositsk land with Porkhovsky to obtain additional land in the same parish as his manor.

The four remaining returns include both parties' records to two exchanges. Two refer to the exchange of pomesties between Gregory Yakovlev syn Nazimov and Filip Kharlamov. Gregory Yakovlev syn Nazimov's Shchepetsk returns refer to the exchange of one nonresidential tax unit with Filip Kharlamov in return for 1.25 tax units in the same Belsky parish where he already held 1.75 tax units. Semen Kharlamov's Shchepetsk returns record Filip's cession of the same Shchepetsk tax unit to his kinsman Semen.¹¹

The motives behind the participation of the two parties in the exchange are unclear. The loss of the returns from Gregory Nazimov's residential parcel prevents the role of the manor's location from being assessed, but his prior possession of 1.75 nonresidential tax units in the same Belsky parish as the land obtained from Filip Kharlamov suggests the desire to consolidate his holdings. Other considerations influenced Kharlamov. Since he did not have other land in Shchepetsk parish and the parcel obtained from Nazimov was several versts farther from his Liadtsk manor (Zakliapie), he was not interested in consolidating his pomesties or acquiring additional land near the manor.

Since the date of the exchange between Kharlamov and Nazimov is not given, the length of time Filip retained possession of the Shchepetsk land be-

fore ceding it to his kinsman Semen is unknown. If Filip entered into the transaction intending to cede the parcel to Semen later, the distance of the Shchepetsk land from Semen's holdings could have been a factor. The reference to the parcel's inclusion in Semen's oklad shows that he was not enfeoffed fully before its cession.¹² Filip's residential returns do not refer to his oklad, but he would not have been able to give land to a relative unless he had more than enough land to serve because the pomesties already in his possession exceeded his oklad. Although it was customary to cede the extra tax units to family members without enough land to serve, the pomeshchik determined which tax units to relinquish. Since most pomeshchiks preferred to hold pomesties in the same parish as their manor, it is unlikely that Filip would have wanted to relinquish some of his Liadtsk lands. The cession of his Belsky parcel would have increased the fragmentation of Semen's holdings. To prevent this Filip gave his Belsky parcel to Gregory Nazimov in return for one of Nazimov's tax units in the same Shchepetsk parish where Semen already held six tax units. As soon as the transaction was completed, Filip ceded the newly acquired Shchepetsk parcel to his kinsman Semen so he would have enough land for cavalry service.

The equivalency of the exchange between Gregory Nazimov and Filip Kharlmaov cannot be determined. The exchange seems unequal because Gregory received 1.25 tax units of abandoned land in the hamlet of Sysoevo in Belsky parish while Filip received one abandoned tax unit in Shchepetsk parish. However, the lack of data from Kharlamov's returns prevents the number of chetverts of arable land per tax unit on the two parcels from being compared.¹³

The last two returns refer to the exchange of pomesties between Dmitry Zlobin syn Yartsov and Zloba Pustoshkin. Since both parcels were located in the same Shchepetsk parish where Pustoshkin resided on his manor in the small village of Iazvee, the 8.5 tax units of average land received by Pustoshkin may have been closer to the manor than the 12.5 tax units of poor land given to Yartsov. The loss of Yartsov's residential returns obscures his motives for participating in the transaction. The net gain of four tax units received by Yartsov was probably not a factor since the same number of chetverts of rye was sown on both parcels. The desire to obtain settled land could have been a factor since 8.5 of the tax units received by Yartsov and none of the tax units given to Pustoshkin had dues paying peasants. The cadasters, however, only record the situation in 1571, shortly after the devastation suffered from the oprichnina; both parcels could have been fully occupied at the time of the exchange.¹⁴

The geographic distance of the exchanged pomesties from the lord's manor could be determined in the eight cases where the lord's residential returns also

survived. The newly acquired parcels of six pomeshchiks were located in the same parish as the lord's manor: Stepan Bobrov of Shchepetsk parish, Vasily Eremeev of Liadtsk parish, Zloba Pustoshkin of Shchepetsk, Sotnik Pustoshkin of Lositsk, Zhdan Ovtsyn of Belsky and Bogdan Loshakov of Lositsk parish.¹⁵ In two cases the parcels acquired by exchange and the lord's manor were located in different parishes. The tax unit obtained by Ivan Parsky from his exchange with Nechai Parsky was located in the same Liadtsk parish as his other six nonresidential tax units.¹⁶ In Filip Kharlamov's case, the new acquired parcel was located in the same parish as the holdings of his kinsmen Semen, to whom he ceded the land.¹⁷

The location of the lord's manor but not the newly acquired pomestie was known in one case. The reference in Levontei Ivanov syn Porkhovskiy's returns to his exchange with Posnik and Rusa Saburov fails to specify which tax units were transferred to the Saburovs. Since Posnik and Rusa's returns for the parcel are lost, its location is unknown. However, the lack of references to the parcel in their residential returns eliminates Lositsk parish as a possible location.¹⁸

THE FRAGMENTATION OF THE ESTATE

The distance between the residential and nonresidential parcels of the sixteen landlords whose sixteen residential and seventeen nonresidential returns survive was calculated to determine the degree of estate fragmentation. Three pomeshchiks (18.75%) held three nonresidential parcels in the same parish as their manor: Fedor Likharev of Sabelsk, Braga Simansky of Bystreevsk, and Elizar Tyrtov of Liadtsk. Since all of a pomeshchik's contiguous holdings were recorded as one entry, the separate returns for the residential and nonresidential parcels of Fedor Stepanov syn Likharev and Elizar Tyrtov prove that their residential and nonresidential parcels were located in different parts of the same parish. The separation of Likharev's residential and nonresidential returns by those of his sister-in-law Aksinia and Elizar Tyrtov's residential and nonresidential returns by those of Peter Andreev syn Tushin, Ivan Vasiliev syn Tushin, Andrew Vasiliev syn Tushin, and several other pomeshchiks confirm this.¹⁹ The absence of other pomeshchiks' returns between the residential and nonresidential returns of Ogar Simansky's sons Braga and Saltan prove that the parcels were adjacent to one another. Their returns were separate because they held their manor at Log in joint tenancy with their younger brother Mikula and their nonresidential parcel alone.²⁰

Two pomeshchiks held nonresidential parcels less than twenty versts from their manor. Mir Gamov syn Tyrtov's Bystreevsk manor was located in the

small village of Vyshkovo seventeen versts from his Lositsk parcel.²¹ Zakharii Ivanov syn Volokhov's Lositsk manor in the small village of Sapog was the same distance from his Bystreevsk parcel.²² The location of three nonresidential parcels in the same parish as the manor and two nonresidential parcels only seventeen versts away indicates that nearly thirty percent of the nonresidential parcels were less than twenty versts from the lord's residence.

Five pomeshchiks (31.25%) held six (29.4%) nonresidential parcels more than twenty but less than thirty versts from their manor. Filip Kharlamov's Liadtsk manor at Zakliapie was located twenty-four versts from his Belsky parcel.²³ The Belsky parish manors and Liadsk parcels of Zhdan Ostafiev Ovtsyn, Ivan Veshnikov syn Parsky, and Daniel Gavrilov syn Peshkov and the Liadtsk manor and Belsky parcel of Ivan Vasiliev Tushin were located twenty-four versts from each other.²⁴ Ovtsyn's Lositsk parcel was 28.7 versts away from his manor.²⁵ The five pomeshchiks holding six nonresidential parcels less than thirty versts from the manor and the five pomeshchiks holding five nonresidential parcels less than twenty versts from the manor represent 62.5% of the residential lords holding 64.7% of the nonresidential parcels.

The last six pomeshchiks held six nonresidential parcels more than thirty versts from their manors. Three were thirty-two versts from the manor. One of the Belsky parcels of Vasily Glotov's sons Kurbat and Menshik was thirty-one versts from their Dremiatsk manor of Dubetsko.²⁶ The other Belsky parcel, which they shared with their younger brothers Fedor and Sherap, was the same distance from the Dremiatsk manor of Zarechie jointly held by all four brothers.²⁷ Ignaty and Nechai Buturlin's Lositsk parcels were 33.5 versts away from their respective Shchepetsk manors in the small villages of Uldega and Griaznoe.²⁸ The five parcels less than thirty-five versts from the manors of their five landlords and the ten parcels less than thirty versts from the manors of their eleven landlords represent 94.1% of the parcels held by 93.75% of the sixteen landlords.

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PARISH FAMILIES

Only a small number of old parish families were uncovered by comparing the abridged parish returns from 1500 with the complete returns from 1571. Sixteen (41%) of the thirty-nine parish families who held at least one residential parcel in 1571 had representatives in the same parish in 1500. They included the Blagois and Ragozins of Belsky, the Lugveneys, Simanskies, and Vorobins of Bystreevsk, the Glotovs of Dremiatsk, the Palekhovs, Kharlamovs, Trofimovs, Tushins and Tyrtovs of Liadtsk, the Eremeevs and Voronins

of Lositsk and the Afrosinins, Buturlins, and Pustoshkins of Shchepetsk. Two branches of Pustoshkins, Andrew's sons Ivan and Stepan and Pirei's sons Guria and Zhdanka, resided on their respective manors at Shchepets and Vorotnoe in the same Shchepetsk parish where Andrew and his kinsmen Semen and Filia held nearly a hundred tax units in 1500.²⁹

Only four (8.6%) of the forty-six parish families holding nonresidential land (the Babichevs and Rozladins of Belsky, the Borshchovs of Bystreevsk and the Tyrtovs of Lositsk) had representatives in the same parish in 1500. Mir Gamov syn Tyrto, who held 1.75 nonresidential tax units in the same Lositsk parish where Semen Tyrto held 21.5 tax units in the volost of Alexander Timofeev in 1500, is one example.³⁰ Dmitry Borshchov, who held two tax units inherited from his father Andrew in the same Bystreevsk parish where his kinsman Osoka held fifteen tax units in the volost of Ivan Moseev syn Babkin in 1500, is another example.³¹

Eight (47%) of the seventeen parish families whose lands had escheated to the crown or been abandoned because the landlord was taken into the oprichnina had representatives in the same parish in 1500. They included the Nashchokins and Shchulepnikovs of Belsky, the Nashchokins of Bystreevsk and the Blagois, Lodygins, Lugvenevs, Nashchokins and Shchulepnikovs of Lositsk. Semen Lugvenev's sons, Dementy and Michael, who held 18.5 tax units and resided on their manor at Zaozerie in Lositsk before their lands reverted to the crown after they were taken into the oprichnina, are an example because their kinsman Negodai Lugvenev held twenty-six tax units in the volost of Michael Blekle in the same parish in 1500.³²

Comparing the Novgorod district families of 1571 and 1500 suggests a higher degree of continuity. Since five district families (the Eremeevs of Liadtsk and Lositsk, the Kvashnins of Belsky and Shchepetsk, the Loshakovs of Lositsk and Shchepetsk, the Pustoshkins of Lositsk and Shchepetsk and the Tyrtovs of Bystreevsk and Liadtsk) had separate branches holding manors in different parishes, the thirty-nine parish residential families represented thirty-four district residential families. The sixteen old residential families, none of whom had representatives in more than one parish in 1500, represent forty-seven percent of the district families of 1571.

The number of district families holding nonresidential parcels is also smaller than the number of parish families. Eight of the forty-six nonresidential parish families held nonresidential parcels in more than one parish. Two of the eight families (the Eremeevs and Nazimovs) held nonresidential parcels in three parishes—Belsky, Bystreevsk and Shchepetsk. Six of the eight families held nonresidential parcels in two parishes: the Kharlamovs and Nagois in Belsky and Shchepetsk, the Ovtsy in Liadtsk and Lositsk, the Parskies in Liadtsk and Shchepetsk, the Tushins in Belsky and Lositsk, and

the Vyshcheslavitsovs in Belsky and Liadtsk. Since the eight parish families held eighteen parcels in different parishes, thirty-six families held nonresidential land in the Novgorod district. The four old nonresidential families, none of whom held nonresidential land in more than one parish, represent eleven percent of the district's nonresidential families.

The number of district families was also smaller than the number of parish families whose former pomesties were unassigned or held by the crown in 1571. Since the Nashchokins had former pomesties in three (Belsky, Bystreevsk, and Lositsk) and the Shchulepnikovs in two (Belsky and Lositsk) parishes, the seventeen parish families represent fourteen district families. The eight parish families with representatives in the same parish in 1500 represent five district families because the Nashchokins and Shchulepnikovs were old families in the parishes where their former estates were located. The five old district families represent 35.7% of the fourteen district families.

The small percentage of old families suggests a significant turnover of land during the preceding seventy years. Since the same family often held several manors in the same parish, each occupied by a different branch of the family, the percentage of families represented in 1500 is misleading. A comparison of the number of residential parcels held by families with representatives in the same parish in 1500 with residential parcels held by newer families shows a low rate of turnover. The sixteen old residential families held thirty-five (56%) of the sixty-two residential parcels of 1571.

THE TURNOVER OF RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

References to the former landlord in the 1571 returns and the survival of a fragment of the complete 1498 Belsky cadaster permit the definite classification of twenty-two of the sixty-two residential parcels. Eighteen parcels were old because the pomeshchik's father was cited as the previous landlord in the 1571 cadaster. Stepan Bobrov's returns, which refer to his father Zaleshan as the former landlord of the 21.5 tax units in Shchepetsk parish where he resided at Gorb, are an example.³³ One Belsky parcel was old because a comparison of the 1498 fragment and the complete 1571 returns proved that Pozniak Blagoi lived on the same manor at Kotorsko and held most of the hamlets his father Vasily had in 1498.³⁴ Twelve of the nineteen old residential parcels belonged to families with representatives in the same parish in 1500. One belonged to the Blagois of Belsky, four to the Pustoshkins of Shchepetsk parish, and seven to the Buturlins of Shchepetsk, the Eremeevs of Lositsk, the Ragozins of Belsky, the Trofimovs, Tushins, and Tyrtovs of Liadtsk and the Vorobins of Bystreevsk.³⁵

Seven of the nineteen residential parcels which were considered old because of their prior possession by the pomeshchik's father belonged to families who did not have any known representatives in the same parish in 1500: the Bobrovs, Boltins, Shusherins and Toporkovs of Shchepetsk, the Golovnins of Liadtsk and the Vyshcheslavltsovs of Lositsk.³⁶ If the seven parcels are added to the thirty-five residential parcels belonging to old parish families, forty-two of the sixty-two residential parcels (67.7%) were either definitely or probably old in 1571.

Since seven of the twenty-seven residential parcels held by families without representatives in the same parish in 1500 were old in 1571 because they had belonged to the same family for more than a generation, only twenty (32%) of the residential parcels could not be considered old. Three of the twenty parcels were definitely new because their returns cite an earlier landlord from another family. Vasily Ivanov syn Ereemev's 1571 Liadtsk returns for the ten tax units on which he resided in his manor at Meshnik cite Diatl Moshkov as the former landlord.³⁷ Ostalets Igolkin's returns for the 2.5 tax units where he resided in the small Shchepetsk village of Gverezno cite Ivan Shusherin as the former landlord.³⁸ Alexis Nikitin syn Loshakov's returns for the 16.3 tax units where he resided in the small Shchepetsk village of Makarovshchino refer to Stepan and Osip Blagoi as the former landlord.³⁹ Seventeen of the twenty parcels could be new since their landlords did not belong to old parish families.

THE TURNOVER OF THE NONRESIDENTIAL PARCELS

The sixty-seven nonresidential parcels held by the Novgorod district pomeshchiks of 1571 have a much higher rate of turnover than the residential parcels. Only eight (12%) parcels could be considered old because their returns cited another member of the pomeshchik's family as the former lord. Earlier pomeshchiks' sons inherited four. Dmitry Borshchov received two tax units in Bystreevsk parish from his father Andrew.⁴⁰ Gregory Yartsov succeeded to the 7.5 tax units of his father Semen in the same Shchepetsk parish where Bogdan Loshakov inherited the sixteen tax units of his father Daniel.⁴¹ Ivan Vyshcheslavltsov succeeded to the 3.5 tax units in the Lositsk parish earlier held by his father Ratman.⁴²

Three nonresidential parcels passed to the former landlords' brothers. Voin Grigoriev syn Kvashnin held eight Shchepetsk tax units earlier belonging to his brother Semen while Fedor Stepanov syn Likharev held 7.3 tax units in Sabelsk parish held by his brother Ivan before becoming a prisoner in the Livonian War.⁴³ Alfery Nikitin syn Loshakov obtained twelve of his thirty-

one nonresidential tax units in Shchepetsk parish from a property division agreement with his brother Stepan.⁴⁴

One of the old nonresidential parcels came from an exchange with another relative. Veshniak Par sky's sons Ivan and Gregory obtained an abandoned tax unit in the hamlet of Vitinezh in Liadtsk parish from an exchange with Nechai Parsky.⁴⁵ The degree of Nechai's relationship to Ivan and Gregory is unknown because his patronymic is not given.

Eight of the fifty-nine nonresidential parcels whose returns do not refer to an earlier landlord from the same family could have been old because the pomeshchik belonged to an old parish family. Prince Ivan Ivanovich Babichev held 5.5 nonresidential tax units in the same Belsky parish where his father Prince Ivan Babich had a tax unit in 1500.⁴⁶ Vladimir Rozladin's sons (Vasily, Piatoi, and Fedor) held 23.5 nonresidential tax units in the same Belsky parish as Dmitry Rodivonov syn Rozladin. The latter held eleven tax units in the volost of Pavel Overkeev, 2.5 tax units in the volost of Ivan Dereviazhkin's widow Ofimiia, eight tax units in the volost of Semen Petrov's sons Ereimei and Klim, 1.5 tax units in the volost of Fedor Kostiantinov syn Domozhirov and one tax unit in the volost of Ivan Stepanov in 1500.⁴⁷ Mir Gamov syn Tyrtoev had 1.75 tax units in the same Lositsk parish as the 21.5 tax units in the volost of Alexander Timofeev held by Semen Tyrtoev in 1500.⁴⁸

Three of the eight nonresidential parcels of the old parish families belonged to landlords who had manors in the same parish as their nonresidential parcel. Braga and Saltan Simansky had 28.5 residential tax units in the same Bystreevsk parish as their twenty-two nonresidential tax units.⁴⁹ They shared their manor in the small village of Log with their brother Mikula, who also held twelve nonresidential tax units in the Bystreevsk parish.⁵⁰ Elizar Tyrtoev held 8.25 residential tax units and lived in the small village of Khtino in the same Liadtsk parish as his seven nonresidential tax units.⁵¹

Two of the eight nonresidential parcels of old parish families belonged to pomeshchiks whose relatives had manors in the same parish in 1571. Ivan Molchianinov syn Ereimeev held a nonresidential tax unit in the same Lositsk parish as the village of Andreevo where his cousin Afanasy Andreev syn Ereimeev lived on 12.5 tax units.⁵² Fedor Meshcherinov syn Ragozin had a nonresidential parcel in the same Belsky parish as the village of Lychnitsy where his brother Osip resided on twenty-one tax units.⁵³ The eight nonresidential parcels belonging to old parish families and the eight parcels whose returns refer to an earlier landlord from the same family represent twenty-four percent of the nonresidential parcels.

Ten (15%) of the sixty-seven nonresidential returns refer to a former landlord from another family. Five refer to the voluntary alienation of land during

the former landlord's life. The returns of Gregory Nazimov of Shchepetsk, Vasily Parsky of Liadtsk, and Levonty Porkhovskiy of Lositsk record the exchange of pomesties between two pomeshchiks. The returns of Vasily Fedorov syn Vysheslavtsov record his possession of nine nonresidential tax units in Lositsk parish earlier held by Elizar Tyrtov, a Liadtsk pomeshchik who was still alive in 1571. The absence of references to the crown and the poor condition of the land are evidence of Tyrtov's voluntary cession of the parcel after the departure of his peasants. Semen Kharlamov's returns refer to the voluntary cession of a tax unit in Liadtsk parish obtained by his kinsman Filip through an exchange with a third party from another family.⁵⁴

The other six tax units of Semen Kharlamov's Liadtsk parcel were new because of their acquisition after the death of a landlord from another family. So can all of the nonresidential tax units belonging to Fedor Baranov, Gregory Elagin and Dmitry Yartsov of Shchepetsk, Vasily Ereemeev and Tretiak Kulikovskiy of Belsky.⁵⁵

Semen Kharlamov was the only landlord of new tax units to belong to an old parish family. In 1500 Palka and Ivashko, the sons of Iuska Kharlamov, had thirty tax units in the Liadtsk volosts of Semen Petrov, Fedor Krokhotkin's sons Daniel, Rodion, and Dmitry, and Gridia Esipov.⁵⁶

A comparison of the surnames of the earlier landlords of the new parcels and the pomeshchiks of 1500 was necessary to determine whether the former landlords belonged to old parish families. The earlier presence of the family of the former landlords of the Kulikovskiy parcel in Belsky parish was impossible to establish because they were petty landowners, Kuzma's sons Volforomeik and Denis, without surnames.⁵⁷

All but one of the other former landlords of the new parcels belonged to old parish families. The Buturlins, Afrosinins, and Pustoshkins (the earlier holders of the Boranov, Elagin, and Yartsov parcels) were old Shchepetsk families. In 1500, Ivan Grigoriev syn Buturlin held sixty-one tax units in the volost of Gregory Tuchin with his sons Timoshka and Michael and 21.5 tax units along the Pliusa River with his brother Ivan. The Pustoshkins had three representatives among the Shchepetsk pomeshchiks of 1500: Semen held twenty tax units in the volost of Esip Maksimov and 17.5 tax units in the volost of Kostiantin Nozhkin; Andrew also had 28.5 tax units in the volost of Esip Maksimov while Filia held 29.5 tax units in the volost of Kostiantin Mikhailov. Three generations of Afrosinins held Shchepetsk land, beginning with Ivan, whose widow Matrena and sons Semen, Matvei, and Nikita held 24.5 tax units in the volost of Luka Fedorov and 31.5 tax units in the volost of Dmitry Kozonsky in 1500. Semen's son Yury was the former landlord of the ten tax units held by Gregory Elagin in 1571.⁵⁸ The Rozladins (the earlier holders of the Ereemeev parcel) were an old Belsky family. In 1500 Dmitry

Rodivonov syn Rozladin held eleven tax units in the volost of Pavel Overkeev, 2.5 tax units in the volost of Ivan Dereviazhkin's widow Ofimia, eight tax units in the volost of Semen Petrov's sons Eremai and Klim, 6.5 tax units in the volost of Fedor Kostiantinov Domozhrov, and one tax unit in the volost of Ivan Stepanov. His brothers Ivanka and Kostia separately held twenty-two and twenty-five tax units in the same Belsky parish.⁵⁹

Comparing the surnames of the former landlords of the new parcels and the other pomeshchiks of 1571 revealed the existence of heirs who could have claimed the nonresidential parcels after the former landlord's death. Sons who were still living in the same parish in 1571 survived two former Shchepetsk landlords. Timothy Buturlin, the former holder of Fedor Boranov's 2.5 tax units, had a son Nikita who held 30.25 tax units and resided on his manor of Avramovskoe.⁶⁰ Yury Semenov syn Afrosinin, the former holder of Gregory Nikitin syn Elagin's ten tax units, had a son Fedor who had ten tax units and a manor at Riaptsovo.⁶¹ Collateral relatives survived two former Shchepetsk landlords. The heirs of Zloba Pustoshkin, the former holder of Dmitry Zlobin syn Yartsov's 12.25 Shchepetsk tax units, included eight cousins (Gregory, Guria, Ivan, Levontei, Nechai, Oksen, and Timothy) and two widows (Aksinia and Fetinia) of deceased cousins (Cheklo and Ivan), all of whom had manors in the parish in 1571. So did another cousin, Zloba Fedorov syn Pustoshkin. Since the latter Zloba lived with his father and younger brothers at Iazvee, he was probably too young to be the Zloba cited as the Yartsov parcel's former landlord.⁶² The heirs of Filip Shusherin, the former holder of seven of Semen Kharlamov's Shchepetsk tax units, included Daniel Fedorov syn and Vasily Rychkov syn, both of whom had manors in the parish.⁶³

The heirs of Dmitry Rozladin, the former holder of Vasily Ereemeev's eleven tax units in Belsky parish, included Volodimer Rozladin's three sons (Vasily, Piatoi, and Fedor). Although the three brothers resided elsewhere, their nonresidential parcel of 23.5 tax units was located in Belsky parish.⁶⁴

Since the cadasters do not refer to the crown's prior confiscation of the new parcels, their reassignment to a pomeshchik from another family may represent the voluntary refusal of the former landlord's heirs to claim possession. The abandonment of large tracts of land during the economic dislocation of the late 1560s and 1570s and the difficulty of attracting enough dues-paying peasants to return the land to cultivation could have been factors.

All of the former landlords' heirs had abandoned land. While 25.25 of Zloba Pustoshkin's 38.5 Shchepetsk residential tax units had peasants, all but nine of Nikita Buturlin's 30.25 and nearly a third of Fedor Afrosinin's ten residential Shchepetsk tax units were abandoned. Since the pomeshchiks could not utilize the land already in their possession, the acquisition of more abandoned land was not economically feasible.

Although some of the new parcels were still under cultivation in 1571, most were not. Two of the 2.5 Shchepetsk tax units alienated from the Buturlins to Fedor Boranov, but only 3.5 of the ten Shchepetsk tax units alienated from the Afrosinins to Gregory Elagin and 1.5 of the 7.5 Shchepetsk tax units alienated from the Pustoshkins to Gregory Yartsov were still productive in 1571.

The economic value of the small number of tax units still under cultivation was slight. If the peasants who occupied the productive tax units were heavily in debt and required loans from the landlord to survive, the former landlords' heirs would have received little, if any additional income. Since the heirs had been unable to carry the indebtedness of the peasants who had fled their own abandoned lands, they probably were unable to take on the burden of the few peasants who remained on their recently deceased relatives' lands.

The location of the heir's manor and the former pomeshchik's nonresidential parcel in different parishes could have been a factor in his refusal to claim possession in two cases. Since none of the parish returns refer to Vasily Rozladin as a residential landlord, his residence could not have been located in or near the same Belsky parish as the nonresidential parcel of Dmitry Rozladin which was given to Vasily Eremeev.⁶⁵ The heirs of Filip Shusherin lived in Shchepetsk parish while the six tax units given to Semen Kharlamov after Shusherin's death were located in Liadtsk parish. Daniel Fedorov syn had a manor at Vetso while his cousin Vasily Ruchkov syn lived at Iazvee.⁶⁶

The five whole parcels and the partial parcel alienated from the former pomeshchik's family after his death represent nine percent of the sixty-seven nonresidential parcels. If the forty-two parcels in the possession of pomeshchiks without relatives in the same parish in 1500 are considered, forty-eight parcels (71.6%) could have been new.

FORMER POMESTIES

The 1571 Novgorod cadaster included the returns from twenty-six parcels of former pomesties. The census-takers reclassified seventeen parcels as crown land by referring to the tsar as the landlord. The seventeen parcels included the former lands of nineteen pomeshchiks since one of the parcels combined three hamlets (Maloe Belsko, Belsko Bolshovo, and Zovotsky Konets) earlier belonging to Fedor Gamov syn Tyrtov, Dmitry Fedorov syn Tyrtov, and Andrew Osokin into one parcel.⁶⁷ The nine remaining parcels consisted of unclassified abandoned land. Although they were no longer in a pomeshchik's possession, they cannot be considered crown land because the tsar was not listed as the landlord.⁶⁸

Determining whether the previous landlords of the seventeen parcels of crown land came from old or new parish families required a comparison of their surnames to the pomeshchiks of 1500. The former landlords of eleven (64.7%) parcels belonged to old parish families: The Blagois, Nashchokins, and Shchulepnikovs of Belsky parish, the Nashchokins and Tyrtovs of Bystreevsk parish, the Lodygins, Lugvenevs, Nashchokins and Shchulepnikovs of Lositsk parish, the Tulupovs of Sabelsk and the Pustoshkins of Shchepetsk parish. Afanasy Nashchokin's family, for example, was holding Belsky land more than seventy years before his half tax unit escheated to the crown after his death. In 1500, his kinsman Ivan Andreev syn Nashchokin held 13.5 tax units in the volost of Matvei Teliatov and 31.5 tax units in the volost of Ofimia, Esip Goroshkov's widow.⁶⁹ The passage of several generations between 1500 and 1571 was enough time for their parcels to become old family land before their reversion to the crown.

None of the former landlords of the six remaining parcels of crown land belonged to families with earlier representatives in the same parish in 1500. Two of the parcels belonged to separate branches of the Lositsk Blagois before their landlords, Andrew Verigin syn and Stepan Fendrikov syn, were taken into the oprichnina.⁷⁰ The other four parcels belonged to the Zhiborovs of Bystreevsk, the Porkhovskies and Saburovs of Lositsk, and the Khlopovs of Sabelsk.⁷¹

The previous landlord's surname was compared to the other provincial pomeshchiks to determine the existence of heirs at the time of the land's reversion to the crown. Four of the seven landlords who lost their lands upon being taken into the oprichnina had close relatives living in the 1570s. Zamiatna Vasiliev syn Blagoi's brother Posnik still lived in Belsky parish at Kotorosko in 1571. Posnik was a cousin of the Lositsk Blagois, Andrew Verigin syn and Stepan Fendrikov syn, who were taken into the oprichnina at the same time as his brother.⁷² Ivan Semenov syn Lugvenev, another former Lositsk pomeshchik, had a brother Andrew and cousin Volodimer Ivanov syn who resided on their respective manors at Uzmena and Ontushov in Bystreevsk parish.⁷³ Three of the former landlords taken into the oprichnina (Vasily Khlopov of Sabelsk, Peter Gavrilov syn Shchulepnikov of Lositsk, and Afanasy Zhiborov of Bystreevsk) did not have any relatives holding Novgorod district land in 1571.⁷⁴

Six of the twelve former landlords who were not taken into the oprichnina did not have relatives living in Novgorod district in 1571. Three (Vasily Zakharev syn Shchulepnikov, Andrew Osokin, and Andrew Tulupov) also had no survivors living in the Porkhov district in 1576.⁷⁵ The other three (Afanasy of Belsky, Gregory Myslakov syn of Bystreevsk, and Mysl of Lositsk) belonged to the Nashchokins, an old district family. Although the 1571 Novgorod

cadaster does not refer to any living Nashchokins, the 1576 Porkhov cadaster includes the returns of Ivan Semenov syn Nashchokin, a Dubrovno parish pomeshchik who resided on his manor at Golovitsy. Since all but five of his 23.5 vyts were abandoned, he probably was interested more in attracting peasants to his Dubrovno estate than in inheriting his cousins' tax units, all of which were abandoned and none of which were located near his manor.⁷⁶

Six of the twelve former landlords who were not taken into the oprichnina were survived by other family members who were still holding pomesties in Novgorod district in 1571. Fedor Tyrto, the former holder of the abandoned hamlet of Maloe Belsko in Bystreevsk parish, was survived by his son Elizar and brother Mir Gamov syn. Mir and Elizar survived their son and nephew Dmitry, the former holder of the Bystreevsk hamlet of Belsko Bolshovo.⁷⁷ Ivan Nikitin syn Pustoshkin, the former holder of an abandoned half tax unit in Shchepetsk parish, was survived by his sons, Gregory and Dmitry, whose manor at Matfeev was located in the same parish. Eight Pustoshkin cousins also had manors in Shchepetsk parish.⁷⁸ Rus Alekseev syn Saburov, the former holder of 1.5 abandoned tax units in Lositsk parish, was survived by two brothers, Dmitry and Ivan, who held 27.5 and 20.5 tax units respectively in the same parish.⁷⁹ Michael Porkhovsky, the former holder of an abandoned tax unit in Lositsk parish, was survived by two cousins, Levontei Ivanov syn and Nikita Borisov syn, who held 18.5 and 3.5 tax units in the same parish.⁸⁰ Andrew Subotin syn Lodygin, the former holder of 4.5 abandoned tax units in Lositsk parish, was survived by his cousin, Vasily Griaznov syn, who held four tax units in Bystreevsk parish.⁸¹

The economic circumstances of the heirs of the earlier landlords of the former pomesties and the survivors of the former landlords of the new parcels were similar. All the heirs had their own abandoned pomesties. 8.5 of the eleven Shchepetsk parish tax units of Ivan Pustoshkin's sons, Gregory and Dmitry, were uncultivated because of their peasants' departure.⁸² So were most of the Lositsk lands of Rus Saburov's brothers Dmitry and Ivan.⁸³ Neither the lands of Michael Porkhovsky's cousins Levontei and Ivan in Lositsk parish nor the tax units of Andrew Lodygin's cousin Vasily in Bystreevsk parish were occupied by dues-paying peasants.⁸⁴ Since the heirs had difficulty retaining old and attracting new peasants to their own estates, they were unable to accept their relatives' abandoned lands, causing their reversion to the crown.

The former landlords of the nine parcels of abandoned and unassigned former pomesties included Sava Musin, Eremai Rumiantsov and Filip Sverbeev of Belsky, Zloba Esiukov, Alexander Osokin, Zamiatna Samarín, Fedor and Yury Simansky of Bystreevsk, and Semen Lugvenev of Lositsk. A comparison of their surnames to the parish pomeshchiks of 1500 uncovered three

from old parish families. Semen Lugvenev, whose sons Dementy and Michael held his 18.5 tax units before being taken into the oprichnina, belonged to an old Lositsk family represented by Negodai Lugvenev, the holder of twenty-six tax units in the volost of Michael Bleklov, in 1500.⁸⁵ Fedor Danilov syn and Yury Simansky, who separately held two Bystreevsk tax units, belonged to an old Bystreevsk family. The 82.5 tax units held by Palka, Semen, and Michael Simansky represented more than a third of the 227 tax units held by Bystreevsk pomeshchiks in 1500.⁸⁶ A fourth, Alexander Levontiev syn Osokin, belonged to an old Bystreevsk family if the descendants of Osoka Borshchov, who held fifteen tax units in the volost of Ivan Moseev syn Babkin and 11.5 tax units in the volost of Fedor Ostafiev syn Kirilov in 1500, adopted the surname Osokin later in the sixteenth century.⁸⁷ If the four former landlords are included with the eleven former landlords of the crown lands, fifteen of the twenty-six (57.7%) earlier landlords of the former pomesties belonged to old parish families.

The surnames of the former landlords of the unassigned parcels were compared to those of the pomeshchiks who continued to hold pomesties in 1571. All but three of the former landlords died without heirs. Fedor and Yury Simansky were survived by a large family whose lands were concentrated in the same parish as their former parcels. Since the Simanskies had abandoned lands of their own, they probably were not interested in their deceased cousins' abandoned parcels.⁸⁸ The same considerations could explain Andrew Lugvenev's failure to claim the 18.5 abandoned tax units of his brothers Dementy and Michael. Although Andrew lived in the same Bystreevsk parish, all but 12.5 of his 35.5 tax units were abandoned.⁸⁹

CONCLUSION

The Muraviev cadaster is an important source for the study of Novgorod landholding in the second half of the sixteenth century. Since the Novgorod district cadasters from 1500 only record the tax units per volost and the 1539 Novgorod returns are lost, the 1571 cadaster provides the only complete set of sixteenth century pomestie returns for the eight parishes with surviving cadasters.

The inability to trace the possession of the hamlets on each estate from census to census requires the historian to rely on the earlier presence of the landlord's relatives in the same parish as an index of the continuity of possession when the returns omit the earlier landlord's name. Since the Porkhov pomeshchiks of 1539 and 1576 from old parish families continued to hold the

same land as the pomeshchiks of 1500, the Novgorod servingmen from old families probably held the same parcels as their ancestors.

Comparing the surnames of the pomeshchiks of 1500 and 1571 suggests a higher rate of turnover in the second half of the sixteenth century. The forty-two residential and fifteen nonresidential parcels which belonged to the old parish families of 1500 only represent forty-four percent of the 129 parcels still held in pomestie tenure and a mere thirty-seven percent of the 155 parcels of pomesties and former pomesties.

The appearance of a higher rate of turnover is misleading. Although only a quarter of the nonresidential parcels belonged to old families, fifty-six percent of the residential parcels belonged to old families. This approximates the percentage (58%) of Porkhov estates remaining in the same family between 1500 and 1540. Since the seventy year interval between the two censuses was more than enough time for new pomeshchiks to pass their lands to their sons and grandsons, other parcels could have been old. The seven old residential parcels held by the son of a former pomeshchik from a family without representatives in the same parish in 1500 are evidence of this.

The twenty-two residential and eighteen nonresidential parcels capable of being definitely classified provide additional evidence of a lower rate of turnover. The nineteen residential and eight nonresidential parcels earlier held by the pomeshchik's family represent 67.5 percent of the forty parcels. The low rate of turnover implies that the later sixteenth century pomestie continued to remain in the lord's family as long as the male members provided military service.

The alienation of the definitely new pomesties to other families and of former pomesties to the state despite the survival of the earlier landlord's relatives do not prove that the state no longer considered the pomestie hereditary family land under customary law. The percentage (20%) definitely new pomesties and former pomesties is too small to be representative of the entire population of current and former pomesties. Since all of the relatives of the former landlords of the new pomesties belonged to old parish families, they probably were residing on their own old pomesties in 1571. Fifteen (54%) of the twenty-eight former landlords of the twenty-six parcels belonging to the former pomesties died without survivors. Since the entire realm was considered the tsar's patrimony, any landlord's death without heirs caused his land to escheat to the crown whether it was owned as a votchina or possessed as a pomestie. Four of the thirteen former landlords with survivors were taken into the oprichnina. Since the oprichnina was an extraordinary campaign conceived and executed by Ivan IV to punish boyars and servingmen suspected of treason, the crown's acquisition of their land was an act of confiscation outside of pomestie law.

The economic dislocation of the late 1560s and 1570s is an important factor in the alienation of the former landlords' estates from their families. All of the survivors had abandoned land of their own. The failure to retain old and attract new dues-paying peasants to their older lands reduced the income needed for cavalry service. Even the presence of the peasants on the landlord's estate did not guarantee an income if the peasants were in debt. Since their relatives' abandoned land added nothing to their income unless they could attract peasants and they were having difficulty retaining their old peasants, it was not economically feasible for them to claim possession of their deceased relatives' parcels. Since their refusal to claim the land was voluntary, the alienation of the parcels does not refute the thesis proposed in the earlier chapters that the pomestie was considered the hereditary property of the landlord's family as long as the males served in the cavalry.

NOTES

1. For the cadaster of Yanush Muraviev, see *NPK*, V, 428–571. All of the following parishes except St Peter's have surviving pomestie returns.

Parish-1571 Returns-1500 Returns

Belsky-*NPK*, V, 519–48-*NPK*, V, 17–20

Bystreevsk-*NPK*, V, 472–90-*NPK*, V, 11–12

Dremiatsk-*NPK*, V, 390–96-*NPK*, V, 22–25

Liadtsk-*NPK*, V, 548–72-*NPK*, V, 13–14

St Peter's-*NPK*, V, 441-*NPK*, V, 25–27

Sabelsk-*NPK*, V, 512–19-*NPK*, V, 30)31

Shchepetsk-*NPK*, V, 442–72-*NPK*, V, 15–16

2. The author uses the term 'residential' to refer to the parcels on which the pomeshchik maintained his residence; other parcels are considered 'nonresidential' because the landlord lived elsewhere.

3. See *NPK*, V, 488–89 for the returns from the Bystreevsk crown land referring to the two exchanges. See *NPK*, V, 485–87 for Mir Gamov syn Tyrtov's residential returns.

4. Most of Mir Gamov syn Tyrtov's known holdings were abandoned before 1571. His Bystreevsk residential pomestie consisted of 32.5 abandoned and only nine occupied tax units. His Lositsk parcel consisted of 1.75 abandoned tax units. Since neither of Mir's returns mention the exchanges with Dmitry Fedorov syn and Andrew Osokin, their equivalency cannot be determined. See *NPK*, V, 485–87 and 507. All but 3.33 of Elizar Fedorov syn Tyrtov's seven nonresidential and two of his 8.25 residential tax units were abandoned. For his residential returns see *NPK*, V, 554–55; for his noncontiguous nonresidential parcel, see *NPK*, V, 562.

5. See Levontei Porkhovsky's returns in *NPK*, V, 511.

6. See the returns of Stepan Bobrov (*NPK*, V, 456–57), Vasily Ereemeev (*NPK*, V, 550), Alfery Loshakov (*NPK*, V, 463–64), Bogdan Loshakov (*NPK*, V, 496–97), Zhdan Ovtsyn, Ivan Parsky (*NPK*, V, 553) and Vasily Parsky (*NPK*, V, 466).

7. Sotnik Pustoshkin's returns are in *NPK*, V, 506–507.

8. See Vasily Popadin syn Vysheslavitsov's Liadtsk returns in *NPK*, V, 559, and his Belsky returns in *NPK*, V, 525.

9. See above, n. 4.

10. For Vasily Fedorov syn Popadin Vysheslavitsov's returns, see *NPK*, V, 505–506. Since the adoption of surnames was not yet final in the sixteenth century, Vasily Fedorov syn's father could have been the son of Popa Vysheslavitsov and the brother of Vasily Popadin syn Vysheslavitsov, making Vasily Fedorov syn the nephew of Vasily Popadin syn Vysheslavitsov. By Vasily Fedorov syn's day, the descendants of Popa Vysheslavitsov's father could have been numerous enough to justify the use of the surname Popadin Vysheslavitsov to distinguish Popa's from his brothers' descendants.

11. See *NPK*, V, 450 (Gregory Nazimov), and *NPK*, V, 458 (Semen Kharlamov).

12. On the oklad, see Pushkarev, 74. See *NPK*, V, 450, for the reference to Filip Kharlamov's conveyance of the parcel received from an exchange with Gregory Nazimov to Semen Kharlamov.

13. Nazimov's returns indicate that five chetverts of arable were sown in each of two fields for each tax unit, so that the abandoned parcel received from Kharlamov consisted of 6.15 chetverts of arable. See *NPK*, V, 526, for Gregory Nazimov's Belsky returns. The absence of data for the land received by Kharlamov suggests the parcel had been abandoned for a longer period.

14. See *NPK*, V, 462 for Dmitry Yartsov's and *NPK*, V, 448–50 for Zloba Pustoshkin's returns.

15. See *NPK*, V, 456 (Bobrov), 550 (Ereemeev), 448 (Z. Pustoshkin), 528 (Ovtsyn), 496 (Loshakov), 506 (S. Pustoshkin).

16. See *NPK*, V, 537 and 553.

17. See above, n. 11.

18. See *NPK*, V, 498 for Posnik and Rus Saburov's Lositsk residential returns.

19. *NPK*, V, 514–16 (Likharev); *NPK*, V, 554–562 (Tyrtov).

20. *NPK*, V, 479–82.

21. *NPK*, V, 485–87, 507.

22. *NPK*, V, 477, 499–501.

23. *NPK*, V, 523 (Belsky) and 552–53 (Liadtsk).

24. For the returns from Ovtsyn's Belsky manor (the hamlet of Zaruchie), see *NPK*, V, 528–29; his Liadtsk returns are in *NPK*, V, 558–59. For Parsky's Belsky manor (Svarets) see *NPK*, V, 537; for his Liadtsk parcel see *NPK*, V, 553. For Peshkov's Belsky manor (the hamlet of Zakhonie), see *NPK*, V, 531–32; his Liadtsk parcel is located in *NPK*, V, 561. The returns from Tushin's Liadtsk manor, which was located in the small village of Bobrovo, are in *NPK*, V, 556–57; Tushin's Belsky returns are in *NPK*, V, 527–28.

25. *NPK*, V, 507.

26. *NPK*, V, 493 (Dremiatsk) and 524–25 (Belsky).

27. *NPK*, V, 490–93 (Dremiatsk) and 524 (Belsky).
 28. See Ignaty Buturlin's returns in *NPK*, V, 459 (Shchepetsk) and V, 510 (Lositsk). For Nechai Buturlin's returns see *NPK*, V, 445–46 (Shchepetsk) and 509–510 (Lositsk).
 29. See Appendix H for the pomeshchiks of 1571 and the earlier representatives from their families who held land in the same parish in 1500. For the returns from the parcel of Ivan and Stepan Pustoshkin see *NPK*, V, 458–59; see *NPK*, V, 453–55 for the returns from Guria and Zhdanka Pustoshkin's parcel. The 1500 Shchepetsk returns for Andrew Pustoshkin are in *NPK*, V, 16.
 30. *NPK*, V, 507 (1571); *NPK*, V, 12 (1500).
 31. *NPK*, V, 474 (1571); *NPK*, V, 12 (1500).
 32. *NPK*, V, 511–512 (1571); *NPK*, V, 13 (1500).
 33. *NPK*, V, 456–57.
 34. For Pozniak Blagoi's returns, see *NPK*, V, 532–34. His father Vasily's complete returns from 1500 are in *NPK*, V, 257–59.
 35. See the returns for Ignaty Buturlin (*NPK*, V, 459), Afanasy Ereemeev (*NPK*, V, 501–502), Guria Pustoshkin (*NPK*, V, 453–55), Ivan Pustoshkin (*NPK*, V, 458–59), Timothy Pustoshkin (*NPK*, V, 465), Zloba Pustoshkin (*NPK*, V, 448–50), Osip Ragozin (*NPK*, V, 526–27), Ivanets Trofimov (*NPK*, V, 561), Ivan Tushin (*NPK*, V, 556–57), Elizar Tyrtov (*NPK*, V, 554–55) and Alexander Vorobin (*NPK*, V, 487–88). See the abridged 1500 returns from the following parishes: Belsky (*NPK*, V, 18–20), Bystreevsk (*NPK*, V, 11–12), Liadtsk (*NPK*, V, 13–14), Lositsk (*NPK*, V, 12–13), and Shchepetsk (*NPK*, V, 16).
 36. See the returns for Stepan Bobrov (*NPK*, V, *NPK*, V, 456–57), Boris Boltin (*NPK*, V, 451–52), Bogdan Golovin (*NPK*, V, 559), Daniel Shusherin (*NPK*, V, 453), Vasily Shusherin (*NPK*, V, 452), Andrew Toporkov (*NPK*, V, 462–63) and Vasily Vyshcheslavtsov (*NPK*, V, 502–503).
 37. *NPK*, V, 550.
 38. *NPK*, V, 459–60.
 39. *NPK*, V, 466–68.
 40. *NPK*, V, 474.
 41. See *NPK*, V, 450, for the Yartsov returns and *NPK*, V, 452, for the Loshakov returns.
 42. *NPK*, V, 503.
 43. See *NPK*, V, 450, for the Kvashnin returns and *NPK*, 516, for the Likharev returns.
 44. Whether Alfery and Stepan were dividing their father Nikita's lands is unclear since the cadasters from Nikita Loshakov's pomesties are lost and none of the other cadasters refers to him. Their father could not have been a Shchepetsk landholder since the 1571 parish returns were complete. Since none of the cadasters refers to Loshakovs in Shchepetsk parish before 1571, the two brothers did not belong to an old Shchepetsk family.
- The reference in Stepan's Shchepetsk residential returns (*NPK*, V, 468–70) to his possession of four Kositsk tax units suggests the Loshakovs were an old Kositsk

family. The failure to introduce the pomestie system into the parish before the completion of the census of 1500 (the returns in *NPK*, V, 29 refer to the zemets Gridka Ivanov Rekolsky as the only private landholder) and the loss of the later parish returns is consistent with the absence of earlier references to Nikita in the cadasters. If Nikita were a Kositsk landholder, the property agreement would have involved Kositsk land. Stepan's residence in a different parish than his father suggests he was older than Alfery and therefore entered military service earlier. Nikita's dependence on his Kositsk pomestie to support his wife and younger son would have caused the crown to give Stepan pomesties elsewhere. Since Nikita's Kositsk pomestie could support only one cavalryman's service, it could not be divided equitably between his heirs unless the elder son, Stepan, ceded some of his Shchepetsk tax units to his younger brother. A *delovaia zapis* was necessary because the two brothers were dividing the Kositsk land of a third party, their father, of which neither had possession. Under the agreement, part of Stepan's Shchepetsk residential parcel was given to Alfery, who in turn would have received most of his father's Kositsk pomestie. The failure of Alfery's nonresidential Shchepetsk returns (*NPK*, V, 463–64) to refer to Kositsk pomesties does not preclude his possession of land in the parish since references to additional land in other parishes only were included with residential returns. On the *delovaia zapis*, also known as a *razdel'naia zapis*, see the *Slovar' russkogo iazyka*, Imperial Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg, 1892, p. 1232, and Pushkarev, 25. Alfery also held two tax units earlier belonging to Matvei Loshakov. The omission of Matvei's patronymic prevents the degree of his relationship to Alferei Loshakov from being determined. If the Matvei Loshakov referred to in Alfery's returns and the Matvei Epifanteev syn Loshakov of Belsky parish are identical, Alfery and Matvei were cousins; see *NPK*, V, 521–23.

45. *NPK*, V, 537, 553.

46. *NPK*, V, 17, 529–30.

47. *NPK*, V, 17, 538.

48. *NPK*, V, 12, 507.

49. *NPK*, V, 479–82. Their relatives Palka, Semen, and Michael Simansky held 29.5, 28.5, and twenty tax units respectively in the same parish in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 11.

50. *NPK*, V, 477–78.

51. *NPK*, V, 14, 554–55, 562.

52. See *NPK*, V, 501–502, and 511 for the Eremeevs' 1571 returns. Their relatives Boris and Ivan Eremeev held twenty-one and fifteen tax units respectively in the same parish in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 12.

53. Although Fedor continued to hold the nonresidential parcel in 1571, the land was abandoned and no longer placed in tax units. See *NPK*, V, 526–27 for the Ragozin brothers' 1571 returns. Fedets and Denis held twenty-four and 24.5 Belsky tax units respectively in the volost of Vasily Lutianov in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 18.

54. See the returns for Semen Kharlamov (*NPK*, V, 458), Gregory Nazimov (*NPK*, V, 450), Vasily Parsky (*NPK*, V, 553), Levonty Porkhovskiy (*NPK*, V, 511) and Vasily Fedorov syn Vysheslavtsov (*NPK*, V, 505–506).

55. For the new parcels see *NPK*, V, 446–47 (Baranov), 470–72 (Elagin), 462 (Yartsov), 436–37 (Eremeev), 537 (Kulikovsky), and 505–506 (Vysheislavtsov).

56. *NPK*, V, 14.

57. *NPK*, V, 537.

58. *NPK*, V, 16.

59. *NPK*, V, 18–19.

60. *NPK*, V, 444.

61. *NPK*, V, 471–72.

62. For Zloba Pustoshkin's 1571 returns, see *NPK*, V, 448–50.

63. *NPK*, V, 452–53.

64. *NPK*, V, 538.

65. *NPK*, V, 536–37.

66. *NPK*, V, 452–53.

67. See *NPK*, V, 488–89.

68. The census-takers carefully distinguished abandoned lands still held in pomestie from abandoned parcels no longer claimed by the former pomeshchik or his heirs. The preposition *za* followed by the pomeshchik's Christian name and patronymic in the instrumental and the surname in the genitive cases designated parcels remaining in the old landlord's possession despite his peasants' departure. "For Ivan Molchianinov syn Eremeev" ("Za Ivanom za Molchianinovym synom Eremeeva") headed the returns from his completely abandoned nonresidential parcel in Lositsk parish; see *NPK*, V, 511. Abandoned parcels no longer claimed by the former landlord and his heirs that were not reclassified as crown land were designated in one of two ways. Three entries refer to the previous assignment of the land to the former pomeshchik before his death. Sava Musin's returns begin: "In Belsky parish, what had been assigned to the newly baptized Sava Musin, but Sava died." See *NPK*, V, 530 ("V Belskom pogoste, chto bylo za novokreshchenym za Savoi Musinym, i Savy v zhivote ne stalo"). The same heading began Eremai Selivanov syn Rumiantsov and Filip Samuilov syn Sverbeev's Belsky returns; see *NPK*, V, 530–31.

Six entries refer to the unassigned former pomestie by using the adjective form of the former landlord's Christian name followed by the patronymic and surname in the genitive case, the same formula used by Ivan III's census-takers to designate the former volosts of the Novgorod boyars. The returns from the former Bystreevsk nonresidential parcel of Alexander Levontiev syn Osokin begin with "Alexander Levontiev syn Osokin's former pomestie" ("Oleksandrovscoe pomestie Levontieva Osokina") and conclude with a reference to the crown's failure to reassign the pomestie after his death; see *NPK*, V, 489. The last landlord's name was usually, but not always, used to designate the unassigned former pomestie. The census-takers used Semen Lugvenev's name to refer to the former Lositsk pomestie later held by his sons, Dementy and Michael, before they were taken into the oprichnina, see *NPK*, V, 511–12. Also see the returns from the former pomesties of Zloba Esiukov (*NPK*, V, 489), Zamiatna Samarin (*NPK*, V, 489), Fedor Simansky (*NPK*, V, 488), and Yuri Simansky (*NPK*, V, 490).

69. *NPK*, V, 18 (1500) and 531 (1571).

70. *NPK*, V, 509.

71. Vasily Khlopov, who had held 4.5 tax units in Sabelsk parish, and Afanasy Zhiborov, who had held five tax units in Bystreevsk parish, were both taken into the oprichnina. See *NPK*, V, 517–18 (Khlopov) and 530–31 (Zhiborov). The reasons for the reversion of Michael Porkhovskiy and Rus Alekseev syn Saburov's Lositsk tax units to the crown are not given; see *NPK*, V, 508.

72. See *NPK*, V, 531 for the crown land formerly belonging to Zamiatna Blagoi and *NPK*, V, 532–34 for Posnik Blagoi's returns. The returns from the crown lands formerly belonging to Andrew Verigin syn and Stepan Fendrikov syn Blagoi are given in *NPK*, V, 509. Zamiatna Blagoi did not live long after being taken into the oprichnina since his widow Okulina was holding a prozhitok in 1571 formerly belonging to Ivan Nesvetaev syn Blagoi before his capture in the Livonian War. See *NPK*, V, 521, for Okulina's returns.

73. The returns from the crown land formerly belonging to Ivan Semenov syn Lugvenev are in *NPK*, V, 509. See *NPK*, V, 478–79 and 483–84 for Volodimer Ivanov syn and Andrew Semenov syn Lugvenev's returns. See *NPK*, V, 13 for the abridged 1500 returns from Negodai Lugvenev's twenty-six tax units.

74. Peter Gavrilov syn Shchulepnikov was the only one of the three former landlords to come from an old parish family. En Zakharov syn held ten tax units in Lositsk parish in 1500; see *NPK*, V, 13. For the 1571 returns from the crown lands earlier held as pomesties, see *NPK*, V, 489 (Zhiborov), 508 (Shchulepnikov), and 517–18 (Khlopov).

75. See Appendix I for the Porkhov district pomeshchiks.

76. *NPK*, V, 676.

77. See above, n.s 2 and 3.

78. For the returns from the crown land formerly held in pomestie by Ivan Nikitin syn Pustoshkin, see *NPK*, V, 472. For Gregory and Dmitry Pustoshkin's returns, see *NPK*, V, 460. For the returns of Ivan Pustoshkin's cousins, see *NPK*, V, 448–50, 453–460, 461, and 465–66. A ninth cousin, Sotnik Semenov syn, had an abandoned residential parcel in Lositsk parish; see *NPK*, V, 507–508.

79. *NPK*, V, 498–99.

80. *NPK*, V, 508, 510–511.

81. *NPK*, V, 487, 509.

82. See above, n. 75.

83. Only 14.5 of Dmitry's 27.5 and 7.5 of Ivan's 20.5 tax units were still under cultivation in 1571; see *NPK*, V, 498–99. Their residential returns are lost.

84. See above, n. 77. Levontei and Nikita Porkhovskiy's residential returns are lost.

85. *NPK*, V, 13, 511–512. The records for the former Semen Lugvenev pomestie refer to the parcel's possession by his sons Dementy and Michael after their father's death. The parcel was abandoned after they were taken into the oprichnina and not reclassified as crown land.

86. *NPK*, V, 11, 488, 490.

87. *NPK*, V, 12, 489.

88. Although Fedor Danilov syn Simansky was still alive in 1571, his Dubrovno manor, which was located in the hamlet of Putilovo, was abandoned before 1576. See

NPK, V, 489 (1571) and 676 (1576). For the returns of the Simanskies who were holding Bystreevsk manors in 1571, see *NPK*, V, 475–77 (Daniel's sons Nikita and Afanasy), *NPK*, V, 482–83 (Dementy Kashin syn), and 479–81 (Ogarok's sons Braga, Saltan and Mikula).

89. Dementy's and Michael's brother Ivan, who held five tax units in the same Lositsk parish, was taken into the oprichnina also; see *NPK*, V, 509. Their brother Andrew and nephew Volodimer, Ivan's son, continued to reside on their Bystreevsk manors at Uzmena and Ontushov Podol; see *NPK*, V, 483–85 for Andrew and *NPK*, V, 478–79 for Ivan's returns.

Chapter Six

The Cadaster of 1576 and the Shelonskaia Pomesties of Porkhov District

INTRODUCTION

The cadaster compiled by Volodimer Matveevich Bezobrazov in 1576 is our principal source for the Porkhov district, the area between the Novgorod district surveyed in the preceding chapter and the southern boundary of Shelonskaia province. The returns describe the town of Porkhov and thirteen of the district's nineteen parishes, including Porkhov, Karachunsk, Bolchino, Pazherevitsy, Belsky, Nativity, Degzha, Smolna, St Michael and St George's, St Michael's-on-the-Uza, Dubrovno, Opoka, and Ruchie.

The continuity of possession displayed by the Porkhov pomestie at mid-century implies the crown's recognition of the pomestie as hereditary property as long as the adult males continued to serve in the pomeschchik cavalry. The Bezobrazov cadaster, completed only six years after the sack of Novgorod, seems to refute the evidence found in the earlier Porkhov cadasters; the state had confiscated or the former lords abandoned a third of the parcels and half of the manors. The incidence of abandoned and confiscated pomesties, however, may reveal more about the oprichnina than the legal development of the later sixteenth century pomestie. By referring to the confiscated and abandoned parcels by the former lord's name, the cadaster makes it possible to trace the possession of the pomestie from the eve of the oprichnina in the late 1560s back to the beginning of the pomestie system in the late fifteenth century.

The uneven survival of the sixteenth century parish returns complicates the comparison of the 1576 returns with earlier censuses. Only seven of the twelve parishes have complete returns from 1539 and 1576. Smolna has returns from 1552 but not 1539. Dubrovno, Karachunsk, St Michael's-on-the-

Uza, and Opoka only have returns from 1498.¹ Dubrovno and Opoka have complete returns; Karachunsk and St Michael's-on-the-Uza only have abridged returns listing the pomeshchik, volost, and number of tax units. Since the 1498 abridged returns omit the hamlets and the 1576 returns omit the volosts, the possession of the pomesties of 1576 located in these parishes cannot be traced definitely to 1498. The cases of Druzhin and Sumorok Karaulov, who resided on their Karachunsk manors of Frolovo and Maliatino on the eve of the oprichnina, illustrate the problem. The Karaulovs' roots in the Karachunsk parish can be traced to 1498 when Sobina Karaulov held sixteen tax units in the hamlets formerly belonging to the archbishop of Novgorod.² Given the low rate of turnover found in other parishes, the estate could have been old. Yet the interval between the censuses of 1498 and 1576 represents nearly three generations. Since the volost where Karaulov's hamlets were located is unknown, a different family could have held his lands in 1498. If the government had granted the estate shortly before 1539, it could have been old in 1576 since more than a generation separates the two censuses. The loss of the 1539 cadasters, however, conceals the date of the parcel's acquisition.

Some parcels located in the four parishes without returns from the 1539 census are classifiable because they belonged to a lord residing in a parish with complete records. The returns from the 1576 census were recorded under the parish of their geographic location because most pomesties were either confiscated by the government or abandoned by their lords; the census-takers of 1539 recorded the lord's entire estate with the returns from the parish of his residence. The Dubrovno parcel held by Vasily Mikitin syn Shishkin in 1576 is an example. Although the 1539 Dubrovno parish returns are lost, the 1539 returns for Vasily's Dubrovno parcel survive because it was part of the pomestie jointly held by his father Mikula and uncle Michael (the sons of Andrew Shishkin), who resided in the Porkhov area parish.³ Vasily's parcel was therefore "old."

THE RESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF THE OLD PARISH FAMILIES

Sixty parcels occupied by lords living in their manor houses were located in the twelve parishes with earlier surviving returns.⁴ Excluding the maintenance pomestie of Matrena Ogareva, the widow of Ivan Ogarev, leaves fifty-nine parcels held by pomeshchiks serving in the cavalry before the oprichnina.⁵

Thirty-one of the fifty-nine parcels (52.5%) whose earlier returns survive were definitely classifiable as "old" or "new." Twenty-seven of the thirty-one parcels (87.1%) were "old" because members of the same family had continuously held them for more than a generation. Seventeen of the old parcels

were located in parishes with returns from 1539. The Degzha parish parcel including Filanovo, for example, was held by Ivan Borisov syn Ogarev on the eve of the oprichnina and Semen Aleksandrov syn Ogarev in 1539.⁶ Six were located in the two parishes with complete returns from 1498 but none from 1539. One case involves Semen Yuriev syn Esiukov's 1576 Dubrovno parcel held by Gridia Grigoriev Esiukov in 1498.⁷ Another case involves the Opoka parcel of Koslovo, which was held by Pauk Ivanov syn Kositsky on the eve of the oprichnina and his father and uncle, Ivan and Kuzma, the sons of Yakov Kositsky, in 1498.⁸ Although complete 1498 returns do not survive from Karachunsk, Istoma Choglokov's parcel at Pliusnino was also old since his relative Ivashko Choglokov held 13.5 tax units in the hamlets of Afanasy Pliusnin in 1498. Since the Pliusnino was named after the former Novgorod votchinnik, it was probably founded before 1480.⁹

Since nearly a quarter century separates the revisionary census of 1552 from the census of 1576, the three Smolna parcels held by the same family in 1576 and 1552 were also classified old. The parcel of Alexis Kalitin recorded in 1576 was held by Ivan Kalitin's sons Vasily and Iosif in 1552.¹⁰ Oliabia Kalitin's parcel was held by his father Iosif and uncle Vasily in 1552.¹¹ Gregory Tatarinov resided on the same parcel in 1576 and 1552.¹²

Thirteen (76%) of the seventeen residential parcels located in parishes with surviving returns from 1539 were already old by 1539. Yury Tyrtov's 1576 Degzha pomestie, for example, was held by Yury Vasiliev syn Tyrtov in 1539 and his father Vasily in 1498.¹³ If the seven old parcels located in parishes without 1539 returns and capable of being classified from the 1498 cadaster are included, the same families held and were living on twenty-four (88%) of the residential parcels since the original grants in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The locations of the pomeshchiks' residences in 1576, 1539, and 1498 were compared to determine whether they preferred to remain in their father and grandfather's residences or establish new manor houses elsewhere. The locations of the manor houses of the Smolna pomeshchiks of 1576 (Alexis Kalitin, Oliabia Kalitin, and Gregory Tatarinov) could not be compared because of the lack of references to the residence in the 1552 returns.¹⁴ Two of the seventeen old residential parcels of 1576 located in parishes with 1539 returns included hamlets earlier held by another family. The Degzha residential parcels of Semen Ivanov syn Uskoi and his brother Zloba were "old" because they included the old Uskoi family lands around Rytaiia earlier belonging to Rium Fedorov syn Uskoi. Rium Fedorov syn Voronoi held the remaining hamlets for which returns survive from the 1539 census. Since Semen's residence at Peshchivaia cannot be traced to 1539, he could have established the hamlet on old family lands after 1539. His brother's residence, however, was

located in the same hamlet of Gorodok occupied by Rium Voronoi in 1539. Since the Uskoi family lands were abandoned by 1576, the two brothers could have lived at Rytaiia before the devastation of the oprichnina. If the brothers entered service before their father's retirement and their father still needed the entire income of his pomestie, however, the government would have given them new pomesties elsewhere. The location of the former Voronoi pomestie next to the Uskoi lands, which is apparent from the placement of the Voronoi returns immediately before the Uskoi returns in the 1539 cadaster, suggests that the two brothers received the Voronoi lands and established their manors before receiving Rytaiia. Since their manors were next to the old family lands, there was no need to change residences after inheriting their father's pomestie.¹⁵

Fourteen (93%) of the other fifteen manors located in parishes with 1539 returns were occupied by pomeshchiks from the same family in 1576 and 1539. One case concerns an unnamed rural residence. In 1576 Gregory Ivanov syn Ogarev was residing on his manor in the countryside near the Church of the Birth of the Holy Mother of God (*Rozhdestvo Sviatoi Bogoroditsy*) and the hamlet of Petrikha. Since a Gregory Ivanov syn Ogarev and his brothers Ivan, Matvei, Yakov, Vasily, and Obrazets also resided on an unnamed rural manor on the same pomestie in 1539, Gregory probably continued to live on the same manor after the estate's division into separate pomesties sometime after 1539 and before 1576.¹⁶

The other thirteen cases concern hamlets occupied by pomeshchiks from the same family in 1539 and 1576. Loba Buturlin, for example, resided in the same Bolchino village of Tishenko in the 1570s occupied by Andrew Ivanovich Poleukhtov syn Buturlin in 1539.¹⁷ A second case concerns Porosha Lazorev, who resided in the same village of Kerebezh on the eve of the oprichnina as Saltan and Bulat Lazorev in 1539.¹⁸ The case of Ivan Selivanov is a third example. In 1576 Ivan was residing in the same hamlet of Gorka as Alexis Ivanov syn Selivanov in 1539.¹⁹ Gregory Ogarev's unnamed rural residence and the thirteen hamlets represent 82% of the seventeen manors located in parishes with 1539 returns.²⁰ The low rate of turnover of the pomeshchik's residence shows the local roots developed by the old families during the sixteenth century.

The residences of the pomeshchiks residing in 1576 and 1498 on the seven old residential parcels located in parishes without 1539 returns were also compared. Three of the residences of the pomeshchiks of 1576 were held by earlier members of the same family who resided in different hamlets on the same pomestie. The Dubrovno pomeshchik Fedor Levontiev syn Kharlamov resided at Zapolie in the early 1570s while his father, Lev, lived at Luka in 1498.²¹ Their cousin Semen Rusinov syn Kharlamov lived in the village of

Ozertsia before the oprichnina; although Ozertsia was part of Andrew Ermolin syn Kharlamov's pomestie in 1498, he resided in an unknown manor outside of the parish.²² Two of the residences of the pomeshchiks of 1576 were also occupied by the same family in 1498. Semen Yuriev syn Esiukov's residence of Golovishche was occupied by Gridia Grigoriev syn Esiukov in 1498.²³ Pauk Kositsky's residence of Kozlovo was occupied by his father and uncle, Yakov Kositsky's sons Ivan and Kuzma, in 1498.²⁴ The remaining two cases concern Karachunsk residences, whose abridged 1498 returns omit the pomeshchiks' residences.²⁵

Twenty old parish families held the thirty-one old residential parcels. Thirteen had known representatives in the parish in 1498. They were the Beloselskies and Selivanovs of Belsky of St Yury's, the Buturlins of Bolchino, the Cheglovks and Evreevs of Karachunsk, the Esiukovs and Kharlamovs of Dubrovno, the Kositskies of Opoka, the Lazorevs and Shishkins of the Porkhov area, the Tyrtovs and Seslavins of Degzha, and the Pleshcheevs of the St Michael's and Belsky parishes formerly belonging to the St. Yury's monastery. Despite the absence of references to the Ogarevs of Degzha and the Shablykins of Belsky of St Yury's in 1498, their representatives lived on pomesties classified "old" by the census-takers of 1539. The Degzha returns refer to the lands of Ivan Ivanov syn Ogarev and his five brothers as "their father's old pomestie."²⁶ Although the Shablykins were new Belsky of St Yury's pomeshchiks in 1539, Subbota Yuriev syn Shablykin's Pazherevitsy estate was an "old pomestie" during the same census. The large pridacha of twenty tax units, which represents 43% of his forty-six tax units, suggests the pomestie was received shortly after the new census.²⁷ If the Ogarevs and Shablykins are included with the thirteen families referred to in the 1498 cadaster, fifteen (75%) of the twenty old parish families of 1576 had representatives in the same parish in the early sixteenth century.

The Tatarinovs of Smolna also may have had representatives living on old family land in 1539. The 1539 returns from the Okolorusie record Tenek Tatarinov's widow Irina and their minor sons Gregory and Yakov as co-holders of a maintenance pomestie of twenty tax units.²⁸ Although the returns do not refer to the former lord, the practice of granting maintenance pomesties from the deceased pomeshchik's estate and the absence of references to Tenek as the former landlord of another pomeshchik's new pomestie indicate that the estate was probably old by 1539.

Four additional old parish families also had representatives in the same parish in 1539 and 1576. The Uskois and Palitsyns of Degzha and the Zasekins of Porkhov area were residing on new pomesties in 1539. Prince Vasily Dmitriev syn Zasekin, for example, held the thirty-three tax units in the Porkhov area assigned to Mitia Alekandrov syn Rumiantsov in 1498.²⁹ The first

known returns for a Kalitin pomestie in Shelonskaia province are in the Smolna cadaster of 1552, when Ivan Kalitin's sons Vasily and Iosif held thirty-eight tax units. But the reference to Vasily and Osip (Iosif) Kalitin as co-holders of the Smolna hamlet of Zakhonie in the 1539 returns from Michael Chebotaev's Porkhov area pomestie proves the Kalitins' possession of parish land before 1539.³⁰

The uneven survival of the cadasters prevented the classification of eight residential parcels belonging to seven old Shelonskaia families (the Evreevs of Bolchino, the Karaulovs and Unkovskies of Karachunsk, and the Kharlamovs, Kositskies Nashchokins, and Shchogolevs of Dubrovno) as definitely old. One case concerns a parish with 1539 returns. In 1576, Moisei Evreev held a manor and three other hamlets on 25.5 Bolchino vyts. Although there are no references to the Evreevs in the 1539 Bolchino cadaster and Semen Semenov syn Pustoshkin held Moisei's manor at Novoselie, the Evreevs were an old parish family. Ivan and Michael Evreev held 2.5 tax units there in the hamlets of Kiril Eskyn in 1498. The loss of the returns for Moisei's other hamlets raises the possibility of their continuous possession by an Evreev residing in a parish without 1539 returns. The same Evreevs who held the Bolchino parcel in 1498 also held land in one of the parishes (Karachunsk) whose 1539 returns are lost. Since the census-takers conducting the census of 1539 recorded all of a pomeshchik's lands with the returns from the parish where his manor house was located, the Evreevs' 1539 Bolchino returns are lost with the missing Karachunsk cadaster. The location of three of Moisei's four hamlets on the Bolchino parcel held by Ivan and Michael Evreev in 1498 would explain their missing returns.³¹

The seven remaining cases of possibly old pomesties were located in parishes without 1539 returns. Although there are no records of Nashchokins and Shchogolevs in the Dubrovno parish before 1576, the references in the 1576 returns to earlier lords from the same family suggest that the pomesties of Stepan Istomin syn Shchogolev and Ivan Semenov syn Nashchokin were old in 1576. Stepan's returns name his father Istoma and uncles Dmitry and Nechai as the former holders of his parcel of fifteen vyts and manor at Vysotsko.³² Ivan Nashchokin's returns name his father Semen Istomin syn as the former holder of his 24.25 vyts and residence of Golovitsy.³³ Since the 1539 returns do not survive, the fathers of the pomeshchiks could have received the lands before 1539. If so, their sons' pomesties would have been old by 1576.

Three of the seven remaining cases of possibly old pomesties involve pomeshchiks from families with representatives in the same parish in 1498. The absence of references to their hamlets before 1576, however, prevented the classification of their pomesties as definitely old. It was impossible to compare the hamlets located on Druzhin and Sumorok Karaulov's Karachunsk

residential parcels in 1576 to those of Sobina Karaulov, who held fourteen tax units in the same parish in 1498, because the surviving returns omitted the hamlets.³⁴ Tracing the hamlets of Maksim Unkovsky, who lived in his Karachunsk residence at Bor before the oprichnina, to 1498 was also impossible. Since the 1498 returns for Oleshka and Ivashko, Ostafy Unkovsky's sons, are fragmentary, the Unkovsky's could have held Maksim's hamlets in 1498. If so, Maksim's pomestie would have been old in 1576.³⁵

The remaining two cases of possibly old pomesties concern the Kharlamovs and Kositskies of Dubrovno parish. Karas and Boris, the sons of Manukh Esiukov, held Vlas Kharlamov's hamlets and manor at Borzilets in 1498. The continuous residence of the two families in the parish between 1498 and 1576 suggests that the Kharlamovs acquired the hamlets through marriage. Since the Esiukovs had four representatives in the parish in 1498 (Gregory's sons, Gridia and Mikula, in addition to Manukh's sons, Karas and Boris) and only one representative (Semen Yuriev syn) in 1576, the other Esiukovs probably died without male heirs. The Kharlamovs, on the other hand, continued to flourish. In 1498, the Kharlamovs had three representatives in the parish, Andrew Ermolin syn, Ivan Mikhailov syn and Lev; in the 1570s, four Kharlamovs were serving from Dubrovno land. Lev's sons Mikifor and Fedor were serving from their father's old estate while Semen Rusinov served from Andrew's old pomestie. Vlas's position as the only Kharlamov not serving from old family lands suggests that the Kharlamovs suffered a land shortage. Since Karas Esiukov, the holder of Borzilets in 1498, did not have sons, Vlas could have obtained the hamlet and other lands necessary for military service by marrying his daughter. If the marriage occurred before 1539, the pomestie would have been old by the 1570s.³⁶ The pomestie of Ilia Borisov syn Kositsky could also have been old by the 1570s since the Kositsky family had a representative (Ivan Yakovlev syn) in the Dubrovno parish in 1498 and the returns of one of the hamlets (Domozherovo) held by Ilia in 1576 were lost.³⁷

Since three of the seven old parish families (the Evreevs, Kharlamovs, and Kositskies) also held definitely old pomesties, twenty-four old parish families held thirty-five (59%) of the fifty-nine residential parcels. Old parish families also held three additional residential parcels. None of the parcels could receive a definite classification because of the fragmentary 1576 or lost 1539 returns for some of their hamlets. If the returns from only one hamlet were lost and different families held the other hamlets in 1539 and 1576, the pomestie was "probably new." If the returns from several hamlets fail to survive and a different family held the others in 1539 and 1576, the pomestie was "possibly new." The pomesties with fragmentary returns from the 1576 census were also "possibly new" if a different family earlier held the hamlets with surviving returns. The Porkhov area pomeschchik Maksim Shishkin held

one of the possibly new residential parcels. Although his returns are fragmentary, Stepan Rumiantsov held his hamlets of Volchei Bor and Bedreevo in 1539.³⁸ The Pazherevitsy pomeshchik Semen Pustoshkin held the other possibly new pomestie in 1576. The returns from three of his hamlets (Brilino, Priatishcha, and Klimovo) are missing, but Yuri Shablykin's three sons (Subbota, Menshoi, and Urmen) held the remaining ones (Pupovo, Ruchei, Krovtsyno, and Glazanovo) in 1539.³⁹ Vasily Terpigorev held a probably new Pazherevitsy pomestie since in 1539 other families held all of his hamlets except Shaldino, whose earlier returns are lost. Tretiak Shablykin held his residence at Luzhok, Semen Kartmazov held the hamlet of Kozhemiakino, and Fedor Denisiev Ragozin held the hamlet of Greben'.⁴⁰ Since Vasily was the state official in charge of the maintenance of the postal stations and public roads (*iam*), his pomestie resembles a "feeding" (*kormlenie*).⁴¹ Instead of paying a regular salary, which the Treasury could not afford, the crown supported its local officials in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with charters authorizing the collection of a certain percentage of court fees from local residents. The dues received from the peasants compensated Terpigorev for his service to the Muscovite state. A passage in the 1539 returns of Semen Ivanov syn Kartmazov, a Yasno pomeshchik who was holding the same Pazherevitsy hamlet of Kozhemiakino later held by Terpigorev, supports this thesis. The passage states "[and for Kartmazov] what had been given to the Kozhemiatsk yam, but had been held of old by Andrew Ovtsyn as well as by the yamshchik."⁴² Since earlier yamshchiks also held Kozhemiakino, the government probably reserved the hamlet to support the supervisor of postal stations and public roads.

All three families had earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576. Michael Andreev syn Shishkin resided on an old Porkhov area pomestie of sixty-five tax units in 1539.⁴³ Ivan Bolshoi Ivanov syn Pustoshkin held 19.5 old Pazherevitsy tax units in 1539.⁴⁴ In addition, Timothy Terpigorev held 28.5 Pazherevitsy tax units in 1498.⁴⁵ Since Nikita Andreev syn Shishkin also held old pomesties in the same Porkhov area where Maksim Shishkin held his possibly new pomestie, twenty-six rather than twenty-seven old parish families held lands before 1539 in the same parish as 1576. The thirty-eight parcels of residential pomesties held by the twenty-six old parish families represent 64.4% of the fifty-nine residential parcels not held as maintenance pomesties.

OTHER FAMILIES' RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

Families without earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576 held the remaining twenty-one parcels. The loss of some hamlets' earlier returns prevented

seventeen (81%) of the parcels from being classified definitely. The parcels possessed by families without any earlier representatives in the province were probably new. The parcels belonging to families with earlier representatives in other Shelonskaia parishes were probably new if only one hamlet's earlier returns were lost and a different family held the remaining hamlets in 1539 or 1498. If the earlier returns from more than one hamlet were lost, the parcel received a possibly new classification.

Ten parcels were probably new because they belonged to nine families (the Azarevs, Belskies, Blazhonkovs, Egupovs, Kniazhnins, Karasovs, Miakois, Onikeevs, and Ziuzins) without earlier representatives in the province. Three upper service class families (the Belskies, Egupovs, and Ziuzins) held four probably new parcels. Two of the parcels were located in the Smolna parish. Vasily Grigorievich Ziuzin held nine abandoned hamlets and an unnamed manor occupied by his servants in 1576. The absence of earlier references to six of his nine hamlets prevents the parcel's definite classification. The reference in the 1524 returns from the crown lands to Gridia Danilov syn Lazorev's possession of a share in the hamlet of Gubino later held by Ziuzin, however, suggests the estate could have been new. The absence of earlier references to the Ziuzins in the sixteenth century cadasters supports this thesis.⁴⁶ So does Ziuzin's career in state service. After entering the Boyar Duma with the rank of gentry councilor (*dumnyi dvorianin*), he served as lord-in-waiting (*okolnichii*) for many years in the later 1560s and 1570s. He must have displayed unquestionable loyalty to the tsar; for Ivan IV not only enrolled him in the oprichnina, but also even retained him in office after the suppression of the oprichniks in 1572.⁴⁷ His relationship with tsar suggests that the Smolna parcel was a reward for his oprichnina service.

The Belskies were the other boyar family holding possibly new Smolna pomesties. In 1576 Afanasy Vasilievich Belsky held three hamlets, including his manor at Dno, on 11.75 living and 0.25 abandoned vyts. The earlier returns for Brodok and Shklevo are missing, but the 1524 returns from the crown lands referred to the division of Dno between the grand prince and unnamed pomeshchiks. The absence of earlier references to the family in the Shelonskaia cadasters makes it extremely unlikely that the unnamed pomeshchiks were Belskies. The family's lineage supports this thesis. While most pomeshchiks came from the middle service class, the Belskies were an old boyar family. The family's career as Muscovite boyars began in 1482, when Prince Fedor Ivanovich Belsky transferred his allegiance from the grand prince of Lithuania to Ivan III of Moscow and All Russia. Fifteen years later, he married Ivan's niece by his sister Anna of Riazan'. His appointment to Vasily III's Duma in 1520 began the family's transition from service princes to boyars. Both of Prince Fedor's sons, Dmitry and Ivan, served on the Duma

after 1530. Prince Ivan Fedorovich was a close friend and the first councilor (*pervosovetnik*) of Ivan IV before the Shiusky regents exiled him in 1542 to Beloozero, where he died a few months later. Prince Dmitry served as a boyar from 1530 until his death in 1551; his son Prince Ivan Dmitrievich sat on the Duma until 1560, was in prison for a short time in 1562, and then resumed his Duma service on the eve of the oprichnina in 1564. His cousin Bogdan Yakovlevich Belsky sat on the Boyar Duma for most of the sixteenth century, retiring upon the accession of Tsar Fedor Ivanovich in 1584. The Belskies' prominent role in the sixteenth century Duma and the boyars' desire to have lands near Moscow may explain the absence of earlier references in the Shelonskaia cadasters.⁴⁸

A representative of the Belskies, Prince Bogdan Yakovlevich, also held a residential parcel in St Michael and St George's, one of the parishes with 1539 returns. Since Fedor Ivanov syn Lazorev held all but one of his seventeen hamlets by in 1539, the pomestie was probably new. The absence of earlier returns from Menshikov, however, prevents the classification of the estate as definitely new.⁴⁹ A representative of the Princes Cherkasky held a probably new residential parcel in Belsky of St Yury's, another parish with 1539 returns. Prince Ivan Egupov Cherkasky held eight occupied and ten abandoned hamlets including his manor at Golovino in 1576. The failure of the earlier returns from ten of the hamlets to survive prevented a definite classification. Egupov Cherkasky held none of the remaining hamlets in 1539. Volodimer Afanasiev syn Cheglovokov held Golovino, Dolgusha, Ovinnaia, and Semkino; Tretiak and Ushak Shablykin held sections of Krutets; Prince Volodimer Beloselsky held Oleshno; and Alexis Ondreev syn Selivanov held Gorodishcho.⁵⁰ Since there are no references to the family among the parish's earlier landholders, the parcel was probably new.

Three families of middle class servingmen without earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576 (the Karasovs, Kniazhnins and Azarevs) held three probably new residential parcels in parishes without 1539 returns. Ivan Karasov's sons Boris and Ilia held 17.25 vyts, resided on their manor at Batino while Semen Kniazhnin's sons held ten vyts, and lived at Kromsko. Both parcels were in the Dubrovno parish.⁵¹ Ushatoi Azariev held 13.75 vyts and a residence at Ostrov in the Karachunsk parish.⁵² Since none of the surviving Shelonskaia cadasters refers to the three families before 1576, their lands were probably new.

Three middle service class families (the Blazhonkovs and Miakois of the Porkhov area, and the Onikeevs of Belsky of St Yury's) held probably new pomesties in parishes with 1539 returns. One of the cases concerns Andrew Onikeev, who held four hamlets and resided on his manor at Krutets in Belsky of St Yury's parish. In 1539 his manor and hamlets of Zapolie, Podklinie,

and Luki were respectively held by Tretiak Ivanov syn Shablykin, Alexis Andreev syn Selivanov, Prince Volodimer Beloselsky, and Ushak Shablykin. Since the earlier returns for the fourth hamlet (Tiutkovo) were lost, the parcel was probably rather than definitely new.⁵³ The ten probably new parcels held by families without earlier representatives in sixteenth century Shelonskaia province and the probably new parcel held by the old Terpigorev family represent 17% of the fifty-nine residential parcels of 1576.

Seven old provincial families without earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576 held seven possibly new pomesties. Four were middle service class families (the Bibikovs, Bobrovs, Zverevs, and Simanskies) residing on land in parishes without 1539 returns. All had earlier representatives serving from pomesties in other Shelonskaia parishes. The Simanskies do not appear in the Dubrovno cadasters before Fedor Simansky received eight vyts and the manor at Putilovo recorded in 1576. However, Mitrofan Simansky's widow Evfimia held a maintenance pomestie in Yasno parish in 1539.⁵⁴ Fedor Zverev held three vyts and a manor at Tverdilovo in the 1570s. Although there were no earlier Karachunsk Zverevs, two sons of Ivan Zverev, Ivan and Peter, held separate Resurrection pomesties while Semen Zverev's widow Fedosia held a Resurrection maintenance pomestie in 1539.⁵⁵ Buslav Fedorov syn Bibikov's 1576 returns, which recorded his 12.5 abandoned vyts, are the first known reference to a Bibikov in St Michael's-on-the-Uza. The reference in Ivan Evsiukov's 1539 returns to Vasily Bibikov as the holder of a share in the hamlet of Vesnino, however, proves the presence of the Bibikovs in the province before 1539.⁵⁶ Zaleshanin Bobrov, who held an unnamed manor on seven vyts, and his cousin Vzhdan, who held a nonresidential parcel of 6.5 vyts, are the first known Bobrovs in Karachunsk.⁵⁷ The 1551 returns from the crown lands of the Shchepetsk parish, however, refer to the grant of two obrok-paying hamlets (Berezno and Dekhino) to Stepan Fedorov syn Bobrov in 1548. The hamlets were abandoned and recorded with the crown lands three years later, indicating that Bobrov either abandoned the land after a short stay or failed to claim possession.⁵⁸ Since the four families had representatives in other parishes and the 1539 returns from the parishes where the families held land in the 1570s are lost, the parcels were classified possibly new.

Two additional middle service class families, the Khlopovs and Kositskies, without earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576 held two possibly new pomesties in Belsky of St Yury's, one of the parishes with 1539 returns. Zhdan Kositsky's residential parcel of 12.75 living and two abandoned vyts at Vetshi is an example. The lack of earlier references to six of his eleven hamlets prevented the parcel from being definitely classified. None of the remaining hamlets was held by Kositskies in 1539. Gorokhovishche, Vostaia

Luka, Zakhonie, and Lipnia were held by Prince Vasily Slitok Ivanov syn Beloselsky while Lug was held by Piatoi Shablykin.⁵⁹ Since there were also no earlier references to the Kositskies in the parish, the parcel was classified possibly new. If the seven possibly new families are included with the two old families (the Shishkins of the Porkhov area and the Pustoshkins of Pazherevitsy) holding possibly new pomesties, then nine families had nine residential parcels representing 15.2% of the residential lands recorded in the Shelonskaia cadaster of 1576.

Vasily Pleshcheev, who held and later abandoned a manor at Isaevo and nine other known hamlets in the early 1570s, is the only representative of the upper service class holding a possibly new residential parcel. Since his fragmentary returns break off in the middle of Kozulino, his other hamlets are unknown and the parcel cannot be classified definitely. The absence of earlier references to Bolchino Pleshcheevs in the 1498 and 1539 cadasters requires a possibly new classification.⁶⁰

Despite the absence of earlier representatives in the same parishes as 1576, the Kositskies and Pleshcheevs were old provincial families. In 1498 Ivan Yakovlev syn Kositsky held 5.5 tax units in the Dubrovno parish thirty-eight versts northwest of the Belsky of St Yury's parish where Vzhdan (Zhdan) Kositsky resided in 1576.⁶¹ In 1539 Alfery Vorypae syn Pleshcheev was holding an old St Michael's-on-the-Uza pomestie twenty-eight versts west of the Bolchino parish where Vasily Pleshcheev held a manor at Isaevo before the oprichnina.⁶²

The uneven survival of the cadasters only permitted the definite classification of four parcels belonging to four families without earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576. All were new because different families held the land in 1539 and 1576. The new residential parcels represent a mere 12.9% of the thirty-one classifiable residential parcels, suggesting that the pomeshchiks of the second half of the century, like their predecessors, preferred to keep their estates in the family.

The four families included the upper service class Egupovs of Bolchino and the middle service class Evreevs, Palitsyns, and Pianteleevs of the Porkhov area. The returns for Prince Ivan Egupov refer to Vesniak and Alexis Dubrovsky as the former holder of the pomestie. Since Vesniak and Alexis succeeded to their father's pomestie in 1551, Prince Egupov probably received the new pomestie less than a decade before the oprichnina.⁶³ In 1539 Andrew Shishkin's sons Michael and Mikula held the same hamlet of Klin where Alexander Pianteleev resided in the 1570s.⁶⁴ The Shishkin brothers also held Goristaia, where Ivan Evreev resided in 1576.⁶⁵ Matvei Rumiantsov's widow Ovdotia and son Stepan earlier held the hamlet of Glinitsy where Bogdan Palitsyn resided in 1576. Since there are no references to

Stepan after 1539, the parcel probably was granted to the Palitsyns after Stepan died without heirs.⁶⁶

Although the Egupovs and Pianteelevs did not have earlier Shelonskaia representatives, the Palitsyns and Evreevs were old provincial families. Matvei Mikhailov syn and Vasily Alekseev syn Palitsyn held separate new pomesties in 1539 in the Degzha parish thirty-eight versts southeast of the Porkhov area where Bogdan Palitsyn resided in the 1570s.⁶⁷ Vasily Borisov syn Evreev held an old pomestie in 1539 in the Shniatinsk parish fifty-three versts northeast of the Porkhov area where Ivan Evreev resided in the 1570s.⁶⁸

THE FRAGMENTATION OF THE POMESTIE

The distance of the nonresidential parcels from the lord's residence was calculated to determine whether the pomeshchiks residing in the province on the eve of the oprichnina shared their predecessors' preference for lands near their residence.⁶⁹ Seventeen (28.8%) of the fifty-nine residential pomeshchiks also held nonresidential parcels. Six (35%) were located in the same parish as the manor. Vasily Pleshcheev, for example, held two parcels in Bolchino parish, including his residence at Isaevo.⁷⁰ His returns are separated by the records of the former pomesties of Prince Ivan Egupov, Moisei Evreev, and Loba Buturlin. Druzhin Karaulov's three Karachunsk parcels, which included his manor at Frolovo, provide another example.⁷¹ The former estates of Sumorok Karaulov, Gregory Cheremisinov syn Karaulov, Maksim Aleksandrov syn Unkovsky, and Gregory Tsypilev are recorded after Druzhin's Pestovo and before his Frolovo parcels. The returns for the former pomesties of Zaleshanin Bobrov, Nekliud Kniazhnin, Timothy Shishkin's widow Anna, Alfery Strechnev, and Istoma Cheglovok separate those of his Frolovo and Ereskino parcels.

Karaulov's separate returns imply the division of his Karachunsk pomestie into three noncontiguous parcels. A survey of the entire Karachunsk cadaster, however, raises the possibility of at least two contiguous parcels. The 1576 Karachunsk returns are recorded under the general heading of "pomeshchiks whose villages and hamlets were taken for the sovereign's desiatin and peasant arable."⁷² The Pestovo and Frolovo returns were recorded with former pomesties retained by the sovereign as crown land while those for the Ereskino parcel were recorded with the "peasants' arable," the black lands.⁷³ Since returns for the "sovereign's arable" begin with Pestovo and those for the "peasants' arable" begin with Ereshkino, the two parcels could have been contiguous before being administratively separated after the oprichnina.

The location of Frolovo vis-a-vis Druzhin's other Karachunsk parcels is more difficult to determine. The Pestovo and Frolovo parcels appear noncontiguous because both were crown lands recorded in different sections of the cadaster. A comparison of their returns, however, suggests that the crown lands were subdivided into completely abandoned former pomesties on the one hand and "living" former pomesties (land occupied by dues-paying peasants) on the other. Although the cadaster does not give subheadings for these categories, all of the Karachunsk hamlets recorded before Frolovo were abandoned while Karaulov's Frolovo parcel and the former pomestie of Zaleshanin Bobrov consisted of farmsteads occupied by peasants.⁷⁴ Although the six crown hamlets whose returns follow the Bobrov parcel were abandoned and their fields were fallow, the peasants were able to tell the census-takers the amount of grain sown per field when the fields were under cultivation. This suggests that the fields were either fallow or recently under cultivation because of the normal rotation between cultivated and uncultivated fields characteristic of the three field system of medieval agriculture. Since the returns for Karaulov's Frolovo parcel were recorded at the beginning of the returns for the "living" former pomesties and the returns for his Pestovo parcel were placed at the beginning of the returns for the abandoned hamlets, the Pestovo and Frolovo parcels may have been contiguous.

The condition of the parish after the oprichnina may explain the recording of contiguous parcels in different sections of the cadaster. The state's interest in retaining the land caused it to distinguish between the productive and unproductive parcels: the former had peasants capable of paying dues to the steward while the latter could be transformed into productive land by being distributed to peasants. Since they were no longer pomesties, there was no need to record all the former landlord's parcels with the returns from his residence. The census-takers placed the returns from the abandoned lands at the beginning of the cadaster, followed by the returns from the "living" lands.

The remaining eleven pomeshchiks held twelve parcels in other parishes. Ilia Borisov syn Kositsky, for example, held ten hamlets and a residence at Batino in Dubrovno parish and seven additional hamlets in Belsky of St Yury's parish. Although the Belsky parcel was thirty-eight versts to the southwest, more than a day's journey from Batino, it was less than twenty versts from Porkhov, the administrative and commercial center of the Porkhov district.⁷⁵ Gregory Ivanov syn Ogarev held ten hamlets and a residence in the Degzha parish (32.5 vyts) as well as a nonresidential parcel (two vyts) in Nativity parish. Since Nativity was located seven versts to the north of Degzha, Ogarev could travel to and from the parish in less than a day.⁷⁶

Measuring the parcels' distance from the lord's manor on the map provided in the inset to the first volume of the Shapiro symposium's *Agrarnaia istoriia*

found an average distance of 20.56 versts (13.56 miles) from the lord's residence. Although twenty versts was a relatively short distance, the average is misleading. Three parcels were less than ten versts from manor. Another three were less than twenty versts away while five of the remaining six parcels were less than thirty-versts. If the six pomeshchiks who held seven nonresidential parcels in the same parish as their residence are considered, ten of the nineteen parcels (53%) were less than ten versts and thirteen of the nineteen parcels (68%) were less than twenty versts away from the lord's residence.⁷⁷ The proximity of the nonresidential parcels to the lord's residence proves the pomeshchiks' desire to consolidate their holdings.

THE NONRESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF THE OLD PARISH FAMILIES

The same system earlier used to classify the seventy-nine residential parcels was utilized to classify the 172 parcels without a landlord in residence. Earlier returns or occasional references to the former landlord allowed fifty-two (30.2%) of the parcels to be definitely classified. The overwhelming majority (forty-five, 88.2%) were definitely old because the same family held the same parcel in earlier censuses. Four of the old parcels were located in the Smolna parish, where the Bachins, Kalitins, and two branches of the Zasekins held old pomesties. Svoiten Bachin, for example, held the same parcel in the 1570s earlier held with his brother Tretiak in 1552. Since the brothers received the parcel after their father Shchavei's death in 1548, the parcel remained in the family for more than a generation.⁷⁸ Two Zasekin Princes (Andrew and Ivan) separately held the same hamlets of Ladiny and Chertenaia belonging to Prince Michael Konstantinovich Zasekin in 1552.⁷⁹

Ten old parish families (the Evreevs, Cheglokovs, Kartmazovs, and Pustoshkins of Karachunsk; the Lazorevs, and Shishkins of Dubrovno; the Kharlamovs of Dubrovno and Opoka; the Kositskies and Pushkins of Opoka; and the Esiukovs of Dubrovno and St Michael's of St Yury's monastery) held thirteen old parcels located in parishes without 1539 returns. The residency of the pomeshchiks' families in other parishes with 1539 returns and the census-takers' practice of recording all the pomeshchik's holdings with the returns from the parish of his residence revealed the families' continuous possession of the parcels. The case of Porosha Lazorev is an example. In the 1570s Lazorev possessed the same hamlets of Ryk and Ivantsovo (Rak and Evantsovo) held by his kinsmen Saltan, Bulat, and Urmen Lazorev in 1539. The three brothers were the sons of the same Andrew Lazorev who held Rak in 1498.⁸⁰ Three of four hamlets (Blانيتса, Podoklinie and Pechkovo) held by Boris Yusiukov

in the 1570s belonged to the old Nativity pomeshchik Ivan Evsiukov as part of his St Michael's-on-the-Uza pridacha in 1539.⁸¹

Sixteen old parish families held the remaining twenty-eight old parcels located in parishes with 1539 returns. Five families (the Cheglokovs, Esiukovs, Pustoshkins, and Shishkins) discussed above also held seven old parcels in parishes with 1539 returns. Istoma Cheglovkov, for example, held the same Porkhov area hamlets of Gorka, Vesnina and Verteia, Zarechie, Lezenitsy, Morozova, and Kraskovo earlier held by Avdotia, Daniel Cheglovkov's widow, in 1539.⁸² Eleven families represented by the Chebotaevs and Terpigorevs of Porkhov area, the Karpovs, Nazimovs, Shablykins and Tatianins of Pazherevitsy, the Kvashnins and Selivanovs of Belsky of St Yury's, the Ogarevs and Palitsyns of Degzha, and the Lazorevs of both the Porkhov area and Pazherevitsy parishes held the other twenty-one definitely old nonresidential parcels. Daniel Borisov syn, Ivan Bolshoi, and Vasily Ogarev held Degzha nonresidential parcels earlier held by other Ogarevs. In 1539 Ivan Ivanov syn Ogarev held ten of the eleven hamlets that belonged to Ivan Bolshoi Ogarev on the eve of the oprichnina. Stephan Sudakov syn Ogarev held the remaining hamlet of Kamenska in 1539. The former holder of Ivan Bolshoi Ogarev's small village (*sel'tso*) of Shriakhovo is unknown because the earlier returns are lost.⁸³

Old parish families held fifty-one additional nonresidential parcels incapable of being definitely classified because the earlier holders of some of the hamlets lived in parishes without returns from the 1539 census. Seventeen families held thirty-two probably old parcels. Despite some hamlets' lost 1539 returns, the family's possession of one or more of the other hamlets in 1552 and the presence of earlier representatives in the same parish before 1539 imply continuity of possession. Only one of the parcels was located in the Opoka parish, whose 1539 returns are lost. In 1576 Istoma Shishmarev held the hamlets of Smetano, Dolzhitsy, and Noskovo. The absence of returns from the census of 1539 prevented the parcel's definite classification. Daniel Chiubarev syn Shishmarev's possession of the Opoka hamlets of Noskovo and Podolzhina in 1552 and Bovyka Shishmarev's possession of the Opoka hamlet of Vezhishcha in 1498, however, suggest the parcel was probably old.⁸⁴

Sixteen old parish families possessed the remaining thirty-one probably old parcels located in parishes with 1539 returns. They included the Kostins, Palitsyns, and Uskois of Degzha; the Moseevs and Ogarevs of Degzha and Nativity; the Tyrtovs of Nativity, Pazherevitsy, and Degzha; the Kvashnins, Levshins, Molchianovs, Shablykins, Shcherbinins, Snazins, Turgenevs, Unkovskies, and Zasekins of Nativity; and Pleshcheevs of St Michael and St George's. Gregory and Gerasim Tyrtov held 5.5 probably old vyts in the

Pazherevitsy parish on the eve of the oprichnina. The 1552 Zhedrity cadaster refers to the holding of Pazherevitsy land by Nikita Tyrto's sons Gregory and Gerasim. Since the parcel recorded in 1552 was located in the same volost of Yurka Bozhin held by their father Nikita in 1498, it was already old by 1552. The 1576 cadaster's omission of the volosts and the 1552 cadaster's omission of the hamlets, however, prevent the comparison of the two parcels. The reference to Gregory's retirement and replacement by his son Ivan in the 1552 cadaster and the absence of Gregory's patronymic from the 1576 cadaster sheds doubt on Gregory and Gregory Nikitin's common identity. If the Gregory referred to in the cadaster of 1576 were Ivan's son and Gregory Nikitin syn's grandson, however, the hamlets held by Gregory and Gerasim Tyrto in the 1570s could have been the located on the same parcel held by the Tyrtovs in 1498 and 1552. Their parcel was therefore probably old.⁸⁵ So were the 1.5 abandoned vyts held by Vasily Turgenev in the same parish. Although the 1576 Nativity returns do not give the hamlets or volost, Vasily and his brothers Ivan, Luchanin and Dmitry (the sons of Peter Turgenev) held a Nativity parcel in addition to the Zhedrity pomestie where they resided on their unnamed manor.⁸⁶

Twelve old parish families also held nineteen parcels of possibly old pomesties. Four (the Dubrovskies of Bolchino, the Terpigorevs of the Porkhov area, and the Tatianins and the Turgenevs of Pazherevitsy) held three parcels in parishes with 1539 returns. Since some of the parcels' hamlets were held by pomeshchiks residing in other parishes in 1539, their returns are lost. Kellar Terpigorev, for example, possessed two vyts in the Porkhov area on the eve of the oprichnina. Although his hamlet of Chistitsa's earlier returns were lost, the pomestie could have been old since earlier Terpigorevs also held land in the same parish. The Yasno pomeshchik Fedor Terpigorev, for example, also held the Porkhov area hamlets of Rosadnik and Poliana in 1539.⁸⁷

Eight old parish families (the Cheglokovs, Evreevs, and Unkovskies of Karachunsk; the Kharlamovs of Opoka and Dubrovno; the Karaulovs of Karachunsk and St Michael and St George's; and the Kositskies, Lazorevs, and Nashchokins of Dubrovno) held the remaining fifteen parcels of possibly old pomesties located in parishes without 1539 returns. Yakov Cheglov's parcel of two vyts in the Karachunsk parish is an example. Although there are no other references to his hamlet of Okatovo, the parcel could have been old since earlier Cheglokovs resided in the same parish. The 1539 Porkhov area returns refer to a Yakov Cheglov and his brothers Ivan and Michael (Daniel Cheglov's sons) as the holders of the Karachunsk hamlets of Zhar Zabolotie, Kriukovo, Rodishka, and Bychek.⁸⁸ The two Nashchokin parcels located in the Dubrovno parish and held by Andrew Nashchokin's sons (Ivan and Stepan) and Istoma Nashchokin's son Paul could have been old despite

the absence of earlier returns for the hamlets on the parcel. The 1576 returns from Ivan Nashchokin's residential parcel refer to the former landlord, his father Semen, as Istoma Nashchokin's son. Since Paul and Semen belonged to the older generation of the family, Paul's parcel could have been old in 1576, especially if the two brothers were close in age.⁸⁹

One old parish family, the Pleshcheevs of Belsky of St Yury's, held a new pomestie. The Pleshcheevs had held land in the parish since the crown granted a pomestie of twenty-five tax units to Ratman Borisovich Pleshcheev before 1539. Despite the Pleshcheevs' earlier presence, the two hamlets held by Stepan Pleshcheev on the eve of the oprichnina belonged to different families in 1539. Likhach Mikiforov syn Kvashnin held Martiukhovo while Shestoi Shablykin held his hamlet of Kikovo.⁹⁰ If the Pleshcheevs new pomestie is considered with the nineteen possibly old and thirty-two probably old parcels, old families held ninety-seven (56.4%) of the 172 nonresidential parcels.

OTHER FAMILIES' NONRESIDENTIAL PARCELS

Families without earlier representatives in the same parish held the remaining seventy-five nonresidential parcels in 1576. Most parcels (sixty-nine or 92%) could not be classified definitely because the earlier returns for one or more of their hamlets were lost. The same classification criteria earlier applied to the parcels with landlords in residence were used for the nonresidential parcels. Lands held by different families in 1498 and 1576 were considered probably new if the 1539 returns were lost and there were no references to the last known landlord's family in the sixteenth century Shelonskaia cadasters before 1576. Lands held by families with earlier representatives in other Shelonskaia parishes were considered probably new if only one hamlet's earlier returns were lost and the remaining hamlets were held by different families in 1552 and 1576 or 1539 and 1576. If more than one hamlet's earlier returns were lost, the parcel was considered possibly new.

Thirty-five of the sixty-nine parcels were probably new because they belonged to families without any known representatives in the province before 1576. Twenty-two parcels located in parishes without 1539 returns belonged to seventeen families: the Bekteevs, Belskies, Lodygins, Novokshchenovs, and Vypovskis of Opoka; the Blazhenkovs, Kostrovs, Krenevs, and Sushilnikovs of Dubrovno; the Princes Egupov and the Gribakins, Kniazhnins, Panteleevs, Susherins, Strechnevs, and Tsypotevs of Karachunsk; and the Golovachevs of Dubrovno and Opoka. Gregory Golovachev's nonresidential Dubrovno parcel of five vyts is an example. The land could not be classified definitely because only one of the five hamlets, Vertelkino, had earlier returns.

Karas Manukhin syn Esiukov's possession of the hamlet in 1498 and the absence of references to the Golovachevs before 1576 indicates that the parcel was probably new.⁹¹

Thirteen probably new nonresidential parcels located in parishes with 1539 returns belonged to ten families: the Princes Rostovsky and the Volovois of Degzha; the Miakois, Shchogolevs, Strechnevs, and Umnois of the Porkhov area; the Boltins of Nativity; the Golovins and Korobins of Nativity and Degzha; and the Sverbeevs of Bolchino and Belsky of St Yury's. The parcel belonging to Alfery Strechnev's sons, Yury and Klementy, on the eve of the oprichnina is an example. Despite the 1539 Porkhov area cadasters, the returns from the hamlets of Pesochno and Vysotsko are lost because the unknown former pomeshchik resided in a parish whose 1539 returns are lost. Since there are no earlier references to the Strechnev family, the parcel was probably new.⁹²

The remaining thirty-four parcels incapable of being definitely classified were possibly new because earlier representatives of the landlord's family were serving from lands in other parishes. Three possibly new parcels belonging to the Yaryshkins, Kulikovs, and Shishkins were located in Smolna parish. Boris Yaryshkin's eight vyts is an example. Since the earlier returns for five of his six hamlets are lost, the parcel could not be classified definitely. The reference to Yaryshkin's remaining hamlet (Roitsyno) as a crown land in 1524 raises the possibility of an old parcel. Since other Smolna crown lands were granted as pomesties shortly after the census, the Yaryshkins could have received the land in the late 1520s or early 1530s. The references to Ivan Yaryshkin as the Kazimerovsk steward on the crown lands of Lositsk parish in 1524 proves the Yaryshkin's status as an old provincial family. So do the references to Ivan's kinsman Mikifor, who was serving as a steward (*poselskii*) on the Gorodnia crown lands. The absence of earlier references to the Yaryshkins in connection with Smolna parish, however, suggests a higher probability that the parcel was new.⁹³ It was therefore given a possibly new classification.

Nine families (the Karpovs, Lazorevs, Snazins, Bachins, and Nashchokins of Opoka; the Miachkovs, Ragozins, and Egnutiev's of Dubrovno; and the Bobrovs of Opoka and Karachunsk) held thirteen parcels in parishes without 1539 or 1552 returns. Meshcheria Ragozin's 2.5 vyts, including the hamlets of Gorka and Kromsko in the Dubrovno parish, is an example. In 1498 Mikula Esiukov held Gorka and two thirds of Kromsko while Andrew Danilov syn Lazorev held the other third of Gorka.⁹⁴ Although the hamlets were held by different families in 1498 and 1576, the three generations separating the two censuses precludes a definitely new classification. The presence of Fedor Denisiev syn Ragozin among the old pomeshchiks of Kolomna

parish in 1539 supports this thesis.⁹⁵ The absence of earlier Ragozins in the Dubrovno parish, however, justifies a possibly new classification.

Thirteen families (the Bobrovs and Zamutskies of the Porkhov area; the Dubrovskies, Evreevs, Kharlamovs, and Kolychevs of Belsky of St Yuri's; the Ignatievs, Levshins, and Veliaminovs of Degzha; the Palitsyns and Simanskies of Nativity; and the Kositskies of Belsky of St Yuri's and Bolchino) held eighteen possibly new parcels in parishes with 1539 returns. The case of Venedikt Kolychev, who held two *pochinoks* (Svetikha and Moshok) on a half *vyt* of arable land in the Belsky of St Yuri's parish, is an example. The absence of earlier references to the two *pochinoks* suggests but does not prove Kolychev's recent founding of the settlements on new lands.⁹⁶ Since *pochinoks* retained their status until the lord attracted enough peasants for a hamlet, the land could have been settled long before the 1576 census. The Kolychevs could have been the founders, for the reference to Fedor Semenov syn Kolychev as the former holder of the Resurrection hamlets of Vasily Markov held by Mitka Ivanov syn Oboturov in 1539 proves the family's earlier residency in the province.⁹⁷ Even if the settlements were comparatively new, the land still could have been old. Lords often held a parcel of land for decades before attracting enough peasants for a settlement. The absence of earlier references to the family in the parish where the settlements were located, however, requires a possibly new classification.

Six families (the Asaevs of Smolna, the Princes Kostrov of St Michael's-on-the-Uza, the Kositskies and Pleshcheevs of Belsky of St Yuri's, the Levshins of Pazherevitsy, and the Shchogolevs of the Porkhov area) without earlier representatives in the same parish as 1576 held six of the seven definitely classifiable new *pomesties*. Prince Yuri Kostrov's St Michael's-on-the-Uza parcel of fifteen *vyts* was classified new because the census-takers of 1576 referred to the parcel as the "*pomestie formerly held by Peter Esiukov.*"⁹⁸ Istoma Ivanov syn Shchogolev's six *vyts* in the Porkhov area were classified new because his hamlets of Gorodek and Nevazhino were held by Stepan Zviagn syn Sukov in 1539.⁹⁹ If the new *pomestie* held by the old Belsky of St Yuri's Pleshcheev family is considered with the six new *pomesties* held by families without earlier representatives in the parish, the seven nonresidential parcels were able to be classified definitely new, representing 13.46% of the definitely classifiable parcels.

THE POMESTIE SYSTEM AFTER THE OPRICHNINA

The low rate of turnover between 1539 and 1576 discussed above only characterizes the Shelonskaia *pomestie* system on the eve of the oprichnina. Since

the abandoned and confiscated parcels had not been reassigned, the census-takers referred to them by the most recent former landlord's name just as their late fifteenth century predecessors had called the volosts by the names of the former Novgorod votchinniks. The possession of the almost the definitely classifiable estates by the same family for several generations proves the stability of the system on the eve of the oprichnina.

The oprichniki of Ivan IV who sacked Novgorod and plundered the surrounding countryside in 1570 severely dislocated the agrarian economy of the Porkhov district, which had the misfortune of being located along the route to Novgorod. By 1576 most of the pomeshchiks and almost all of the peasants had fled. The percentage of abandoned arable land and hamlets shows the extent of the damage. 1852.78 vyts (79.6%) of the arable land and 699 (75.56%) of the 925 hamlets located on the 239 parcels were abandoned.¹⁰⁰ The situation was worse on the nonresidential parcels, where the devastation was nearly total: 449 (84.5%) of the 531 hamlets located on nonresidential parcels and 1272.65 (90.6%) of the arable vyts were abandoned. Although the condition of the residential parcels was somewhat better, 580.13 (62.9%) of the 922.68 arable vyts and 250 (63.45%) of the 394 hamlets were abandoned.

The economic devastation severely disrupted the operation of the pomestie system. The pomeshchik could not support his family and purchase the horses and weapons needed to serve the crown without the income provided by his dues-paying peasants. By 1576 only twenty-six (43%) manors were occupied and obrok-paying peasants were residing on only six residential and two non-residential parcels.¹⁰¹ The peasants of Bogdan Belsky who resided in four homesteads in the hamlet at Liutoi paid an annual obrok of two Muscovite rubles for their 1.5 vyts of arable land.¹⁰² The two peasant homesteads residing in Vasily Palitsyn's hamlet of Babachevo paid an annual obrok of ten altyns for their half vyt.¹⁰³ Although all of the pomeshchiks were receiving an income, some of the peasants were unable to pay. In 1576 the five peasant homesteads in Mosei Evreev's pochinovs of Trebikha and Skoromoshikha paid an annual obrok of one Muscovite ruble for their one vyt of arable land while the pochinov of Perelog, whose peasants used to pay eight altyns and two dengas for their quarter vyt, paid nothing.¹⁰⁴ Stepan Istomin syn Shchogolov received nothing from his peasants, who had fled, but five households of cotters (*bobyli*) paid one Muscovite grivna per year and provided two days' labor.¹⁰⁵

The location of the four parishes where the pomeshchiks were still receiving obrok suggests but does not prove that the greatest devastation occurred between the southern border and the town of Porkhov. None of the four parishes was close to Porkhov: Dubrovno, Belsky of St Yury's and St Michael and St George's were near the northern border between the Porkhov and Nov-

gorod districts while Degzha was forty versts southeast of Porkhov. Given the small number of estates still furnishing the lord with an income, however, the difference in the degree of devastation between the northern and southern sections of the district may be marginal.

Pazherevitsy parish was representative of most of the Porkhov district lands ravaged by the oprichnina in the early 1570s. Only two of the twenty-five pomesties had landlords in residence. Vasily Terpigorev resided on his manor at Puzhok while Semen Pustoshkin lived at Klimovo. The two pomeshchiks, who were state officials (*prikazhshiki*) in charge of the postal stations and public roads, had ancestors living in the parish before 1500.¹⁰⁶ Ivan's oprichniki confiscated twelve (54.5%) of the remaining twenty-two parcels while the former landlords abandoned eleven parcels, perhaps in response to the tsar's general order to leave the parish.

The families referred to in the 1576 cadasters were compared to the Pazherevitsy pomeshchiks of 1539 and 1500. Six of the fifteen families (Karpovs, Pustoshkins, Tatianins, Terpigorev-Chetvertkins, Nazimovs, and Shablykins) had representatives residing on old Pazherevitsy pomesties in 1539. The other two families, the Karpovs and Shablykins, received their lands shortly after the census of 1500 and their estates were classified as "old" by the census-takers during the 1539 census.¹⁰⁷

Nine families (the Lazorevs, Levshins, Kartmazovs, Kositskies, Turgenevs, Tyrtovs, Rezantsovs, Korobins, and Volnins) are mentioned in the 1576 Pazherevitsy returns, but not in 1539. Since the 1576 parish returns only record the lands of the pomeshchiks most recently residing in the parish, family representatives living in other parishes could also have held Pazherevitsy land. Saltan Andreev Lazorev, for example, held a small parcel of Pazherevitsy land recorded under the returns for his Our Lady's pomestie.¹⁰⁸ Semen Ivanov Kartmazov lived on his Yasno pomestie but also held land in Pazherevitsy in 1539.¹⁰⁹

Three of the nine families had representatives residing on other Shelonskaia pomesties that did not include Pazherevitsy land in 1539. The 1539 Kolomna returns list Osip Rezantsov as an old parish pomeshchik, but Rezantsov did not hold any Pazherevitsy land.¹¹⁰ In 1539 Semen Yakimov syn Turgenev held a Los pomestie while the Ivan and Zuk Tyrtovs held Degzha and Yasno pomesties respectively. Although neither Ivan nor Zuk held Pazherevitsy land, other Tyrtovs residing in parishes without surviving returns could have held Pazherevitsy land. The abridged returns from 1500 mention Mikita Tyrtov as the holder of two sokhas (six tax units) in the hamlets of the former Novgorod votchinnik Yurka Bozhin in Pazherevitsy parish.¹¹¹

The remaining four families (the Kositskies, Korobins, Levshins, and Volnins) did not have any known representatives in either Vodskaia or Shelonskaia

provinces in 1539. There were Kositskies in both provinces in 1500, but none in 1539.¹¹² One Volnin (Matvei) resided on twelve sokhas in the St Peter parish of Shelonskaia province in 1500, but there are no Volnins in any of the Novgorod cadasters surviving from the 1530s; despite the loss of some of his hamlets' earlier returns, Semen Volnin's 5.5 vyts could have been new.¹¹³ The only Korobin listed before 1576 lived in Derevskaia province in 1498; although the earlier returns for one of his hamlets were lost, Posnik Korobin's 6.75 vyts were probably new.¹¹⁴ The Levshins do not appear in the Novgorod cadasters before 1552 when the Zhedritsy returns record Nenarok Levshin's succession to his father Vasily's pomestie after the latter's death at Kazan in 1551.¹¹⁵ The 1539 Zhedritsy returns are fragmentary, raising the possibility that Vasily Levshin lived in the parish in 1539. Since no Pazherevitsy lands are mentioned in the 1552 returns, Nenarok must have acquired and lost his Pazherevitsy lands after 1552 and before the crown's confiscation in the early 1570s. Nenarok may have retired to his Zhedritsy pomestie after the loss of his Pazherevitsy lands, but his ultimate fate is unknown since the 1576 Zhedritsy returns are lost.

The confiscation of Nenarok Levshin's recently acquired Pazherevitsy lands shows the tsar's willingness to seize the lands of the newer parish families. If the confiscated Volnin and Korobin parcels were also new, the three most recently enfeoffed newer families were losing their lands along with the older Terpigorev, Pustoshkin, and Tatianin families. The sovereign also took the maintenance pomestie of Maria Rezanov, whose husband had acquired his Pazherevitsy pomestie after 1539. The use of the same formula designating other confiscations during the oprichnina period and the inclusion of her returns with pomeshchiks "ordered not to reside in the parish" suggests Maria, the widow of Fedor Rezanov, was forced to leave involuntarily.¹¹⁶

While Ivan was confiscating recently acquired pomesties, he allowed two representatives of old parish families, Vasily Terpigorev and Semen Pustoshkin to reside in the parish. Although the estates could have been new, both pomeshchiks were yamshchiks probably serving from lands traditionally reserved for the yamshchik.¹¹⁷ Their estates were new because they were new yamshchiks and not because the tsar intended to replace the old pomeshchiks with servingmen from other families.¹¹⁸ A fully rational monarch concerned about Novgorod's loyalty would not have employed two representatives of the oldest families as administrators in charge of postal roads and stations, especially in a region close to the front in wartime. He would have appointed loyal Muscovite oprichniki. By 1576 Terpigorevs and Pustoshkins had been residing in Pazherevitsy for nearly a century.

A rational tsar faced with real treason could have attributed the Novgorod's disloyalty to the legal nature of the pomestie. By 1576 the descendants of the

original families enfeoffed by Ivan III had held their lands for nearly a century, long enough for strong regional loyalties to emerge from intermarriage and social ties. The state actually had promoted this by allowing the sons and grandsons of the original pomeshchiks to inherit the family's lands. The government could have reversed this development by transferring the old landlords to new lands outside of the region, as Ivan III had done with the rebellious Novgorod boyars. But Ivan IV was not acting rationally during the oprichnina. Instead of replacing the old landlords with new servingmen loyal to the sovereign, the tsar left some of the older families retain their lands while confiscating the estates of the more recently enfeoffed pomeshchiks. He was attacking treason rather than the legal nature of the pomestie as hereditary property.

The fate of the abandoned and confiscated pomesties in the Porkhov parishes between the oprichnina terror of the early 1570s and the census of 1576 is additional evidence of the tsar's irrationality. Ivan III required less than a decade after exiling the old Novgorod boyars to reassign their lands to loyal Muscovite gentry. The lands abandoned by the pomeshchiks and confiscated by Ivan IV were still unassigned six years after the oprichnina. Although the state now legally possessed the land, the estates were not administered as obrok-paying crown land. All the peasants' residences on the twelve confiscated and twelve abandoned Pazherevitsy pomesties were empty and none of the arable land was being cultivated.¹¹⁹ Although most of the two yamshchiks' hamlets were being cultivated, neither landlord received obrok or barshchina. Even the "neighboring peasants Ivanko Pavlov and Kiprianko Yuriev from the sloboda [who] used to cultivate" one abandoned vyt in Pustoshkin's hamlet of Krovtsy no paid nothing.¹²⁰ Whether the peasants were former residents who had fled into the forest during the oprichnina is unknown in the absence of any references to a former landlord.¹²¹

CONCLUSION

The comparison of the Bezobrazov cadaster with earlier censuses confirms the stability of the pomestie system during the first century of its existence. On the eve of the oprichnina the descendants of the original pomeshchiks enfeoffed in the later fifteenth century were residing in the same parishes as their parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents. 133 (57.6%) of the 231 parcels of pomesties not held as maintenance pomesties belonged to old parish families. Since the loss of some hamlets' earlier returns prevented most of the parcels from being classified definitely, the percentage held by old families probably underestimates the continuity of the possession of the pomestie. The much

higher percentage of old pomesties among the definitely classifiable parcels supports this thesis. Seventy-two or 86.7% of the eighty-three parcels were held by the same family for more than a generation. Since seventy-six percent of the old parcels were also old in 1539, the families of 1576 were descended directly from the original pomeshchiks enfeoffed in the 1480s.

The family's possession of the manor from generation to generation is another index of the continuity of the pomestie before the devastation of the oprichnina. The pomeshchiks' residency on the same manors in the same hamlets as their fathers and grandfathers implies the development of the strong local ties characteristic of landed gentries. The higher percentage (64.4%) of residential and lower percentage (55%) of nonresidential parcels held by old families shows that the residences were less likely to be alienated than other lands. The greater percentage of abandoned hamlets and arable on the nonresidential parcels is additional evidence of the pomeshchik's reluctance to leave his residence. So does the continuing occupation of nearly half of the manors by the pomeshchiks or their servants after the tsar's general order to leave.

The ability of the old parish families to retain their pomesties for nearly a century proves that the pomestie was considered hereditary property in customary if not statutory law. Although the state could deprive cavalymen of their pomesties for failure to provide military service, the Service Decree of 1555/1556 also deprived boyars who failed to serve of their patrimonial votchinas. The confiscations of pomesties and general order to the pomeshchiks to leave their lands in the 1570s only resemble the assertion of the state's authority over conditional property on the surface. The tsar created the oprichnina to fight treason, not to assert the state's authority over conditional property. Since anyone convicted of treason lost his property, the confiscations during the oprichnina reveal more about the tsar's determination to punish treason than the legal nature of the Novgorod pomestie.

The oprichnina nearly destroyed the stability displayed by the pomestie system during the first ninety years of its existence. Ivan III created the pomestie system to support the military servingmen required by the crown to defend the expanded borders of the Muscovite state. Since the crown could not afford to maintain a standing army of paid cavalymen, the pomeshchiks were supported from the obrok paid by the peasants. The system continued to function for nearly a century before his grandson Ivan IV sent the oprichnina to punish Novgorod for its suspected treason. The devastation caused by the oprichniki who stole grain and burned the peasant homesteads in their path caused most of the peasants to flee. Incapable of supporting themselves without the peasants' dues, the landlords had to abandon their old pomesties for new lands elsewhere. Since the region depended on the pomeshchik cavalry

for its defense, their departure made the area vulnerable to Muscovy's traditional enemies, Poland and Sweden. A generation later the more powerful of the two, Sweden, would occupy Novgorod and administer the entire region until the Treaty of Stolbovo returned it to the Russian state in 1617.

NOTES

1. For the surviving Smolna returns see *NPK*, V, 650–60 (1576); IV, 564–70; and V, 381–87 (1524). The Smolna returns from 1524 were limited to the crown lands. For the Dubrovno returns see *NPK*, V, 667–80 (1576) and IV, 180–208 (1498). For the Opoka returns, see *NPK*, V, 680–83 (1576); IV, 162–80 (complete 1498 returns); and V, 70 (abridged 1498 returns. See *NPK*, V, 663–67 for the 1576 and V, 66 for the abridged 1498 St Michael-on-the-Uza returns; the 1498 St Michael returns in *NPK*, V, 189–92 concern the grand prince's crown lands. See *NPK*, V, 582–613 for the 1576 Karachunsk returns and V, 66, for the abridged 1498 returns. The fragmentary returns for five Karachunsk pomesties from 1498 are also in V, 269–75. Although the returns are dated 1524 by the editors, A.A. Kaufman found from the references to the termination of tax exemptions in 1501 and 1503 that the records actually refer to the "new census" conducted between 1495 and 1505; see his *Novgorodskiiia pistsovyia knigi v statisticheskoi obrabotke*, 5.

2. See *NPK*, V, 68, for the reference to Sobina Karaulov. Druzhin Karaulov's 1576 returns are in V, 585; Sumorok Karaulov's are in V, 583.

3. For the 1576 returns for the Vasily Shishkin parcel, see *NPK*, V, 672–73. For the 1539 returns for his father and uncle's pomestie held in joint tenancy, see *NPK*, IV, 318.

4. The Ruchie returns consist of two residential parcels separately held by Filip and Gregory Golovachev. For Filip's returns, see *NPK*, V, 694–95. For Gregory's returns, see *NPK*, V, 696.

5. For the returns from the Ogareva maintenance pomestie, see *NPK*, V, 639.

6. See *NPK*, V, 641–42 for the 1576 returns from the Ivan Borisov syn Ogarev pomestie and IV, 280, for the 1539 returns from Semen Aleksandrov syn Ogarev's pomestie.

7. See *NPK*, V, 670–71 (1576) and IV, 197 (1498).

8. See *NPK*, V, 685–86 (1576) and IV, 172–75 (1498).

9. See *NPK*, V, 67 (1576) and V, 600 (1498).

10. See *NPK*, V, 658–59 (1576) and IV, 565 (1552).

11. See *NPK*, V, 657–58 (1576) and IV, 656 (1552).

12. See *NPK*, V, 653–54 (1576) and IV, 667–68 (1552).

13. For Yuri Tyrtov's 1576 returns see *NPK*, V, 646–47. Yuri Vasiliev syn Tyrtov's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 274. For Vasily Tyrtov's abridged returns from 1498, see *NPK*, V, 59. Although the hamlets' returns are missing from the abridgement, Vasily and his son Yuri both held the former hamlets of Konstantin Nemogo Babkin. Since Vasily held the entire volost, the Babkin hamlets held by his son Yuri were already old by 1539.

14. Alexis Kalitin's 1576 returns for his manor at Skugra are in *NPK*, V, 658–59; the 1552 returns for his pomestie are in *NPK*, IV, 565. Oliabia Osipov syn Kalitin's 1576 returns including the manor of Opche Pole are in *NPK*, V, 657–58; his 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 565. Gregory Tatarinov's returns for the manor at Zalesie are in *NPK*, V, 653–54; his 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 567–68.

15. See *NPK*, V, 642 for Zloba Uskoi's 1576 returns; *NPK*, V, 643–44 for his brother Semen's returns. Rium Fedorov syn Voronoi's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 254–57; Rium Fedorov syn Uskoi's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 257–58.

16. *NPK*, V, 638–39 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 247 (1539).

17. See *NPK*, V, 607–11 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 410 (1539). The lord abandoned the manor before 1576. The reference in the 1576 returns to "Loba Buturlin's pomestie, which was assigned to Osip Pleshcheev" ("Da Lobanovskogo pomest'e Buturlina, chto bylo za Osipov za Pleshcheeva") is interesting. A comparison of the hamlets with Andrew Buturlin's 1539 returns confirmed the estate as old Buturlin land in 1539. The heading of the returns implies that Pleshcheev held the pomestie before Buturlin. If so, the estate reverted to the Buturlin's after Pleshcheev's death. The problem with this interpretation is the reference to the manor as the former seat (*dvor*) of Osip Timofeev syn Pleshcheev. Since the returns for the manor do not mention Buturlin, Pleshcheev could have been the last pomeshchik to hold the estate. The Pleshcheevs' relationship with the oprichnina may resolve the problem. Although representatives of both families were sitting in the Boyar Duma on the eve of the oprichnina, Alexis Danilovich Pleshcheev-Basmanov was especially close to the tsar. The author of the *Piskarevsk Chronicle* (see Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoi dумы," p. 72) attributed the oprichnina to Alexis's remarks to Ivan during the latter's temporary retirement to Alexander's suburb (*Aleksandrovskaiia sloboda*). The relationship did not last, for the government executed Pleshcheev along with his nephew Zakhary Ivanovich Pleshcheev-Ochin during the purge following the sack of Novgorod in 1570; see Zimin, 74–75. If Osip's fortunes depended on his cousin and the oprichnina, it would have been reasonable for the tsar to evict him after the fall of Pleshcheev-Basmanov and the suppression of the original oprichniks. Vasily Pleshcheev's abandonment of his Bolchino manor at the same time supports this thesis; see *NPK*, V, 611–12. By restoring the land to the Buturlins, the sovereign recognized the family's proprietary interest in land held by their representatives for most of the sixteenth century. The restoration of the Buturlins' legal title, however, could not ensure the manor's reoccupation. The absence of a reference to Buturlin in the returns for the manor may reflect simply the landlord's failure to attract the peasants necessary to support his military service.

18. Porosha's manor was abandoned before 1576; see *NPK*, IV, 582. For Saltan and Bulat's 1539 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 306.

19. *NPK*, V, 623 (1576), and *NPK*, IV, 306 (1539).

20. In the 1570s Prince Posnik Volodimerov syn Beloselsky resided in the hamlet of Kichkovo held by his father in 1539, but Prince Volodimer preferred to reside at Dolgaia Niva. See *NPK*, V, 630 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 419 (1539).

21. See *NPK*, V, 667–68 for Fedor Kharlamov's 1576 returns and *NPK*, IV, 191–92, for his father's 1498 returns. His brother Mikifor resided in the village of Podmoshie on his share of his father's lands; see *NPK*, V, 669.

22. For Andrew Ermolin syn Kharlamov's 1498 returns see *NPK*, IV, 194. The returns also refer to Opoka and Ruchaisk parcels, but the Opoka returns do not mention him while the Ruchaisk returns do not refer to a manor. See *NPK*, IV, 216 for the 1498 Ruchaisk and *NPK*, IV, 162–80, for the 1498 Opoka returns. Semen Rusinov syn Kharlamov's returns are in *NPK*, V, 669.

23. *NPK*, IV, 197 (1498) and *NPK*, V, 670–71 (1576).

24. *NPK*, IV, 172–75 (1498) and *NPK*, V, 685–86 (1576).

25. The 1498 residence of Dmitry Evreev, whose pomestie was held by Ivan Evreev in the 1570s, is unknown; see *NPK*, V, 68 (1498) and *NPK*, V, 576 (1576). The other case concerns Istoma Cheglov, who resided in the hamlet of Pliusnino in 1570 on the former estate of Ivashko Cheglov. Since the only 1498 returns for the parish are in the abridgement that omits the returns for the hamlets, Ivashko's residence is unknown. Because the hamlet was named after the former Novgorod votchinnik, Afanasy Pliusnin, however, it probably existed before Ivashko received the original grant at the end of the fifteenth century; see *NPK*, V, 67 (1498) and *NPK*, V, 600 (1576).

26. For the reference to Ivan Ivanov syn's father as the former holder of his pomestie, see *NPK*, IV, 250 ("Da Ivanu zh Ogarevu z brateiu otdeleno k staromu ikh pomest'iu ko ottsovskomu v Degozhskom pogoste. . .")

27. See *NPK*, IV, 382f for Subbota Shablykin's 1539 returns.

28. See *NPK*, IV, 363 for Irina Tatarinova's 1539 returns. Her grandsons, the sons of Yakov Tatarinov, held the estate in 1552; see *NPK*, IV, 567–68.

29. *NPK*, IV, 313–316.

30. See *NPK*, IV, 311f for the 1539 Chebotaev returns. Iosif and Vasily Kalitin's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 566. The Kalitins were also an old Vodskaia family. In 1539 Fedor Vasiliev syn Kalitin held twelve old tax units in the St Andrew's at Gruzinsk parish where his cousins Loba Grigoriev syn and Patreky Peresvetov syn held two and fourteen old tax units respectively; see *PKVP*, 91–92. Fedor also held seven old tax units in the same parish of Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov where another cousin, Stepan Ivanov syn, held 10.5 old tax units; see *PKVP*, 101–102. Loba Grigoriev syn had an additional four old tax units in St Nicholas at Pidebsk; see *PKVP*, 6–7.

31. For Moisei Evreev's 1576 returns see *NPK*, V, 605–607; for Ivan and Michael Evreev's 1498 Bolchino returns see *NPK*, V, 70; for their separate Karachunsk parcels see *NPK*, V, 68. For the reference to Novoselie in Semen Semenov syn Pustoshkin's 1539 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 407. Novoselie was crown land in 1498; see *NPK*, IV, 159. On the lack of returns for the Bolchino hamlets of Krasnoselie, Pokolotovo, and Khrap Bolshaia and Menshaia, see respectively in the *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 150, 188, and 215.

32. *NPK*, V, 669–70.

33. *NPK*, V, 676–77.

34. See *NPK*, V, 585 for Druzhin Karaulov's returns and *NPK*, V, 592 for Sumorok Karaulov's returns. Sobina Karaulov's 1498 abridged returns are in *NPK*, V, 68.

35. See *NPK*, V, 592, for Maksim Unkovsky's 1576 returns; see *NPK*, V, 268, for Oleshka and *NPK*, V, 269–70 for Ivashko Unkovsky's fragmentary 1498 returns. Oleshka and Ivashko were the sons of Ostafy Unkovsky.

36. Vlas Kharlamov's returns are in *NPk*, V, 678–79. For 1576 returns of Vlas's cousins see *NPk*, V, 667–669. Andrew Ermolin syn Kharlamov's 1498 returns are in *NPk*, IV, 194. Ivan Mikhailov syn Kharlamov's 1498 returns are in *NPk*, IV, 191. Lev Kharlamov's 1498 returns are in *NPk*, IV, 192f. Karas Esiukov's returns from 1498 are in *NPk*, IV, 200–203; Boris Esiukov's 1498 returns are in *NPk*, IV, 203f. See *NPk*, IV, 195–97 for the returns from 1498 for the adjacent but separate pomesties of Gridia and Mikula Grigoriev deti Esiukov. Semen Yuriev syn Esiukov's 1576 returns are in *NPk*, V, 669.

37. Iliia Borisov syn Kositsky's 1576 returns are in *NPk*, V, 670–71. The other Kositsk hamlets were held by the Boris and Karas Esiukov in 1498.

38. *NPk*, V, 573 (1576) and *NPk*, IV, 309–11 (1539).

39. See *NPk*, V, 619–20 for Semen Pustoshkin's 1576 returns. On the lost references to Brilino, Klimovo, and Priatishcha, see *NPk*, Index, I–VI, 108, 144, and 191 respectively. The 1539 Shablykin returns are in *NPk*, IV, 382–85.

40. See *NPk*, V, 618–19, for Vasily Terpigorev's 1576 returns. For the 1539 returns of the earlier holders of the Terpigorev parcel, see *NPk*, IV, 422 (Tretiak Shablykin), 444 (Semen Kartmazov), and 373 (Fedor Denisiev syn Ragozin).

41. On the yam see Pushkarev, 29–30. On the kormlenie see Pushkarev, 44.

42. *NPk*, IV, 444. “V derevne v vopchei v Kozhemiatskine chto bylo dane pod Kozhemiatskoi iam, a iz stari bylo za Ondreets za Ovtssynym, vopche s iamschchiki.”

43. *NPk*, IV, 316.

44. *NPk*, IV, 391.

45. *NPk*, V, 60.

46. See *NPk*, V, 650–53 for Vasily Grigorievich Ziuzin's 1576 returns. The 1524 crown land returns are in *NPk*, V, 383.

47. On the *dumnyi dvoriane*, the upper middle service class gentry chosen to serve in the Boyar Duma, see Hellie, 22, and Pushkarev, 16. On the *okolnichii*, who served as judges, chancery heads, and military commanders, see Hellie, 22, 24, 71, 132–33, 282 n. 2; also see Pushkarev, 74. On Ziuzin's service career see Zimin, “Sostav boiarskoi dumy,” 79.

48. Prince Afanasy Belsky's 1576 returns are in *NPk*, V, 655–57. The 1524 returns for Dno are in *NPk*, V, 385. On the absence of earlier returns for the Smolna hamlets of Brodok and Shklevo, see *NPk*, Index, I–VI, 108, 224. The Brodok held by Prince Volodimer Ivanovich Beloselsky in 1539 was located in the Belsky of St Yuri's parish; see *NPk*, IV, 419. On the Belsky family see Zimin, “Sostav boiarskoi dumy,” 51, 52, 63 n. 255, 64, 71, 72 n. 353, and 75.

49. See *NPk*, V, 660–63, for Bogdan Belsky's 1576 returns. The hamlets held by Lazorev in 1539 include Pankratovo, Stvolino, Egolsko, Medvednikovo, Ekhirevo, Potseluevo, Kolianitsa, Krivaia Chiasovnia, Liutoi, Korkhovo, Ramenie, Mokroe, Zakhonie, Liutoi (Lutkova), Sorokino, and Vyskid. For Lazorev's returns see *NPk*, IV, 293–94. On the absence of earlier returns for Menshikovo see *NPk*, Index, I–VI, 163.

50. See *NPk*, V, 634–36 for Prince Egupov Cherkasky's 1576 returns. Prince Beloselsky's 1539 returns are in *NPk*, IV, 419–420; Volodimer Cheglovskov's are in *NPk*, IV, 426; Tretiak Shablykin's are in *NPk*, IV, 421; his brother Ushak's are in *NPk*, IV,

428, as Alexis Selivanov's are. See the following pages in the *NPK*, Index, I-VI for the references to the ten hamlets with lost earlier returns: Simanovo (199), Khotovan' (215), Novinka (175), Maloe Semkino (161), Yukovo (127), Selishcha (198), Belska (110), Novaia Niva (173), Luchinovik (158), and Goristoe (121).

51. See *NPK*, V, for the Karasov returns and *NPK*, V, 674 for the Kniazhnin returns.

52. See *NPK*, V, 593–94 for the Azariev returns.

53. See *NPK*, V, 632–33, for Andrew Onikeev's 1576 returns. For the 1539 returns from Krutets see *NPK*, IV, 421. For Zapolie see *NPK*, IV, 428. For Podklinie see *NPK*, IV, 420. For Luki see *NPK*, IV, 429. On the absence of returns for the Belsky of St Yury's hamlet of Tiukovo, see *NPK*, Index, I-VI, 210.

54. *NPK*, V, 675 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 445 (1539).

55. *NPK*, V, 596 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 463 (1539).

56. *NPK*, V, 664 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 289–91 (1539).

57. See *NPK*, V, 593–94 for Zaleshanin and *NPK*, V, 599 for Vzhdan Bobrov's returns. The term 'nonresidential parcel' refers to the land held by a pomeschchik who resided in a manor house (*bol'shoi dvor*) in another parish. Although the lord lived elsewhere, peasants continued to reside on the land unless it was called an abandoned parcel.

58. The 1548 charter was issued to Stepan Fedorov syn Bobrov by the Novgorod majordomo Alexander Upin and the secretaries for the crown lands, Kazarin Dubrovsky and Bogdan Loginov. See *NPK*, V, 322.

59. See *NPK*, V, 627–28 for Zhdan Kositsky's 1576 returns, *NPK*, IV, 419, for Prince Beloselsky's 1539 returns and *NPK*, IV, 418 for Piatoi Shablykin's 1539 returns. See the following pages in the *NPK*, Index, I-VI for the references to the hamlets with lost earlier returns: Vetshi (113), Grivo (124), Tesenok (207), Rechki (196), Bykovo (109) and Golubikha (121).

60. For Vasily Pleshcheev's incomplete 1576 returns see *NPK*, V, 611–613. Although peasants and cotters lived in the hamlets, the manor was completely abandoned. Since the returns do not contain the census-takers' notation "confiscated by the crown," Pleshcheev's departure may have been voluntary. On the other hand, he could have been responding to the tsar's general order for the pomeschchiks to reside elsewhere. The loss of the final paragraph of the Bolchino cadaster, where the order would have been cited, however, prevents the thesis from being proven. Although Pleshcheev belonged to a boyar family, he was not a boyar himself. See the list of sixteenth century boyars in Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoi dумы," 85.

61. *NPK*, V, 627–28 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 188 (1498).

62. *NPK*, IV, 297 for Alfery Pleshcheev's 1539 returns; *NPK*, V, 611–12 for Vasily Pleshcheev's 1576 returns.

63. Prince Egupov's 1576 returns are in *NPK*, V, 601–605. Vesniak and Alexis Dubrovsky's 1552 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 553–55. Their father Yury's returns are in *NPK*, IV, 510–13.

64. *NPK*, V, 580 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 316 (1539).

65. *NPK*, V, 576 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 316 (1539).

66. *NPK*, V, 573–74. For Rumiantsov's 1539 returns, see *NPK*, IV, 309–11.

67. See *NPK*, IV, 260–61 for Matvei Mikhailov syn and Vasily Alekseev syn Palitsyn returns from 1539.

68. *NPK*, V, 576, and *NPK*, IV, 496.

69. The correlation of 0.99 between the mean distance of the nonresidential parcels from the lord's manor obtained for the 128 pomesties of 1540 capable of being classified as "old" or "new" showed the earlier pomeshchiks' preference for lands near the manor. See Hammond, "History . . .," 228–229. The small number of parishes with surviving returns from the census of 1576 and the later sixteenth century Shelonskaia census-takers' failure to record the returns of all of the pomeshchik's lands under the parish where the manor is located unfortunately prevented the use of correlation and linear regression analysis.

70. See *NPK* V, 600–601 for Pleshcheev's nonresidential parcel; and *NPK* V, 611–12 for his residential parcel.

71. Druzhin Karaulov's first Karachunsk parcel consisted of the hamlets of Pestovo and Shchepets; see *NPK* V, 582–83. The second parcel consisted of his manor in the village of Frolovo and the hamlets of Shilova, Vishenie Yakimovo, Gogolka, and Rytitsa; see *NPK*, V, 585–586. His third parcel included the hamlets of Ereshkino, Terebeshnitsa, Dolgusha, Belogubovo, Lipotiagi, Prusa, Osie, Rebrino, Khamlovo, Lipovitsa, Vorotnitsa, Olferovo, Kakovkino, Pirozhok, Ofanasovichi, Lagirevo, and Shevnitsyno; see *NPK*, V, 587–90.

72. See "V Karachiunitskii [Karachunsk] pogoste pomeshchikovy kotorye sela i derevni ostalis' za gosudarevoiu za desiatinoiu i khrest'ianskoiu pashneiu" in *NPK*, V, 582.

73. See *NPK*, V, 582, 585–86, and 590.

74. See *NPK*, V, 586 for the returns from Zaleshanin Bobrov's former pomestie.

75. See *NPK*, V, 671–72 for the returns from Ilia Kositsky's former Dubrovno pomestie and *NPK*, V, 629–30, for the returns of his former Belsky of St Yury's pomestie.

76. For Ogarev's Degzha parcel, see *NPK*, V, 641–42. The number of Nativity hamlets is unknown since the returns only give the former pomeshchiks' vyts or arable land; see *NPK*, V, 637. For the other nine pomeshchiks holding lands outside of their residential parish see the Appendix: "The Former Shelonskaia Residential Pomeshchiks of 1576."

77. Although earlier censuses gave the pomeshchik's patronymic in addition to his Christian name and surname, the cadaster of 1576 usually omits the patronymic. In all but one of the eight cases involving residential pomeshchiks, the patronymic is only recorded in the returns from the residence. Maksim Aleksandrov syn Unkovsky is the sole exception; the returns from his Karachunsk residence refer to him as Maksim Unkovsky while the returns for his Karachunsk nonresidential parcel include the patronymic Aleksandrov; see *NPK*, V, 592 and 583–84 respectively. The statistics on the average distance of the nonresidential parcels from the manor identify pomeshchiks with patronymics with the other pomeshchiks having the same Christian name and surname without patronymics. Maksim Unkovsky is considered the same pomeshchik as Maksim Aleksandrov syn Unkovsky, for example. If this assumption were dropped, four pomeshchiks referred to by their patronymics holding

four parcels would be eliminated from the category of pomeshchiks holding lands outside of their residential parish. This would leave seven residential pomeshchiks holding eight parcels in other parishes. The average distance of the eight parcels from the lord's manor would become 20.96 versts, an insignificant statistical difference from the 20.56 versts calculated for eleven pomeshchiks and twelve parcels. Two of the eight parcels would be less than ten versts from the manor, five less than twenty versts, and seven less than thirty versts. If the four pomeshchiks referred to by their Christian names and surnames holding five parcels in different areas of the same parish were considered, seven (53%) of the thirteen parcels were less than ten versts from the manor while ten (77%) of the thirteen parcels were less than twenty versts from the manor. The pomeshchiks were Druzhin Karaulov, Sumorok Karaulov, Niki-for Miakoi, and Vasily Pleshcheev.

78. *NPK*, V, 655 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 565 (1552).

79. *NPK*, IV, 568–70 for Prince Michael Konstantinovich Zasekin's 1552 returns. The 1576 returns of Prince Andrew are in *NPK*, V, 659. Prince Ivan's returns are in *NPK*, V, 660. Since the patronymics of the two princes are not given, their relationship to Prince Michael is unknown.

80. *NPK*, V, 677–78 (1576); *NPK*, IV, 308 (1539); and *NPK*, IV, 186 (1498). Although the 1539 Dubrovno returns are missing, the three Lazorev brothers resided in the Porkhov area, whose returns survive.

81. *NPK*, V, 665 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 289 (1539). Boris's fourth hamlet (Fedovo) does not have earlier returns. See *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 227.

82. *NPK*, V, 578 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 302 (1539).

83. See *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 223 on Shriakhovo. Ivan Bolshoi's 1576 returns are in *NPK*, V, 639–40. See Daniel Ogarev's returns in *NPK*, V, 640–41, and Vasily Ogarev's in *NPK*, V, 639. Ivan Ivanov syn's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 247. Stepan Sudakov syn Ogarev's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 267–68.

84. See *NPK*, IV, 179 (1498), *NPK*, IV, 557 (1552) and *NPK*, V, 692 (1576).

85. *NPK*, V, 617–18 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 578–79 (1552).

86. *NPK*, V, 637 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 572–74.

87. *NPK*, V, 581 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 449 (1539). On the lack of additional references to Chistitsa, see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 222.

88. *NPK*, V, 583 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 304 (1539).

89. Paul Istomin syn Nashchokin's returns are in *NPK*, V, 677. His nephew Ivan Semenov syn's are in *NPK*, V, 676–77.

90. Stepan Pleshcheev's 1576 returns are in *NPK*, V, 626. Shestoi Shablykin's 1539 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 431; Likhach Kvashnin's are in *NPK*, IV, 423.

91. Gregory Golovachev's 1576 returns are in *NPK*, V, 674. Karas Esiukov's 1498 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 201. On the absence of earlier references to the Golovachev's hamlets of Votskovo, Kulatino, Utushi, and Kholopia, see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 116, 152, 212, and 214.

92. For the Strechnev returns see *NPK*, V, 578. On the lack of earlier references to Vystosko and Pesachna, see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 117 and 184.

93. Boris Yaryshkin's 1576 returns are in *NPK*, V, 659. The references to Ivan and Mikifor are in *NPK*, V, 332 and 342 respectively. Another Ivan Yaryshkin also served

as the crown's Yasno steward in 1524; see *NPK*, V, 377. On the poselskie, see Pushkarev, 96. The distant location of Los and Gorodnia from Smolna makes it seem unlikely that the Yaryshkins would be enfeoffed in Smolna. Both parishes were nearly ninety versts from Smolna. On the other hand the Yasno farm possessed by Ivan as the crown's steward was only thirty-three versts to the south in the same Porkhov district as Smolna. The Yaryshkins could have entered military service and continued to reside in Yasno while receiving additional land in Smolna. The lack of references to the family in the 1539 Yasno and 1552 Smolna cadasters, however, suggests the family did not enter the Porkhov district before the later 1550s.

94. Meshcheria Ragozin's 1576 returns are in *NPK*, V, 675. Andrew Danilov syn Lazorev and Mikula Esiukov's 1498 returns are in *NPK*, IV, 186, 198.

95. *NPK*, IV, 476.

96. For Venedikt Kolychev's 1576 returns, see *NPK*, V, 626. On Moshok and Svetikha see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 167, 197.

97. The reference to Fedor Semenov syn Kolychev in the 1539 returns for the Oboturov pomestie is in *NPK*, IV, 458. Fedor Semenov syn was also the former holder of the Retno hamlets held by Semen Chikhachev in 1539. See the reference in *NPK*, IV, 494, which is repeated in the 1552 returns for the same pomestie in *NPK*, IV, 537. The 1552 cadaster also includes a reference to Fedor as the former holder of the Slaviatinski hamlets of Senka Kolesnitsyn; see *NPK*, IV, 562.

98. *NPK*, V, 664–65. The Kostrovs are an example of the numerous princes who were neither wealthy nor aristocratic enough to serve on the Boyar Duma. See Zimin's list of late fifteenth and sixteenth century boyars in "Sostav boiarskoi dumy," 84.

99. *NPK*, V, 580 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 301–302 (1539).

100. These statistics represent the author's summation of the figures given by the census-takers for each of the 231 parcels (fifty-nine residential and 172 nonresidential) of pomesties and eight maintenance pomesties in the twelve parishes with surviving returns.

101. Mosei Evreev and Peter Kositsky held the two nonresidential parcels. See *NPK*, V, 624–25 for the Evreev and *NPK*, V, 628–29, for the Kositsky nonresidential parcels.

102. *NPK*, V, 662.

103. *NPK*, V, 645–46.

104. *NPK*, V, 624–25.

105. *NPK*, V, 669–70.

106. The Pustoshkin returns are in *NPK*, V, 619–620; Terpigorev's are in *NPK*, V, 618–19. On the yam see above n. 50. On the length of the Terpigorevs' Pazherevitsy residency, see the reference to Alexis Timofeev syn Terpigorev in the abridged 1500 returns in *NPK*, V, 61. No Pustoshkins are mentioned in the 1500 abridgment, but the returns from 1539 mention Ivan Pustoshkin as an "old" Pazherevitsy pomeschchik; see *NPK*, IV, 389.

107. See *NPK*, IV, 391, for the Ivan Karpov pomestie; *NPK*, IV, 382f for the Subota Shablykin pomestie.

108. *NPK*, IV, 308.

109. *NPK*, IV, 444.

110. *NPK*, IV, 476.

111. *NPK*, IV, 237, 274, and 453, and *NPK*, V, 61.

112. *NPK*, V, 617.

113. *NPK*, V, 618.

114. *NPK*, V, 618.

115. *NPK*, V, 615–16 (1576) and *NPK*, IV, 575 (1552).

116. *NPK*, V, 618. The only other Rezantsovs referred to in the Novgorod cadasters were Daniel and Dmitry, both Shniatinsk pomeshchiks in 1539, and Yakov Osipov syn, a Kolomna pomeshchik in 1539. The references to Daniel and Dmitry concern their status as co-holders of one of the hamlets on Matvei Molchanov's estate; see IV, 501. The returns for Yakov's pomestie from 1539 do not include Pazherevitsy land.

117. On Vasily Terpigorev's probably new pomestie, see above, n. 45; his returns are in *NPK*, V, 618–19. For the returns for Semen Pustoshkin's possibly new pomestie, see *NPK*, V, 619–20. Ruchei, Krovtsyno, and Brylino were held by Subbotta Shablykin and his brothers Menshoi and Urmen in 1539; see *NPK*, IV, 382–85. The earlier returns of Glazanovo, Zapolie, Priatishcha, Klimovo, Chudino, Zapolie, Kapel, and Pupovo were lost.

118. On the lands reserved for the yamshchiks, see n. 50 and n. 151 above. The distinction between the pomesties and lands reserved for the yamshchiks in the summary of living and abandoned arable lands at the end of the Pazherevitsy cadaster supports the thesis that Terpigorev and Pustoshkin held a special category of pomesties. See *NPK*, V, 620.

119. See *NPK*, V, 613–618.

120. *NPK*, V, 619. The northern Russian sloboda was a small rural district; see Pushkarev, 128. Unlike the yamshchiks' peasants, the neighboring peasants cultivating three of Oliabia Osipov syn Kalitin's abandoned vyts paid an obrok of three altyns and two dengas to the crown's tselovalniks Zhuk Filipov and Gavrilko Mikhailov. Vasily Ziuzin's peasants paid five altyns and three dengas to Filipov and Mikhailov for cultivating half of an abandoned vyt on the neighboring estate of Vasily Asaev. The Kalitin returns are in *NPK*, V, 567; Asaev's are in *NPK*, V, 654. On the use of the tselovalnik (literally a "sworn man," one who has kissed the cross) as the state's local tax collector, see Pushkarev, 161.

121. The neighboring peasants who cultivated the few vyts still under cultivation in scattered hamlets in other parishes were also often unknown. The returns from the abandoned lands of the Smolna pomeshchik Oliabia Osipov syn Kalitin refers to the "neighboring peasants of the same parish" without mentioning their former landlord. See *NPK*, V, 657.

Chapter Seven

The Exchange and Acquisition of Additional Land in Early Sixteenth Century Vodskaia Province

The Shelonskaia cadasters surviving from the censuses of 1500 and 1540, all of which have been published, indicate that the pomestie resembled allodial rather than conditional land from the beginning of the pomestie system in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. The exchange of pomesties between pomeshchiks, the donation of hamlets held in pomestie to the church, and the passage of the pomestie to the former pomeshchiks' heirs at law are all attributes of allodial rather than conditional property.

The Vodskaia returns from the censuses of 1500 and 1540 provide additional evidence on the degree to which the pomestie resembled allodial rather than conditional property. Although some portions of the Vodskaia cadaster have not been published, those collected and edited by A. M. Gnevushev in 1917 represent more than 80 percent of the parishes whose returns survive from the census of 1540–41.¹ Their geographic representation is evenly balanced. They include such parishes as St Nicholas's at Pidebsk, which was located only a few versts from Novgorod in the Novgorod district, and St Ivan's of Kuivasha, which was located more than 190 versts to the north (measured from Kuivasha) in the Orekhov district.

Vodskaia, which was located across the Luga River on the northern boundary of Shelonskaia piatina, occupied an area more than three times Shelonskaia's 31,800 square kilometers.² Because of the great distances involved between parcels of land held by the same pomeshchik, the Vodskaia census-takers (Semen Klushin and Shemet Rezanov) recorded each pomeshchik's holdings in each parish (parish) under the returns for that parish. The cadaster therefore contains separate entries for "old," "new," "exchanged," and "supplemental" (*pridatochnyi*) pomesties while Gregory Sobakin's Shelonskaia cadaster records all the lord's holdings under the parish where his manor was

located. A comparison of the mean distances between the parcels of land recorded as separate pomesties in the Vodskaia cadaster and the fragmentation index of the Shelonskaia pomeshchiks' estates suggests the Vodskaia lands were recorded separately because they were administered separately. It would not have been feasible to administer the holdings of pomesties whose lands were more than one hundred versts from the manor. Prince Ivan Davydov syn Putiatin's Krechnevo estate, which was located near Novgorod in the southern part of Vodskaia province, was 280 versts from his Korelsk Gorodnia estate on Lake Ladoga. The distance between the prince's holdings suggests the two parcels were separately administered by their own stewards.³ On the other hand, the Shelonskaia estates were relatively compact. The mean distance of the lands in other parishes from the lord's manor was only 16.95 versts while sixty-eight of the 128 estates not held as pridachas had fragmentation indices of less than ten versts and only eleven estates had indices of more than forty versts.

THE EXCHANGE AND DONATION OF POMESTIES

The Vodskaia pomeshchiks of 1500 and 1540, like their Shelonskaia colleagues, exchanged parcels of land with each other and occasionally made small donations of tax units to the church. The portions of the Klushin and Rezanov cadaster published by Gnevushev in 1917 contain thirty references to the exchange of pomesties between pomeshchiks after 1500 and before 1540. Nine references concern all of the family head's holdings in the parish where the exchange occurred. The remaining twenty-one references concern individual hamlets or sections of jointly held (*vopche*) hamlets located on the lord's pomestie. If the holdings of each family head are considered as a unit, the thirty family heads exchanging pomesties represent 17.24 percent of the 174 family heads holding Vodskaia pomesties in 1540. The frequency of these transactions suggests that additional exchanges occurred in the half of the province surveyed by Gregory Valuev.

The practice of exchanging Vodskaia pomesties began before 1500. Ivan Bolshoi and Gridia Bykov, the sons of Michael Chiurkin, acquired the hamlet of Kiriakino from an exchange with Semen Klementiev. Since Klementiev's returns are lost, what he received in return is unknown and the equivalency of the exchange cannot be determined. The location of the Chiurkin brothers' manor in the hamlet of Kiriakino, however, suggests they were motivated by the desire to consolidate their holdings. The same motive caused them to acquire the hamlet of Perekula, which was located on the same former votchina of Yakov Gubin, from an exchange with Peter Khomutov.⁴

In most cases, the lack of returns for one of the parties involved in the exchange precluded a comparison of the farms, peasants, and rye exchanged. Vasily Nekrasov syn Chastov's exchange of twelve tax units with Fedor Vasiliev syn Kushelev is the only case where the farms, peasants, rye, and tax units can be compared for the two estates. Vasily relinquished land in the former volost of Liutchik (Bogdan Esipov's in Novgorodian times) in St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov parish for Fedor Kushelev's pomestie on the former lands of the St. Anthony's monastery in the Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish. The transaction gave Vasily a net gain of one farm, and seventy-five bales of hay and a net loss of 4.5 bushels of rye while both pomeshchiks received an equal number of peasants and tax units.⁵

A comparison of the lands involved in the transfer of pomesties from Zloba Andreev syn Bukalov to Dmitry Aksakov suggests an unequal exchange between two pomeshchiks. After the completion of the transaction Bukalov was left with nineteen farms, twenty peasants, thirty-two bushels of rye, and seven tax units in the St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish while Aksakov held eight farms, eight peasants, 37.5 bushels of rye, and 7.5 tax units in the St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov parish.⁶ The Bukalov returns, however, reveal that the transaction involved an exchange of seven tax units with the grand prince, who later granted 6.5 of the St Michael's tax units and Bukalov's one St Nicholas's at Gorodishche tax unit (tax unit) to Dmitry Aksakov as a supplement to his old pomestie. The reference to the grand prince, which is not found in the other Vodskaia and Shelonskaia exchanges between pomeshchiks, suggests the transaction involved the Muscovite government's redistribution of pomesties to equalize the pomeshchiks' dachas (the amount of the claim, *oklad*, actually in their possession). The census-takers' characterization of the lands received by Aksakov as a pridacha supports this theory.⁷

Although the farms, peasants, and rye cannot be compared, the remaining eight cases involved the exchange of an equivalent number of tax units. Fedor Ivanov syn Neledinsky received five tax units in St Egor's at Luzhsk parish from an exchange with his brother, Yury, who received five tax units in the Poddubsk parish.⁸ The Saburov brothers also exchanged equivalent tax units. Ivan Semenovich Saburov gave his brother Boris one tax unit in the hamlet of Gurino in the Yarusolsk parish in return for the one tax unit hamlet of Tukhani in the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda parish, where he established his manor.⁹ Prince Ivan Davydov syn Putiatin exchanged ten tax units of old pomesties in the Shelonskaia piatina for ten tax units of crown land in Vodskaia province.¹⁰

The absence of surviving returns for some of the holdings of most of the pomeshchiks precludes the calculation of the percentage of total holdings ob-

tained by exchange in all but two cases. Boris and Stepan Kostentinov (Kostiantinov) deti Shepiakov (Sheviakov) received eight tax units in the St Egor's at Lopsk parish from an exchange of unspecified tax units in the Izhora parish with Daniel Suponev. The exchange represented 57 percent of their farms, 48 percent of their peasants, 30 percent of their rye, and 47 percent of their tax units.¹¹ The land in St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish received by Zloba Bukalov represented 57.57 percent of his farms, 58.82 percent of his peasants, 38.72 percent of his rye, and 36.84 percent of his tax units.¹²

The above examples may not be representative of the mean percentage of holdings received by exchange since they only represent two of the ten exchanges recorded in the published cadaster of 1540. Yet a comparison with the percentage of holdings acquired by exchange in Shelonskaia province raises the possibility that the cases do not greatly overestimate the percentage of land acquired by exchange; for one-third of the cases in Shelonskaia involved the acquisition of more than 20 percent of the pomestie by exchange.

A comparison of the location of the exchanged parcels reveals that the pomeshchiks often preferred lands closer to Novgorod. The seven tax units which Zloba Bukalov gave to the grand prince were located in the St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov parish 153.4 versts from Novgorod while the seven tax units received in the St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish were only ten versts from Novgorod. The pomeshchik's preference for lands near the administrative and commercial center of the entire Novgorod land was so strong that he relinquished land only ten versts from his other holdings in the St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov parish in order to obtain the St Gregory's at Krechnevo estate.¹³ The lands which Ivan Kuzmin syn Brovtsyn obtained by exchange with Pavel Uvarov were also closer to Novgorod (28.77 versts) than his other holdings, which were located in the St Nicholas's at Dudorovo parish, 143.85 versts from Novgorod.¹⁴ The twelve tax units received by Vasily Chastov in exchange with Fedor Kushelev were located in the Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish thirty versts closer to Novgorod than the St Egor's at Terbuzhka lands relinquished to Kushelev were.¹⁵ The lands in the St Egor's at Lopsk parish received by Boris and Stepan Kostentinov deti Shepiakov in an exchange with the Suponev brothers were also thirty versts closer to Novgorod than their old St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda pomestie.¹⁶

The pomeshchiks' desire to consolidate their holdings or relocate near other family members' lands motivated some exchanges. Prince Ivan Davydov syn Putiatin's exchange of ten Shelonskaia tax units for ten Vodskaia tax units in the St Nicholas's at Pidebsk parish, near Novgorod, provided him with an estate in the same province where his father, Prince Davyd Mikitin syn Davydov held lands in 1500. The St Nicholas's at Pidebsk land, moreover, was only five

versts from the St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish, where Prince Ivan held a pridacha of three tax units.¹⁷

The motive for Fedor Vasiliev syn Kushelev's exchange with Vasily Chastov may have been the desire to consolidate his holdings in the same region along the southeastern shore of Lake Ladoga where the Kushelev family held most of their lands. The twelve tax units received from Chastov were located in the same St Egor's at Terbuzhka parish where Kushelev also held a pridacha of four tax units.¹⁸ The combined St Egor's at Terbuzhka exchange and pridacha represented nearly 80 percent of Kushelev's holdings. Since all of the holdings of his brother Daniel and of his cousin Nikita Romanov syn Kushelev were in the St Egor's at Terbuzhka parish, Kushelev's exchange with Chastov gave him additional tax units in the same parish where the rest of his family's lands were located.¹⁹ Yury Ivanov syn Neledinsky's exchange of one tax unit in the St Egor's at Luzhsk hamlet of Gusi resulted in the acquisition of an additional tax unit in the Budkovo hamlet of Kilo, formerly held by Alexis and Yakov Ignatiev deti Pushkin. Since Neledinsky's manor was located in Kilo, he probably wanted to increase his holdings near the manor.²⁰

The pomeshchiks of Vodskaia province resembled those of Shelonskaia in their ability to donate land held in pomestie tenure to the church. The 1540 returns for the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda pomestie of Ivan Semenovich Saburov refer to his donation of two-thirds of a tax unit in Zamostie to the parish church.²¹ The returns for his brother Boris refer to the donation of an additional two-thirds of a tax unit in the same hamlet.²² The donation of land from the same hamlet by two brothers who held administratively separate estates suggests the donations represented the decision of the family acting as a unit rather than pomeshchiks acting individually.

The Vodskaia returns support the tentative conclusion reached from the Shelonskaia cadasters that pomeshchiks could alienate their holdings as early as the late fifteenth century. The references to the exchange of pomesties in the records of the "new census" (1495–1505) show the ability of the first generation of pomeshchiks (those in service between 1480 and 1500) to exchange pomesties with one other. The larger number of exchanges in the cadasters of the 1540s shows the practice became more widespread in both provinces after 1500. The absence of any references to the grand prince except in the two instances where the sovereign was a party to the exchange indicates that the pomeshchiks rather than the Muscovite government initiated most transactions.

The donations of parcels of pomestie to the church discovered in both provinces' cadasters are legally significant because they remove the land from service, reducing the income earned by the pomeshchik and the taxes re-

ceived by the state from the peasants. The references to these donations in legal documents citable as evidence in litigation indicate the government's approval of the alienation of secular land held in pomestie tenure to the church. Since the right to alienate land is an attribute of ownership rather than possession, the government's approval weakens the traditional distinction between the patrimonial votchina and the conditional pomestie. The pomeshchiks' ability to make these donations without the government's prior approval is especially surprising during the shortage of available service land in the early sixteenth century, when Ivan III supported the Nonpossessors and his successor Vasily III (r. 1505–1533) did not hesitate to confiscate monastic land in both provinces despite his support for the Josephites.²³

PRIDACHAS

The additional parcels (*pridachi*) received by the Vodskaia pomeshchiks were recorded separately with the returns for the parish of their location. The fifty-six pridachas represent 20.58 percent of the 272 estates whose returns surviving from 1539 have been published. Since twelve family heads received more than one pridacha, however, the forty-four pridatchiks represented 25.28 percent of the 174 family heads not holding maintenance pomesties. The forty-five Shelonskaia pridatchiks represented 35.1 percent of the 128 family heads not holding maintenance pomesties, which suggests that fewer Vodskaia pomeshchiks received pridachas. However, a statistical comparison of the Vodskaia and Shelonskaia percentages is not possible since the published Shelonskaia cadasters represent the population of all surviving cadasters while the published Vodskaia returns represent a sample of the surviving returns. Since the selection of returns for publication was based on geographic location (six parishes from Novgorod and one from Yama district were unpublished), the sample was not random and therefore may not be representative of the general population of surviving returns.

Most (forty parcels or 70 percent) of the lands granted as pridachas came from other pomeshchiks' estates while twelve parcels or 21% of the land were taken from the grand prince's obrok-paying crown land and the remaining pridachas came from recently confiscated monastic and archiepiscopal lands. Eighteen families serving in 1500 lost land to other families. Eight or 44.4 percent of the families did not have any representatives serving in the province in 1539.²⁴ The lands of three gentry families (the Chiurkins of St Nicholas's at Dudorovo, the Kushelevs of St Egor's at Terebuzhka, and the Nashchokins of St Egor's at Lopsk parishes) were granted as pridachas to other members of the family.²⁵

Most of the representatives of the other seven families, who were cousins of the pomeshchiks whose lands were regranted to a different family, were already serving from old estates in other parishes. Only two pomeshchiks shared their father's lands with members of another family. Domash Ivanov syn Okliachev received only 13.5 tax units of his father's twenty-six St Egor's at Lopsk tax units while three of Fedor Nashchokin's sons (Dmitry, Gregory, and Alexis) received ten of the remaining 13.5 tax units.²⁶ The transference of the land from the Okliachevs to the Nashchokins does not violate the custom of granting a pomeshchik's land to his adult sons since Domash's childless brother (Fedor) briefly held the land after his father's death. Domash also had no adult sons, which may account for his failure to petition for the estate after his brother's death. Gregory Kolzakov received a pridacha of six tax units in the St Dmitry's at Gditsk parish from the pomestie of Timothy Mokeev, whose son (Vasily) was serving with four adult sons from his remaining 36.5 tax units. Since Kolzakov's lands had earlier been used as Timothy's widow's prozhitok, the estate was originally divided between his widow and surviving adult son.²⁷

The location of the Vodskaia pridachas was compared to the location of the pomeshchik's other parcels, the location of other family members' holdings, and the pridacha's distance from Novgorod. Thirty-five (79.5 percent) of the forty-four pridachas were in the vicinity of the pomeshchik's other holdings. Twenty-one (60%) of the thirty-five pridachas were located in the same parish as the pomeshchik's old pomesties. The Chiurkin cousins (Ivan Grigoriev syn and Orap Ignatiev syn), for example, received 3.5 additional St Nicholas's at Dudorovo tax units in the same volost where they held an old pomestie of twenty-five tax units.²⁸ Gridia Semenov syn Terkov and his five brothers received a pridacha of 2.5 tax units in the same St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish where they already held their old pomestie of nine tax units.²⁹ Ten of the remaining fourteen estates were within forty versts of the lord's other pomesties. The pridacha of eight tax units received by Prince Ivan Ivanov syn Meshchersky in St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish was twenty-eight versts from his manor in the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish.³⁰ The results support the findings from the Shelonskaia data that pomeshchiks preferred pridachas near their other holdings.

The lands of the eighteen families of pridatchiks who had more than one representative serving in 1539 were located near other family members' estates. Ivan Vasiliev syn Khomutov's four sons received pridachas in the St Nicholas's at Dudorovo parish where three (Dmitry, Fedor, and Mochal) also held old pomesties.³¹

Four of the five Kushelevs, a family of provincial servingmen originally from Dmitrov, held lands in the St Egor's at Terbuzhka parish.³² In 1539,

Daniel Vasiliev syn was serving from his father's old pomestie of 14.5 tax units and a pridacha of four tax units, both of which were located in the same volost, formerly belonging to the Novgorod boyar Dmitry Pobeditsky.³³ His brother Fedor was serving from a pridacha of four tax units in the same volost and an additional twelve tax units obtained by an exchange with Vasily Chastov in the neighboring volost of Liutchik formerly held by the Novgorod boyar Bogdan Esipov.³⁴ His cousin Nikita Romanov syn was serving from 14.5 tax units in the volost of Dmitry Pobeditsky that had also belonged to his uncle, Vasily Borisov syn Kushelev.³⁵ The three sons of the boyar Semen Ivanovich Vislovkha Saburov held lands in the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda parish where Pap Semenovich received a pridacha of 1.5 tax units.³⁶

The close proximity of several pridachas to Novgorod suggests that the distance from the region's major administrative and commercial center may have affected the pridacha's location. Although Matvei Kuzmin syn Brovt-syn's old pomestie was located in Izhora parish, twenty-eight versts south of Lake Ladoga and 125 versts north of Novgorod, his pridacha of three tax units was located only thirty versts from the city in the St Egor's at Luzhsk parish.³⁷ Gregory Klementiev's pridacha of one-half tax unit in St Egor's at Luzhsk parish was only 28.7 versts from Novgorod while his old pomestie of 14.5 tax units was ninety-five versts to the north in St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda.³⁸ Both of Prince Ivan Davydov syn Putiatin's pridachas were only ten versts from Novgorod while his manor was 182 versts to the north in Korelsk Gorodnia parish.³⁹

Distance from Novgorod was not as important as the location of the other holdings of the pomeshchik and his family. Only six or 13.6 percent of the forty-four pridachas were located close to Novgorod. The location of their manors in the more remote northern parishes suggests the pomeshchiks who received pridachas near Novgorod wanted additional land near the region's administrative and commercial center. Such a location would have been especially convenient during the annual muster and enrollment, when the pomeshchik purchased horses and weapons and petitioned the government for additional land.⁴⁰ A comparison of the unpublished returns for the three parishes of the Korelsk and two parishes of the Orekhov districts, located more than 200 versts north of Novgorod, with the published returns from the central and southern districts would provide the additional evidence required for a definitive conclusion.⁴¹

The published Vodskaia cadasters support the conclusions drawn from the Shelonskaia cadasters concerning the concept of the pomestie as "family" land. The pomeshchik's preference for pridachas near his or another family member's estate is apparent from both provinces' returns. The location of the lands of servingmen from different branches of the same family in a particular or

neighboring parish supports this thesis. Indeed, the preference was so strong that it overcame the obvious economic advantages of land near Novgorod. Although the returns from several northern parishes have not been published, the census-takers' practice of recording each pridacha's returns under the parish of its location with references to the landlord's holdings in other parishes makes it possible to determine whether the southern recipients of pridachas had northern estates. Since the southern pridachas usually belonged to pomeshchiks with other land in the area, the pridachas of the northern lords residing in the parishes with lost returns must have been located in the same or a neighboring parish.

NOTES

1. The 1540 returns for Koporie district, which had the highest concentration of pomesties in the Novgorod land in 1500, have not survived. See Gnevushev's introduction to the published cadasters of 1540 in *PKVP*, ii.

2. Shapiro, I: 184.

3. See *PKVP*, 4–5, for the 1540 returns from his St Nicholas's at Pidebsk estate.

4. See the returns for the pomestie of Ivan and Gridia Chiurkin, which was located in the St Nicholas's at Vvedensk parish, in *Vremennik*, XI, 315–21. The returns for Peter Khomutov's estate have not survived.

5. For Vasily Nekrasov syn Chastov's estate, see *PKVP*, 80–81; for Fedor Vasiliev syn Kushelev's estate, see *PKVP*, 149–52.

6. For the Bukalov returns, see *PKVP*, 2–3; for the Aksakov returns, see *PKVP*, 164–65. We know the exchange was between the grand prince and Bukalov since the latter received in return seven tax units of crown land not previously held by Aksakov.

7. Ibid, 164. For the 1500 returns from this parcel, see *Vremennik*, XI, 91–93.

8. *PKVP*, 9–10.

9. See *PKVP*, 41 and 42 for the respective returns of Boris and Ivan Semenovitch Saburov.

10. *PKVP*, 4–5.

11. The Shepiakov brothers received twelve farms, twelve peasants, 33.5 bushels of rye, and eight tax units. See *PKVP*, 257–58. The reference at the end of the St Egor's at Lopsk returns referred to another pomestie in the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda parish. The returns for that parish mention Boris and Stepan Kostiantinov deti Sheviakov as the holders of nine tax units in that parish. Since sixteenth century spelling was not standardized, the Sheviakovs of St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda were probably the same pomeshchiks known as the Shepiakov brothers of St Egor's at Lopsk parish. For the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda returns, see *PKVP*, 31–32.

12. The lands Bukalov received from his exchange with the grand prince included nineteen farms, twenty peasants, thirty-two bushels of rye, and seven tax units. See *PKVP*, 2–3. The returns from his five tax units in the St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov parish

are in *PKVP*, 127–28; the entries for his seven tax units in the St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov estate are in *PKVP*, 169.

13. For Zloba Bukalov's returns see *PKVP*, pp. 2–3 (St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish); pp. 127–28 (St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov parish); (3) pp. 169ff. (St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov parish).

14. *PKVP*, 25–26.

15. *PKVP*, 80–81.

16. *PKVP*, 257–58.

17. The estate held by Prince Davyd Mikitin syn Putiatin in 1500 was located in the St Michael's at Sakulsk parish of the Korela district; see *Vremennik*, XII, 39–40. His son Prince Ivan also held an estate in the Gorodnia parish in Korela district, but the returns have not survived. See the reference in *PKVP*, 7. The returns from Prince Ivan's St Nicholas's at Pidebsk estate are in *PKVP*, 4–5.

18. For Fedor Vasiliev syn Kushelev's St Egor's at Terbuzhka holdings, see *PKVP*, 149–52.

19. For Daniel Vasiliev syn Kushelev's holdings, see *PKVP*, 136–38; for those of Nikita Romanov syn Kushelev, see *PKVP*, 138–39.

20. See *PKVP*, 9.

21. *PKVP*, 42.

22. *PKVP*, 41–42.

23. On the dispute over clerical landholding between the Nonpossessors led by Nil Maikov of the Sora Hermitage, a devout ascetic, and the Possessors headed by the Abbot Joseph of Volokolamsk, see V. E. Hammond, *Russia from the Rise of Moscow to the Revolution of 1917* (Ann Arbor, 2003), pp. 21–22.

24. The families of the following pomeshchiks, all of whom were serving in 1500, do not have any representatives in the published cadasters of 1539: (1) Pozdei Artemiev of St Egor's at Luzhsk parish; see *NPK*, III, 37, for the 1500 returns from his estate and *PKVP*, 14–15, for the 1539 returns of the boyar Michael Dmitrievich Buturlin's pridacha. (2) Kodash Kosetsky of St Nicholas's at Dudorovo parish; see *Vremennik*, XI, 296, for the 1500 returns, and *PKVP*, 262–63, for the return of Gavrill Kuzmin syn Elagin's pridacha. (3) Ivan Koshkarov syn Amirev of Our Savior's at Gorodnia parish; see *Vremennik*, XI, 131–32 (1500) and the returns for Fedor Ivanov syn Khomutov's pridacha in *PKVP*, 182. (4) Prince Ivan Buinosov syn Rostovsky, on whom see the returns for Mochal Nikitin syn Khomutov's pridacha in *PKVP*, 284, and also Rozhdestvensky, pp. 148–52. (5) Andrew Malyi, whose Soltsa on-the-Volkhov estate was granted to Ivan Vasiliev syn Kushelev (see *NPK*, III, 434–35, for the 1500 returns and *PKVP*, 78–80, for the 1539 returns) and whose St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda estate was granted to the boyar Pap Semenovich Saburov (see *NPK*, III, 405, and *PKVP*, 44–45). (6) Yakov Zakharich of St Egor's at Lopsk parish, on whom see the references in the 1539 returns published in *PKVP*, 247–59 and the returns for his pomestie in 1500 in *Vremennik*, XI, 260–267. (7) Ivan Durov was referred to in *NPK*, III, 479, and in the returns for Afanasy Denisiev Skrypitsyn, who received his lands as a pridacha, in *PKVP*, 107–108. (8) Prince Artemi Semenovich Riapolovsky, on whom see the 1500 returns in *NPK*, III, 32–34, 44, and the 1539 returns for Gribak Grigoriev

syn Tetkin, in *PKVP*, 32–35; Prince Artemi was the son of Prince Semen Riapolovsky, who was executed for treason in 1499; see Vernadsky, *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*, pp. 126–27.

25. On the Chiurkins of St Nicholas's at Dudorovo parish, see *PKVP*, 273–74 for Ivan Grigoriev syn Chiurkin's pridacha and *Vremennik*, XI, 317, for the returns from 1500 for the pomestie of Mikhail Chiurkin. After their father Vasily's death Daniel, Fedor, and Ivan Kushelev, who were already serving from part of their father's pomestie, received his remaining tax units as pridachas. For Daniel's St Egor's at Terbuzhka pomesties, see *PKVP*, 136–38. For Fedor's pridacha, located in the same parish, see *PKVP*, 149–52. For Ivan's pridacha, see *PKVP*, 149–52. For the returns from the hamlets located on Vasily Kushelev's pomestie in 1500, see *Vremennik*, XI, 79–82.

26. For Domash Okliachev's St Egor's at Lopsk returns, see *PKVP*, 242–43 (*Vremennik*, XI, 281–83). For the St Egor's at Terbuzhka returns, see *PKVP*, 158, and *Vremennik*, XI, 84. On Dmitry Nashchokin, see *PKVP*, 252 (*Vremennik*, XI, 282–83).

27. On Gregory Kolzakov, see *PKVP*, 30–31 and *NPK*, III, 57. For Vasily Mokeev's returns see *PKVP*, 28–30; for his father's returns, see *NPK*, III, 56–61.

28. For the 1539 returns from the pomestie of Ivan Grigoriev syn and Orap Ignatiev syn Chiurkin, see *PKVP*, 271–74. For the 1500 returns, see *Vremennik*, XI, 316–20.

29. The 1539 returns from the pridacha of Gridia, Nikita, Foma, Daniel, Vasily, and Andrew Semenov deti Terkov are in *PKVP*, 211–14. The 1500 returns for these lands are in *Vremennik*, XI, 158–61.

30. For the 1539 returns from the St Ivan's at Kuivasha pridacha of Prince Ivan Ivanov syn Meshchersky, see *PKVP*, 219–20. The returns for his Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk old pomestie and pridacha are in *PKVP*, 185–88. Prince Ivan also had an old pomestie and pridacha in St Ilia's at Keltushi parish, seventeen versts from his manor; see *PKVP*, 234.

31. The returns for Ivan Vasiliev syn Khomutov from the 1500 Vvedensky Dudorovo returns refer to him as the former unfree servant of the Tuchkov family; see *Vremennik*, XI, 324–332. Although the returns omit the boyar's Christian name, he may have been the Ivan Borisovich Tuchkov mentioned in the 1500 returns for the former posluzhilets Semen Klementiev in *Vremennik*, XI, 299–304. On the Tuchkovs, who were related to the Morozovs, see Veselovsky, *Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie*, p. 289. The 1539 returns for the sons of Ivan Khomutov are in *PKVP*: 10, 279–82 (Dmitry); 182, 277–79 (Fedor); 282–84 (Mochal); and 279–82 (Usk).

32. Veselovsky, *Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie*, p. 294.

33. *PKVP*, 136–38.

34. *PKVP*, 149–52.

35. *PKVP*, 138–9. The rest of the Kushelev family's lands were thirty-eight versts to the south in the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda and Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parishes, where Ivan Vasiliev and his cousin Fedor Kostiantinov syn held old pomesties. For Ivan's Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov old pomestie see *PKVP*, 78–80. Fedor Kostiantinov syn's St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda returns are in *PKVP*, 35–38. Additional Kushelev returns are found in *PKVP*, 81–82, 136–40, 149–52.

36. See the returns for the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda pomesties of the three sons of Semen Saburov (Boris, Ivan, and Pap) in *PKVP*, 41–45.

37. *PKVP*, 26.

38. *PKVP*, 23, 48–50.

39. The returns for Prince Ivan's pridacha in St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish are in *PKVP*, 4–5; the St Nicholas's at Pidebsk returns are in *PKVP*, 6–7. The returns for his Korelsk at Gorodnia manor have not been published.

40. On the muster and enrollment, see Rozhdestvensky, pp. 287–330. On the “great enrollment” of 1538, which coincided with the census of the Novgorod provinces, see G.V. Abramovich, “Pomestnaia politika v period boiarskogo pravleniia v Rossii (1538–1543 gg.)” in *Istoriia SSSR*, 1979, no. 4, pp. 193–96.

41. The cadasters are located in the Central State Archive of Ancient Documents, (TsGADA), fond 137, Boiarskie i gorodovye knigi, no. 5-a.

Chapter Eight

The Inheritability of the Early Sixteenth Century Vodskaia Pomestie

Our comparison of the Shelonskaia pomeshchiks of 1500 and 1539 showed that the same families usually held the same estates in both censuses. Since inheritability is the definitive characteristic of the allod, the low rate of turnover demonstrated by the Vodskaia data provides additional evidence of the patrimonial character of the pomestie. Since Vodskaia and Shelonskaia (the only provinces of Novgorod with cadasters from both censuses) had the highest concentrations of pomesties, their results may be representative of the region.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF VODSKAIA POMESTIES

The classification of the Shelonskaia pomesties was relatively simple. The returns from each pomeshchik's entire estate were recorded under the parish of his residence. Land held by the same landlord or his relatives for more than a generation was called "old." Parcels granted after the pomeshchik entered service were pridachas, additions to the *dacha*, the part of the pomeshchik's claim (*oklad*) actually in his possession. Because of the shortage of arable land, under ordinary circumstances the pomeshchik could not expect to receive a dacha until an adult son's entry into service required more land. Pomesties that did not include old parcels were considered new.

The classification of Vodskaia pomesties was more complicated. The greater geographic distance between the individual parcels prevented the census-takers from recording the entire estate under the parish of the landlord's residence. Instead, they recorded each parcel under the parish of its location and at the end of the entry noted additional parcels held by the same landlord

in other parishes. The cadasters continued to use the term “old pomesties” for individual parcels held by the same family or pomeshchik for more than a generation, long enough for his eldest son to enter the cavalry and serve from part of his father’s “old” or his own “new” pomestie. Parcels granted as additions to the old pomesties were pridachas.¹

Other parcels, however, were not classified “old” by the census-takers. Sixty-one (31%) of the 198 parcels that were not designated as maintenance pomesties, pridachas, or exchanged pomesties can be considered “new” because a comparison of returns from the censuses of 1500 and 1540 indicates their possession by servingmen with different surnames in 1500 and 1540. The ten tax units held by Ivan Ivanov syn Neledinsky in the volost of Fedor Mustelsky in the St Ivan’s at Kuivasha parish were “new” because they were held by the four sons of Kostiantin Bormosov (Ivan, Dmitry, Kuzma, and Fedor) in 1500.² Similarly, the eighteen tax units held by Boris Semenovitch Saburov in the St Ilia’s-on-the-Tigoda parish in the volost of Ivan Ovinov were “new” because Ivan Sumorok Voksherin held them in 1500.³

Two Vodskaia pomesties included old and new hamlets. The ten tax units held by Semen Terkov’s sons (Gridia, Dmitry, Vasily, Foma and Daniel) in the volost of Vasily Onanin included the hamlet of Manino Ves where their father Semen, Uncle Ivan, and grandfather Ivan Mikhailov syn Terkov resided in 1500. Although Pavel Ekhidinov held the remaining nine tax units in 1500, the presence of the old Terkov family manor on the pomestie suggests an “old” classification.⁴ Although the pomestie of Zakhar Vasiliev syn Nefediev in the small volost (*volostka*) of Dubrovo belonging to Gregory Petrov syn Chiashnikov before Novgorod’s annexation was not designated “old,” it has been included with the old pomesties because his father earlier held six of the eleven tax units.⁵

The existence of “old” and “new” hamlets on the same parcel in the same parish indicates the pomeshchik received the land upon entering military service. Since the pridachas were additions to the dacha, the term only referred to lands received by a pomeshchik already in service. Because the pomeshchik entered service at the age of fifteen, most pomeshchiks began their service careers while their fathers were still serving and supporting their wives and younger sons and daughters. Under these circumstances the older son could only expect to receive part of his father’s estate; the rest of his lands had to come from the estates of retired or deceased childless pomeshchiks. The new parcels, added to the old lands received from the pomeshchik’s father, were not pridachas because the new pomeshchik received them upon entry into military service at the annual muster and enrollment. Since most pomeshchiks’ fathers were still serving when their sons were enrolled and given their first dachas, the census-takers did not refer to the parcels with old

and new lands as “old” pomesties. Yet the granting of old hamlets to pomeshchiks’ sons while their fathers were still in service shows the lord’s desire to keep his land in the family. For this reason, these estates may be included with the “old” pomesties.

The small estates held by old families located in different parishes from the lord’s manor resemble pridachas. Dmitry Ivanov syn Aksakov’s unclassified tax unit in the volost of Afrosinia Lavrentieva in the St Nicholas’s at Gorodishche parish looks like an addition to his old pomestie of thirty tax units in the Archbishop of Novgorod’s former volost in St Michael’s-on-the-Volkhov parish. Dmitry also held a pridacha of six tax units in the same parish.⁶ The census-takers’ reference to the six St Michael’s tax units as a “pridacha” suggests they restricted the term to lands granted in the same parish as the “old” pomestie. A comparison of the returns for the estates classified as pridachas, however, does not support this thesis. Michael Dmitrievich Buturlin’s 2.5 tax units in the volost of Bogdan Esipov in the St Egor’s at Luzhsk parish were called a “pridacha” although his old estate was located in the Gorodnia parish.⁷

The Buturlin case shows the census-takers did apply the term “pridacha” to lands located in different parishes than the lord’s manor. Their failure to use the term in connection with Aksakov’s one tax unit in the hamlet of Laren in St Nicholas’s of Gorodnia parish suggests the estate was old. Since Dmitry held his lands with his two adult sons, Fedor and Stepan, he had already served more than a generation by 1540.

The case of Rium Gubin Ivanov syn Zholtukhin shows that the census-takers considered estates remaining in the same family for twenty years or more “old.” In 1540, Rium held his St Michael’s-on-the-Volkhov manor and Gorodnia parcel with his two adult sons, Stepan and Gregory. The St Michael’s pomestie, which was held by Our Savior’s Monastery during the “new” census of 1495–1505, was classified as “old” by the census-taker in 1540.⁸ Since Rium did not hold any pridachas, the classification does not refer to the old sections of an estate receiving new land in the same parish. Since Rium’s two adult sons were already in service, his eldest son could not have been younger than seventeen or eighteen and may have been twenty. On the other hand, he could not have been much older than twenty because he still resided with his father in the family manor at Mimina, which indicates he was still unmarried. This suggests that Rium entered service and received his first pomesties around 1520. Since the St Michael’s-on-the-Volkhov pomestie was classified as “old,” pomesties held by the same lord or family for a generation of twenty years can be considered “old.”

Daniel Fedorov syn Saburov’s unclassified St Michael’s-on-the-Volkhov parcel may also have been old. His 8.5 tax units Gorodnia pomestie, where his manor was located, was classified “old” although Yushka Kostiantinov

syn Pechenegov held the land in 1500.⁹ Since neither the St Michael's nor Gorodnia parcels are classified as pridachas, they were granted at the same time, when the pomeshchik entered military service. Both estates can therefore be considered "old."

The Aksakov, Zholtukhin, and Saburov cases suggest that the small parcels belonging to representatives of old families should routinely be classified as old. However, the same pomeshchik could hold "old" and "new" parcels. Pomeshchiks who married in their late teens or early twenties would still have been in their thirties (with more than two decades of military service remaining) when their older, fifteen year old sons were enrolled in the grand prince's cavalry. If a father did not have enough land to support a newly enrolled son's military service, the state could either give the father a pridacha to support his son's service or give the son new land elsewhere. Since the life expectancy of a sixteenth century landlord was considerably less than the retirement age of sixty, most sons could not have held their first dachas for more than a decade before their father's death. If the son's original dacha came from another family's former holdings, it would not have been in the family long enough to be "old" by 1540.

The three tax units in the St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish held by the three sons of Vlas Bastanov (Volodia, Gutman, and Pentei) were considered "new" although the brothers also held their father's "old" pomestie of seventeen tax units in the volost of Fedor Aksentiev Mustelsky in the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish twenty-eight versts to the south.¹⁰ Since none of the brothers had adult sons in service, the St Ivan's pomestie had been held less than a generation.

A comparison of the terms by which the Vodskaia census-takers referred to the parcels of pomesties located in different parishes and the length of time the land remained in the lord's family clarifies their classification system. Land held by the same lord or remaining in the same family for more than a generation was considered old. Since Muscovite servingmen were enrolled in the cavalry at the age of fifteen and generally married before the age of twenty, twenty years was considered a generation. Land held for less than twenty years was considered new.

Occasionally the census-takers omitted the term "old" when recording the returns for the smaller estates located outside the parish where the lord resided on his manor. In those instances where the pomeshchik had adult sons in service and the family had resided in the parish for more than a generation, the small estates may be considered "old" since the census-takers' failure to call them pridachas indicates they were granted when the pomeshchik began service.

Most classifiable parcels may be considered old. The 137 pomesties remaining in the same family for more than a generation represent 69 percent

of the 198 parcels neither exchanged nor held as a maintenance pomestie or pridacha. The remaining sixty-one estates were classified “new” because they were held by the same family for a generation or less.¹¹

Although the Vodskaia provincial parcels could easily be classified by comparing the 1500 and 1540 cadasters, the classification of the *dacha* (the part of the claim or *oklad* actually received by the pomeshchik) was more complicated. The Shelonskaia provincial returns for all the parcels belonging to the landlord’s *dacha* were recorded under the parish of his residence (*bol’shoi dvor*), regardless of their location elsewhere. Since all the provincial returns survived, each estate included the landlords’ entire *dacha*. The returns for Vodskaia province, which was located to the north between Lake Il’men and the Livonian border, were recorded separately under the parish of their location. 198 Vodskaia parcels belonged to the dachas of 175 family heads, who either held their land in single tenancy or were listed first among the landlords of land held in joint tenancy.¹² 172 dachas were capable of being classified as “old,” “new,” “a pridacha” or “maintenance pomestie” while two were entirely obtained by exchange and one was unclassifiable. Since four of the 172 dachas included three maintenance pomesties held by widows and a small parcel retained by Tolkach Ekhidinov after turning the remained of his estate over to his two sons, the pomeshchiks still in service in 1540 held 168 dachas.¹³

102 (60.7%) of the 168 dachas were “old” because they included one or more parcels called “old” by the census-takers. Fifty (29.8%) of the 168 dachas were definitely “new” because they were neither called “old” by the census-takers nor held by the same family in 1500. Since twenty-nine of the fifty new dachas consisting of entirely new parcels and six including new and exchanged parcels were incomplete, they could also have belonged to estates with “old” parcels located in parishes without surviving returns. Sixteen dachas that had neither new nor old parcels included “pridachas,” indicating that the landlords held old pomesties in other parishes without surviving returns.¹⁴ The 102 old dachas and sixteen pridachas represent seventy percent of the 168 dachas supporting the family heads in service in 1540. This supports the conclusion that it was customary for the Vodskaia pomestie to remain in the landlord’s family from the beginning of the system.

OLD POMESTIES

The relationship of the pomeshchiks who held each parcel of land in 1500 and 1540 was compared to determine which family members usually received the

land on the death or retirement of the original servingmen. Most of the land remaining in the same family had different lords in 1540 than 1500. Most (175 or 76%) of the parcels remaining in the same family passed from one family member to another during this period. Seventeen (51.6%) of the remaining thirty-three parcels were held by the same landlord in 1500 and 1540. Since the pomeshchik entered service at fifteen and retired at sixty, they were probably just beginning their service careers in 1500. The other sixteen parcels were granted to their lord between the conclusion of the "new census" (1505) and 1520, had been held for at least a generation by 1540, and were considered "old" by the census-takers.

The passage of more than seventy-five percent of the parcels remaining in the same family to the original landlords' sons indicates that patrilineal succession was normal even before the issuance of Ivan IV's charter (1546) citing the pomeshchik's death without heirs as his justification for granting the landlord's former estate to a different family.¹⁵ However, other family members could also receive some or all of a pomestie if the landlord died without descendants or had sons already serving from other "old" pomesties who neither required nor sought to claim all of their father's "old" estate. More than twenty percent of the parcels passed to a cousin or unidentifiable relative with the same surname.

Six pairs of brothers received administratively separate shares of their father's pomesties between 1500 and 1540. The division of each father's estate between his sons was analyzed to determine whether some sons received larger shares of their father's lands than other sons. The estates of the sons of Kostiantin Kuchetsky, Vasily Nefediev, Daniel Neledinsky, and Volodimer Volynsky were examined since complete returns survive for the dachas of all of the sons who received part of their father's land.¹⁶

The pomesties of Vasily Nefediev passed to his two sons, Vasily and Zakhar. Both received three hamlets from their father's pomestie in the Our Savior's at Gorodnia parish of the Orekhov judicial district (*Orekhovskoi prisud*). Vasily's three hamlets (Shapkino, Vettsakh-on-the-Tosna, and Varvist) occupied 4.5 tax units in the volost of Dubrovo held in Novgorod times by Gregory Petrov syn Chiashnikov. Since Vasily also received an additional tax unit from his father in the hamlet of Manino Ves in the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish, he received a total of 5.5 tax units occupied by six peasant households from his father's pomesties.¹⁷ His brother Zakhar also received three hamlets from his father's Our Savior's at Gorodnia pomestie (Rai-on-the-Neva, Opiaseevo-on-the-Tosna, and Valitovo-on-the-Neva) in the same volost. Although Zakhar's hamlets were occupied by five peasant households on five tax units, his total share of his father's lands was greater than his brother's because he also held eight of his father's nine tax

units in the volost of Gregory Petrov syn Chiashnikov in the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish.¹⁸

Zakhar's thirteen tax units represented more than 70 percent of his father's old pomestie. Despite the unequal division of their father's pomestie, both servingmen had approximately equivalent dachas, for Zakhar held 19.5 and Vasily 18.5 tax units. Since neither brother had sons of serving age, their requirements for pomesties were approximately equal. Since both sons also held Our Savior's at Gorodnia hamlets in the section of the Chiashnikov volost earlier belonging to Ivan Shishelev (who was not survived by adult sons), they probably began service before their father's death or retirement. Since the younger Vasily already held 11.5 tax units, in contrast to Zakhar's six tax units, on the former pomestie of Ivan Shishelev, giving the two brothers equal shares of their father's pomesties would have resulted in unequal dachas.

The lands of Kostia Kuchetsky, who held fourteen hamlets occupied by twenty-three peasant households on 25.5 tax units in 1500, in the volost of Gregory Petrov syn Chiashnikov on the Ust River in Our Savior's at Gorodnia parish, were held by his sons, Ivan and Volodia, and a grandson, Vasily Ivanov syn, in 1540.¹⁹ On the surface, it appears that Volodia, probably the younger son since he did not have any adult sons in service, received the larger share of his father's estate. His pomestie (which comprised his entire dacha) consisted of thirteen tax units and twelve peasant households while his elder brother and nephew only held 12.5 tax units occupied by nine peasant households. Volodia's tax units, however, were less productive than his brother's were. He received an annual income from the peasants' dues of 567.25 Novgorod dengas while his elder brother and nephew received a combined income of 786.36 Novgorod dengas.²⁰ Granting the more productive hamlets to Ivan and his son indicates that provision was made for all the male descendants of a deceased pomeshchik.

The military service of Daniel Neledinsky's grandson, Murza, probably was considered when his holdings, which were located in the St Egor's at Terbuzhka and Gorodnia parishes in the Ladoga district, were granted to his heirs. In 1540 Gordei Danilov syn and his son, Murza, were serving from 17.5 tax units or 54.6 percent of Daniel's old pomesties while Gordei's younger brother, Vasily, who did not have any adult sons, was serving from the other 10.5 St Egor's at Terbuzhka tax units and their father's four Gorodnia tax units.²¹ Gordei and Murza's need for additional land to support their service in the cavalry is shown by the pridacha of three tax units received in the same St Egor's at Terbuzhka parish where their other lands were located.²²

Volodimer Volynsky's two sons, Afanasy and Semen, received nearly equal shares of their father's lands. In 1500 Volodimer held 35.5 tax units in the

volost of Abrosim and Gavril Ivanov deti Sarsky in the St Egor's at Terbuzhka parish.²³ In 1540 Afanasy and Semen were serving from 18.5 and 17 tax units respectively, all of which came from their father's lands in the Sarsky volost. Each brother received sixteen peasant households on which fifteen adult males resided. The dues paid by the peasants in 1500 in the hamlets received by each son suggest that the division of Volodimer's estate was supposed to provide each son with an equivalent income. Although the peasants in Afanasy's hamlets had paid his father 1307 Novgorod dengas in contrast to the 1244 Novgorod dengas paid by the peasants' in Semen's hamlets, the latter's estate included his father's old demesne. The 4.5 korobi of rye sown in one field after seed would have provided Volodimer with eighteen korobi of rye worth 180 dengas, which, after the unfree tenants' share was deducted, probably gave him a total income close to 1300 dengas.²⁴ The census-takers who authorized the division of Volodimer's estate were therefore justified in believing that each son would receive an equal income.

The passage of most old parcels held by different lords in 1500 and 1540 from father to son suggests that the inheritance of the father's lands by his sons was recognized in customary law. However, the son did not have the right to receive more than necessary for cavalry service. Older sons who left the father's manor after marriage because their father could not support another adult servitor could receive less than a younger son who began service around the time of his father's retirement or death. Older sons with adult sons of their own just entering service, on the other hand, could receive more than younger sons with the understanding that part of the estate would be used to support their own sons' service.

When a pomeshchik died without male survivors or had more land than his sons needed to serve, his brother could receive part of his land. The reference to the ten tax units in the Dudorovo parish granted to Vasily Ivanov syn Voronin, formerly held in pomestie by his brother Fedor, implies that it was customary for a brother to receive the lands of a sibling who died without male descendants. The entry records Vasily and his younger brothers (Nikita, Tretiak, and Yakov) received the land as an addition to their old pomestie "because their brother Fedor died."²⁵

The case of Loba Grigoriev syn Kalitin illustrates the passage of pomesties from brother to brother. In 1540 Loba and his four sons (Peter, Semen, Vasko, and Stepanko) were serving from two tax units in the hamlet of Pertichno in the St Andrew's at Gruzinsk parish and 20.5 tax units in the volost of Luka Guznishchev, Nefed Shapkin, and Kostia Bogdanov in the Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov parish earlier held by Loba's deceased brothers, Vasily and Andrei.²⁶ His nephews, Fedor Vasiliev and Stepan Ivanov syn Kalitin, were serving from the remainder of his brothers' lands.²⁷

Lands held in joint tenancy by two brothers were divided between the uncle and nephew when an adult son survived one brother. Although the uncle and nephew could retain possession of the estate in common, the old *pomestie* could also be broken up, with the nephew administering his father's old hamlets as a separate estate. In 1500 Semen and Fedor Ivanov *deti Ovtsyn* held eighteen tax units in the *volost* of Vasily Onanin in the parish of Loptse in Ladoga district.²⁸ In 1540, Fedor Ivanov *syn* was still serving from eight tax units of the old *pomestie* while Semen's son, Fedor, was serving from the remaining ten tax units.²⁹ Since the tax units were recorded as one estate in 1500 and separate estates in 1540, the estate may have been broken up after Semen's death.

When a son and grandson survived a *pomeshchik*, the latter received the share of his grandfather's land that would have gone to his father. In 1500, Peter Gridin *syn* Aminev and his adult son Borisko held 29.5 tax units in the *volost* of Alfery Ivanov *syn* Afanasov and Semen Ignatiev Velikiy and Gavril Ivanov *syn* Sarsky in the St Egor's at Lopsk parish.³⁰ In 1540 Ivan Aminev, Peter's grandson by Borisko, was serving from seventeen tax units or 57.6 percent of his grandfather's old *pomestie* while his uncle Kopt, who did not have male heirs, was serving from the remaining 14.5 tax units.³¹ Since Ivan was just beginning his service career while his uncle was probably near retirement, he received the larger share of his grandfather's estate.

Brothers holding an estate in common could receive their deceased brother's share even if the brother were survived by adult male descendants. In 1500, Semen and Fedor Ivanov *deti Ovtsyn* held four tax units in the *volost* of Vasily Onanin in the St Fedor's at Peski parish.³² In 1540, the surviving brother, Fedor, held the four tax units

alone despite the fact that Semen's son Fedor was also serving in the grand prince's cavalry.³³

NEW POMESTIES

More than 75 percent of the lands comprising the sixty-one new *pomesties* were taken from the estates of other families from the middle service class. Forty-two parcels (68.85 percent) were held by different lords in 1500 and 1540. Three of the forty-two parcels were held by three different families between 1500 and 1540.³⁴ Four additional parcels (6.55 percent) were recorded with the grand prince's *obrok*-paying black lands in 1500. The lands were granted as *pomesties* shortly after the census's completion in 1505, for the notation "granted to" on the cadasters was in different handwriting than the re-

turns from 1500.³⁵ Since the land did not remain in the families of the original pomeshchiks, the pomestie parcels were classified “new” in 1540.

The crown continued to grant obrok-paying black land as pomesties between 1510 and 1540. Seven parcels recorded as crown land in 1505 and later granted as pomesties were still in the original pomeshchik’s possession in 1540. Ivan Grigoriev syn Solovtsov, for example, received seven tax units in the volost of Bogdan Esipov in Dudorovo parish held by the crown in 1500.³⁶ His cousin, Fedor Andreev syn Solovtsov five tax units on former crown land in the same volost.³⁷ The parcels were considered “new” because they had been held for less than a generation.

The Bastanov family held four parcels of pomesties that had belonged to petty landowners in 1500. The cousins Ivan Ivanov syn and Volodia Vlasiev received one and three tax units respectively of land formerly held by yeomen in St Ivan’s at Kuivasha parish.³⁸ Volodia’s brother, Ivan, received three tax units in Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk and one tax unit in the St Ilia’s at Keltushi parishes formerly held by the yeoman Esk Kostin.³⁹

The remaining new pomesties included clerical land, all of which was taken from the lands of the St Nicholas’s at Lipensk and Prechistye Perynsk monasteries in the St Egor’s at Luzhsk parish, twenty-five versts from Novgorod. The nine tax units confiscated from the Prechistye Perynsk monastery were granted to Timothy, Vasily, and Ivan Gnevashov syn Chertov.⁴⁰ Semen Ivanov syn Borkov and his nephews, Bogdan and Vasily Bulgakov deti Borkov, held 15.5 tax units of the former St Nicholas’s at Lipensk monastic land while Tretiak Nekrasov syn Kuzminsky held 1.5 St Nicholas’s at Lipensk tax units.⁴¹ Twenty of the twenty-seven tax units held by Vasily Vysheslavtsov in the St Egor’s at Luzhsk parish were also taken from the former lands of the St Nicholas’s at Lipensk monastery.⁴²

A comparison of the returns from the censuses of 1500 and 1540 indicate that twenty-five families lost pomesties between the two censuses. Ten (40 %) of the families did not have any descendants serving in 1540.⁴³ The granting of their pomesties to other families after the death of a pomeshchik without male descendants resembles the escheat of English feudal law under which estates reverted to the King when the lord died without heirs.⁴⁴ Since the former lord did not have any heirs at law, the Muscovite grand prince, like the medieval English Kings, granted the land to a servingman from a different family.

Although the remaining fifteen families had servingmen holding pomesties in both censuses, seven were represented by cousins of the pomeshchik serving in 1500. The lands of Ivan Matveev syn Bezstuzhev in the volost of the Resurrection Derevanitsk monastery in the Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish were

granted to Ivan Mikhailov syn Dubrovin between 1500 and 1540. However, a collateral branch of the family continued to hold pomesties in another parish, for Kostiantin Afanasiev syn was serving from his father's old pomesties in the Dudorovo and Kepensk parishes.⁴⁵ The ten families without representatives in service in 1540 and the seven families who lost land because the pomeshchik serving in 1500 died without heirs account for 68 percent of the twenty-five families holding fewer pomesties in 1540 than 1500.

The remaining eight families were represented by sons, all of whom were serving from other old pomesties. In 1500 the four sons of Kostia Bormosov (Ivan, Dmitry, Kuzma, and Fedor) were serving from thirty-eight tax units in the volost of Fedor Ivanov Mustelsky "near the border" (twenty versts from the Livonian border) in the St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish.⁴⁶ In 1540, Ivan Ivanov syn Neledinsky was serving from 10.5 tax units and Daniel Fedorov syn Bormosov was serving from 17.5 tax units formerly belonging to the sons of Kostia Bormosov.⁴⁷ Since the estate consisted of thirty-eight tax units and was held by the four Kostin deti in 1500, it is reasonable to assume that Daniel received not only the 9.5 tax units which represented his father's share, but also the most of the land of one of his uncles. As a result, the granting of 10.5 tax units to Ivan Neledinsky rather than Daniel Bormosov, the only representative of the Bormosovs serving in 1540, does not violate the custom of giving a father's pomestie to his adult son. The division of the estate between Bormosov and Neledinsky, moreover, suggests that the Kostin deti Bormosovs held the estate in common rather than joint tenancy. Instead of the surviving brother, the deceased brother's sons, if any, received their father's share of the estate. The deceased brother's share was not inherited by the surviving brothers to the exclusion of the son, as it would have under an arrangement resembling modern joint tenancy.

The granting of two tax units in the Dudorovo parish formerly belonging to Michael Chiurkin's sons, Ivan Bolshoi and Gridia, to Boris Suponev, also does not violate the custom of granting the deceased father's pomesties to his sons. In 1500 Ivan and Gridia held 54.5 tax units in the volostka of Yakov Gubin. Since Ivan's son, Semen Chiurkin, was serving from 18.5 tax units earlier belonging to his father and uncle, he received most of his father's share. Since Semen did not have adult sons, he may not have needed the additional 8.75 tax units that would have represented his father's share of the lands held by the family in 1500. Nearly 80 percent of the lands held by the Chiurkins in 1500 did remain in the family, for Semen's cousins, Ivan Grigoriev syn and Orap Ignatiev syn Chiurkin received an additional 25 tax units from Ivan Bolshoi and Gridia's estate.⁴⁸

Eighteen families, who received thirty-one "new" pomesties, had representatives serving in 1500 and 1540. Seven families received ten pomesties

located in the same parish as the family's old estates. Ivan Vlasov syn Bastanov received three tax units in the same Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish where his brother Volodia held an "old" pomestie of seventeen tax units in the volost of Fedor Aksentiev Mustelsky.⁴⁹ Tretiak Nekrasov syn Kuzminsky held one "new" tax unit in the St Egor's at Luzhsk parish, where his brother Shiria held six "old" tax units; Tretiak also held eight "new" tax units in the Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish where his brother held twenty-four "old" tax units.⁵⁰ Ivan Grigoriev syn Solovtsov held seven tax units in the volost of Bogdan Esipov in the same Dudorovo parish where his cousins, Ivan Saburov syn, Liapun Fedorov syn, and Nikita Brekhov syn held their "old" pomesties.⁵¹

Although eight "old" families received thirteen "new" pomesties in different parishes from their "old" lands, the geographic distance of four pomesties was less than thirty versts (nineteen miles) from the "old" pomesties of the lord's family. Ivan Ivanov syn Bastanov's "new" tax unit in St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish was twenty-five versts from his cousin Volodia Vlasov syn's estate in Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish.⁵² Boris Suponev's two tax units in the volost of Yakov Gubin in Dudorovo parish were only twenty-five versts from his cousin Daniel Leventiev's old pomestie in the Izhora parish.⁵³ The four pomesties within nineteen miles of the family's old pomesties together with the ten pomesties in the same parish as the family's other holdings represent 60.8 percent of the twenty-three pomesties whose distance from the old pomesties of the lord's family can be determined.⁵⁴ These findings support the thesis that new servingmen from old families preferred estates near their families' other lands.

LOCATION AND THE RATE OF TURNOVER

The parcels of pomestie capable of being classified as "old" or "new" were compared with the distance of the parish from Novgorod to determine whether the percentage of old estates varied with the parish's geographic location. The location of each parish was found by measuring the distance from Novgorod to the village or hamlet from which the parish received its name on the map of the Novgorod provinces at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries in the endpapers of the first volume of the Shapiro collective's agrarian history of northwestern Russia. The percentage of old pomesties in each parish was found by dividing the number of old parcels by the total number of old and new classifiable parcels. The resulting simple correlation coefficient of 0.4097 indicates that the percentage of old parcels was higher in the more remote parishes.⁵⁵

The significance of the 0.409 correlation between the percentage of old pomesties in each parish and that parish's distance from Novgorod was evaluated by dividing the parishes into five categories of 36.642 versts (twenty-four miles) each. Instead of finding the mean of the percentages of old pomesties by dividing the sum of the percentages by the number of parishes in each category, each category was treated as a separate geographic area. In other words the total number of old pomesties was divided by the sum of the old and new pomesties in the region. The five parishes located between 9.59 and 46.232 versts from Novgorod had the lowest percentage of old pomesties (40.74 %). The percentages in the thirteen parishes located more than 120 versts from Novgorod were significantly higher: 73.8 percent of the eighty-four estates located in the nine parishes between 120 and 156 versts from Novgorod were old while 80.85 percent of the forty-seven estates located in the four most remote parishes were old.⁵⁶

The higher percentage of old pomesties in the more remote parishes does not refute the thesis that the pomeshchik preferred land near Novgorod. The sources of the new pomesties in the five parishes closest to Novgorod indicate that half of the sixteen new estates were either crown lands or held by the St Nicholas's at Lipensk or Prechistye Perynsk monasteries in 1500. If the term "new" were restricted to pomesties held by a different lord in 1500 and 1540 (thereby eliminating the lands not held by pomeshchiks in 1500), the eleven old pomesties would represent 57.8 percent of the nineteen estates held by pomeshchiks in 1500 and 1540. Four of the seven pomeshchiks who held the eight new pomesties belonging to different lords in 1500 and 1540, moreover, were childless.⁵⁷ The remaining three pomeshchiks were survived by sons serving from other old pomesties in the same parishes. Gregory Zabelin's son, Ivan, was serving from six tax units in St Egor's at Luzhsk parish.⁵⁸ Okun Linev's son, Andrei Okunev, was serving from four tax units in the St Nicholas's at Pidebsk parish.⁵⁹ Vasily Nashchokin's brother, Semen, was serving from six tax units in St Egor's at Luzhsk parish.⁶⁰

The high percentage of old pomesties in the four parishes furthest from Novgorod may be related to their location near the border opposite the Swedish fortress of Vyborg. The St Ilia's at Keltushi parish, in which 83.3 percent of the pomesties were old, was only ten versts from the border. Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk, which was only twenty-three versts from the shore of Lake Kotlino and near Vyborg, had the highest concentration of old pomesties in the region, for all but one of the fifteen pomesties (93.75 %) remained in the same family between 1500 and 1540. These findings suggest that the Muscovite government wanted the area settled by stable gentry who could be relied on to defend the border from the Lithuanians, Livonian knights, and Swedes.

MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION

Since the Shelonskaia census-takers recorded the entire estate under the parish of the landlord's residence, it was possible to compare the relationship between the rate of turnover of the pomestie and four predictor variables. The resulting correlation coefficients showed a significant relationship between the rate of turnover and four variables. They include (1) the number of lords assigned to the estate, (2) the income-producing ability of the land (measured by the number of peasant households, bushels of rye sown, tax units, and peasant dues), (3) the fragmentation of the lord's holdings, and (4) the estate's geographic location (measured by the distance of the landlord's residence from Novgorod).

A comparison of the rate of turnover of the Vodskaia dachas and the four predictor variables is not possible because the census-takers separately recorded each parcel under the parish of its location. Despite the references at the end of each entry to the pomeshchik's other holdings, it was impossible to reconstruct nearly half the family heads' dachas because the other holdings were in a parish without surviving returns. The dachas of the eighty-eight family heads with complete returns for all parcels may not be representative because they contain a smaller percentage of "new" pomesties. Only fifteen (16.85%) of the complete dachas were made up of "new" pomesties while fifty (29.76%) of all dachas consisted of "new" pomesties.

It is possible to determine whether a significant relationship exists between the rate of turnover of each pomestie parcel and (1) the number of lords to whom the estate was assigned, (2) the income-producing ability of the land and (3) the geographic location of the parcel, measured by the distance from Novgorod. Since the locations of the manors of the lords with incomplete dachas are unknown, the parcel's distance from the manor is unsuitable as a predictor variable. However, Ivan III's enfeoffment of the former unfree servants of twenty-four exiled Novgorod and twelve disgraced Muscovite boyars in 1480 suggested using the social origins of the pomeshchiks of 1540 as the fourth predictor variable to distinguish between the old and new gentry families.⁶¹

The results of the linear regression analysis indicate the absence of a significant relationship between the rate of turnover of the individual parcels and the four predictor variables. While the multiple correlation coefficients for all four models were less than 0.37, the multiple coefficients of determination were less than 0.15 for all four models. The coefficients show that the independent variables explained less than fifteen percent of the change in the rate of turnover.⁶² The partial correlation coefficients computed from the model using tax units as the index of the parcel's income-producing ability revealed

the absence of a strong relationship between the predictors and rate of turnover. The correlation of 0.0061 between the rate of turnover and the pomeshchiks' social origins was statistically insignificant while the correlations between turnover and tax units (-0.1516), the number of landlords holding the estate in joint tenancy (-0.2043), and the geographic distance of the estate from Novgorod (-0.2122) were relatively weak.

The inability to obtain strong correlations between the rate of turnover and the four predictor variables from the 198 Vodskaia parcels is significant. Although higher correlations were obtained from the Shelonskaia data, it is important to remember that the latter referred to the entire estate while the Vodskaia data only referred to individual parcels. The lower Vodskaia correlations using parcels and the higher Shelonskaia correlations using data for the whole pomestie suggest that the Muscovite government considered the pomeshchik's holdings as a unit to which each parcel contributed a percentage of income. This is juridically important because it implies that the pomeshchik's adult male heirs were entitled to receive his entire estate and not just a few parcels located in certain parishes as long as they were serving the crown.

Although only half of the Vodskaia records are extant, the survival of the returns from all the land held by eighty-eight family heads raised the possibility of reconstructing entire estates from the references to other parcels at the end of the returns. The problem of estate reconstruction was complicated by grants of pomestie parcels in single tenancy to new pomeshchiks living on old pomesties held in joint tenancy with their elder brothers or cousins. Their possession of new parcels in single tenancy is evidence of the establishment of nuclear families enabling the landholders to be considered family heads. On the other hand their continuing residence on the family's old land is significant. Since the pomeshchik's lands were administered from the manor house of residence (*bol'shoi dvor*), the single tenancy parcels were governed from the parcels held in joint tenancy. While the pomeshchiks holding other land in single tenancy were heads of their immediate families, they were junior members of an extended family that included their elder brothers and occasionally cousins from an elder branch of the family listed as the senior pomeshchiks on their jointly held land. Since the pomeshchiks thought of their land as family property, it is reasonable to believe that the head of the extended family exercised control over all of the parcels belonging to all the family members who were joint tenants on his land. Under these circumstances all of the lands held by the joint tenants, even if held in single tenancy, deserve to be considered part of one family pomestie. Since Prince Boris Myshetsky and Dmitriev Ivanov syn Nashchokin lived on lands jointly held with their elder brother and senior cousin respectively, their other, single ten-

any parcels were considered part of the estates on which Prince Daniel Myshetsky and Ivan Timofeev syn Nashchokin were listed as the senior pomeshchiks. For the same reason the parcels held by Stepan Poryvaem syn Rokhmanov and his younger brothers were considered part of the pomestie jointly held with Gregory Rokhmanov and his brothers and cousins, where they resided. The eighty-eight family heads with complete returns for all of their holdings therefore held eighty-five pomesties capable of being reconstructed.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to describe the relationship between the factors (X) influencing the rate of turnover (Y) of the reconstructed estates. The variables tested for inclusion in the model included X1 (the number of landlords jointly holding the estate), X2 (the landlords' income from the demesne and peasants' dues),⁶³ X3 (the manor's distance from Novgorod),⁶⁴ X4 (the fragmentation of the estate represented by the average distance of the parcels from the lord's manor), and X5 (the number of relatives holding nearby pomesties, where 0 = none, 1 = other relatives in the province, 2 = other relatives in the same parish). Also tested were X6 (the availability of additional land, a *pridacha*), X7 (the total number of tax units, *obzhi*), X8 (the total number of peasant farms, *dvory*), X9 (the total bushels of rye sown), X10 (the tax units in the lord's demesne), X11 (the social origins of the pomeshchik, where 1 = boyar, 2 = syn boiarskii or dvorianin, and 3 = a former unfree servant, *posluzhilets*, of an exiled dispossessed Novgorodian boyar).

The multicollinearity found in the Shelonskaia model indicated the need to evaluate the correlations between farms, rye, tax units, and income in the Vodskaia model for multicollinearity.⁶⁵ Although only the correlation between rye and tax units approached multicollinearity, the extremely high correlation between income and tax units indicated their inclusion in the resulting equation could exaggerate the influence of the income-producing indices. This suggested removing rye from the equation and using tax units or the landlord's total income as the index of the estate's income producing ability. The strong correlations between rye and tax units (.87) and income and tax units (.72) corroborate the evidence found in the Shelonskaia cadasters of norms recognized by the Pomestie Chancery, who expected each tax unit to provide a specific income.

After the removal of rye the remaining independent variables were correlated with the rate of turnover to determine whether the relationship was strong enough to justify their inclusion in the final regression model. The correlations between the rate of turnover and the fragmentation of the landlord's holdings (-0.0316), the origins of the landlord's family (-0.0512), and the number of peasant households (0.0561) were too weak to include the

three independent variables in the subsequent linear regression models. The correlations between the rate of turnover and the number of lords sharing the estate (-0.3501), the presence of other relatives in the same parish or province (-0.2877), the availability of additional land (-0.2692), total income (-0.2298), tax units (-0.1870), and the demesne (-0.1696) permitted the inclusion of these variables in the Vodskaia linear regression models.

Since fourteen of the eighty-four estates capable of being classified old or new did not have prices for some of the commodities used for the peasant dues, two models were constructed.⁶⁶ The first used the landlord's total income from the demesne and the peasants' dues and the second tax units as the index of the estate's income-producing ability.⁶⁷ The multiple correlation coefficients of 0.52 for the model using total income as the index of income-producing ability and 0.497 for the model using tax units indicate a strong relationship between the independent variables and rate of turnover. The coefficients of determination of 0.27184 and 0.247 indicate that the first model explained slightly more and the second model slightly less than a fourth of the rate of turnover.

Partial correlation coefficients, which are statistically more accurate because the other predictor variables are constant, were computed from the two models.⁶⁸ The strong partial correlations between the rate of turnover and lords (-0.3495 and -0.3296) and turnover and relatives (-0.3405 and -0.3012) suggest old pomesties were more likely to be held in joint tenancy by more than one family member and located in the same parish as other relatives' estates. The low partial correlation coefficient between income and the rate of turnover (-0.1147) is surprising because of the significantly higher correlation (-0.3295) obtained from the Shelonskaia data. The pomeshchik's need for a sufficient income from the peasants' dues and his own demesne to provide cavalry service suggest that older pomesties should have generated significantly higher incomes than new. It is doubtful that the pomeshchik's heirs would have wanted to retain old land from generation to generation that was incapable of adequately supporting their military service. Since all the Shelonskaia cadasters have survived and been published, it is reasonable to believe that the higher Shelonskaia correlation between the rate of turnover and income is more valid.

CONCLUSION

A comparison of the Shelonskaia and Vodskaia returns suggests that the pomestie system functioned in the same way in both provinces. The percentage of Shelonskaia estates (60%) and Vodskaia parcels (59%) retained by the

same family for more than a generation indicates that pomeshchiks preferred to keep their lands in the family by being succeeded by their sons, brothers, or nephews. When a pomeshchik's son entered service in his sixteenth year, he was supported by his father's estate, which could receive an additional parcel(s) of land as a pridacha, often from a deceased relative's estate. The practice of recording the adult sons in service as junior joint tenants of their fathers' land is evidence that the Muscovite state considered the pomestie to be family land.

Although each pomeshchik had his own dacha, the amount of his claim actually in his possession, many pomesties in both provinces were held by several pomeshchiks in joint tenancy. The fact that all the joint tenants had the same surname and therefore belonged to the same family is additional proof that the pomestie was family land.

NOTES

1. The census-takers used either the noun *pridacha* or the past participle of *pridaviti'* (*pridano*, "granted in addition to") to designate additions to the dacha. The exception is the pridacha in the Kepensk parish granted to Kostiantin Afanasiev Bezs-tuzhev and his three brothers (Matvei, Shest, and Kuzma). Most Kepensk returns are in the lost cadaster of Gregory Meshok Valuev, on which see Gnevushev, *PKVP*, and ii-iii. The returns for the Kepensky pridacha are after those for the Bezs-tuzhevs' old pomestie of forty-four tax units in the Dudorovo parish, only fifteen versts from Kepensky. The beginning of the Dudorovo entry states, "the volostka [small volost] of Ivan Zakharyn syn Ovinov . . . and in addition to this were assigned the hamlets of Pavel Liudkin." Comparing the 1539 cadaster to the 1500 Dudorovo returns in *Vremennik*, XI, 292–97 indicates the eighteen hamlets and forty-four tax units recorded as "old" in 1539 belonged to the volost of Ivan Ovinov in 1500. As a result the small village and hamlet located in Kepensky parish probably belonged to the volost of Pavel Liudkin. The phrase "and in addition the hamlets of Pavel Liudkin" ("da k tomu zh pripisany derevni Pav'lovskie Liudkina") indicates the four Kepensk tax units were a pridacha to the Dudorovo tax units. See *PKVP*, 262. This is the only inclusion of returns from a parish surveyed by Valuev in Kliushin and Rezanov's cadaster.

2. For the 1540 returns from the pomestie of Ivan Ivanov syn Neledinsky, see *PKVP*, 215–17; the returns for the same hamlets from the "new" census of 1495–1505 are published in *Vremennik*, XI, 167–71.

3. For the 1540 returns from the pomestie of Boris Semenovich Saburov, see *PKVP*, 41–42; the returns for these hamlets from the "new" census are in *NPK*, III, 375.

4. For the 1540 returns from the estate of Semen Terkov's sons, see *PKVP*, 190–92. On the nine tax units formerly held by Pavel Ekhidinov, see *Vremennik*, XI,

201ff. The notation of the census-taker, which is in different handwriting than the rest of the returns, indicates the Ekhidinovs received the lands from Ivan III shortly after 1500. On the old Terkov family manor at Manino Ves, see *ibid*, 222. The manor, which was located near the Livonian border later occupied by the Swedes and known as Ingria during the seventeenth century, was abandoned after “German” raids. The Terkov brothers therefore established a new manor at Kirilovo.

5. The six tax units formerly held by Vasily Nefediev consisted of the hamlets of Rai-on-the Neva, Opiaseevo-on-the Tosna, and Valitovo-on-the-Neva. See *PKVP*, 179–80. The returns from 1500 for the hamlets on the Nefediev pomestie are in *Vremennik*, XI, 126–28, 134–35.

6. On the pomesties of Dmitry Ivanov syn Aksakov, see *PKVP*, 164–5 and *Vremennik*, XI, 92–96 (the 1540 and 1500 St Michael’s-on-the-Vokhov returns) and *PKVP*, 171, and *Vremennik*, XI, 110 (the St Nicholas’s at Gorodishche returns).

7. On Michael Dmitrievich Buturlin’s St Egor’s at Luzhsk pridacha, see *PKVP*, 14–15 and *NPK*, III, 37. The returns for his old pomestie in the Gorodnia parish have not survived.

8. *PKVP*, 166. Rium and his two sons also held two tax units in the volost of Fedor Glukhov in the Gorodnia parish; see *PKVP*, 121. Since the Gorodnia parcel was not classified as a pridacha, it was received at the same time as the St Michael’s-on-the-Volkhov pomestie and also may be considered an “old” pomestie by 1540.

9. The returns from Daniel Saburov’s St Michael’s-on-the-Volkhov pomestie for 1500, when Yushka Kostiantinov syn Pechenegov, the former posluzhilets of Vasily Borisovich Tuchkov, held the estate are in *Vremennik*, XI, 101.

10. See *PKVP*, 194–97, for the 1540 returns and see *Vremennik*, XI, 203–5, for the 1500 returns from the Bastanov pomestie.

11. See below, appendix D, which gives the percentages of “old,” “new,” “pridachas,” and maintenance pomesties together with the number of entire pomesties received by an exchange between the lords. The addition of the category “exchanged pomesties” results from the listing of the parcels of pomesties under the parish in which they were located.

12. Two pomeshchiks with complete returns for the dacha (Prince Boris Fedorov syn Myshetsky of St Egor’s at Lopsk and Ivan Dmitriev syn Nashchokin of St Nicholas’s at Pidebsk) were considered family heads because they held separate parcels in single tenancy. Since they resided on other land held in joint tenancy with senior relatives (Prince Boris’s elder brother, Prince Daniel Myshetsky and Ivan Dmitriev syn’s cousin Vlas Timofeev syn Nashchokin), they can only be considered heads of junior branches of their respective families. On Prince Boris see *PKVP*, 151–53, for the 3.5 tax units held alone in St. Egor’s at Terebuzhka and *PKVP*, 233–34, for the three tax units held alone in St. Ilia’s at Keltushi parish. For the returns from the land held in joint tenancy with Prince Daniel at St. Egor’s of Lopsk (where Prince Boris lived at Kanila), see *PKVP*, 249–51. On Ivan Dmitriev syn see *PKVP*, 7 and 20 for the two tax units in St. Nicholas’s at Pidebsk and one in St. Egor’s at Luzhsk held in single tenancy. For the three parcels held in joint tenancy with Vlas Timofeev syn, see the returns from his 29.5 tax units in St Anthony’s parish, where he

lived at Korolevichi (*PKVP*, 105), his twenty-one tax units in St. Andrew's at Gruzinsk (*PKVP*, 89–91) and fourteen tax units in Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov parish (*PKVP*, 94).

A third family head with complete returns for the dacha (Stepan Poryvaem syn Rokhmanov) held two parcels with his younger brothers Semen, Bovyk, and Nekras in the parishes of St. Egor's at Luzhsk (*PKVP*, 20–21) and St. Andrew's at Gruzinsk (*PKVP*, 88–89). The four brothers were also joint tenants of two parcels also held by their cousins, Gregory Vasiliev syn Rokhmanov and the two sons (Andrei and Ivanets) of Andrei Rokhmanov in St Nicholas's parish at Dudorovo (*PKVP*, 276–77). Since Gregory Vasiliev syn was listed first, his branch of the Rokhmanovs was probably senior to Stepan Poryvaem syn's branch.

13. The returns for St. Nicholas's parish at Dudorovo refer to Tolmach Ekhidinov and his sons Stepan and Ivan as the holder of one tax unit at Zamosh'e (see *PKVP*, 259) while the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk returns (see *PKVP*, 184–85) record Stepan and Ivan Ekhidinov's possession of "their father's old estate." Since the tax unit in St. Nicholas's at Dudorovo only provided an income of twenty-nine den-gas, the senior Ekhidinov was probably a retired pomeshchik who turned over most of his lands to his adult sons in service.

14. See below, appendix E, for the dachas of the eighty-nine family heads referred to in the cadaster of 1540 for which complete returns survive for all of the parcels held in pomestie tenure.

15. See Vernadsky, *Source Book*, p. 162, and Kalachev, *Akty*, I, 139.

16. The estates of Ivan Terkov and Fedor Myshetsky were also divided between their sons. The returns for the pomesties of Usk Ivanov syn Terkov and Prince Boris Fedorov syn Myshetsky, however, refer to additional pomesties in parishes whose records have survived. Since the possibility remains that they also received pomesties from their father in those parishes, the available evidence does not permit a determination of what percentage of their father's lands was received by each son. On Usk Terkov, see *PKVP*, 220f, the returns for his St Ivan's at Kuivasha pomestie, which indicate that he held an additional pomestie in the Our Savior's at Ozeretsk parish surveyed in the lost cadaster of Gregory Mikhailovich Meshok Valuev; the returns for Usk's Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk pomestie are in *PKVP*, 206. Although there are no references at the end of the entries for Prince Boris Myshetsky in either the St Egor's at Terbuzhka (*PKVP*, 151ff) or St Ilia's at Keltushi returns (*PKVP*, 233–34), the prince's manor is not listed, indicating he lived elsewhere. As a result the complete returns for his dacha do not survive.

17. On Vasily Vasiliev syn Nefediev's dacha, see the Our Savior's at Gorodnia returns for 1540 in *PKVP*, 175–77 and for 1500 in *Vremennik*, XI, 124–27, and 129–30. The Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk returns for 1540 are in *PKVP*, 193, and for 1500 in *Vremennik*, XI, 220.

18. On Zakhar Vasiliev syn Nefediev's dacha, see the Our Savior's at Gorodnia returns for 1540 in *PKVP*, 179–80, and for 1500 in *Vremennik*, XI, 126–28, 134–35. The Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk returns for 1540 are in *PKVP*, 192–3, and for 1500 in *Vremennik*, XI, 220–21.

19. On Kostia Kuchetsky's Our Savior's at Gorodnia lands, see *Vremennik*, XI, 124–29. For the Ivan Kostiantinov syn's share, see *PKVP*, 178–179. On Volodia Kostiantinov syn's share, see *PKVP*, 174–75.

20. The calculation of the Kuchetsky brothers' incomes was complicated by the fact that the peasants of Our Savior's at Gorodnia parish (located on the southern shore of Lake Ladoga) paid some of their dues in *sigi*, fresh water trout of the salmon species. Although *sigi* were sold for forty-two Novgorod dengas per *bochka* (see Shapiro, I, 33), the census-takers often gave the number of trout rather than *bochkas*. The *bochka* was equal to forty pails (*vedra*) or 131.5 gallons of water. Since a gallon of water weighs 8.34 pounds, the *bochka* held 1097 pounds of water. Because the average size of the *sigi* is eight kilograms or 17.64 pounds, a *bochka* of *sigs* held sixty-two fish. On the *bochka* and *vedro* see Pushkarev, pp. 4, 126, 175, and 195. On the weight of the *sigi*, see *Sovetskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, edited by A.M. Prokhorov (1984), 1199. Also see Genevra Gerhart's discussion of northern Russian fish in *The Russian's World: Life and Language* (New York, 1974), p. 174.

21. For the returns from the pomesties of Daniel Bykov syn Neledinsky, see *Vremennik*, XI, 15, 62 ff. Gordei and Murza held seventeen tax units occupied by fifteen peasant homesteads paying 1217 Novgorod dengas in annual dues and located in the volost of Liutchik held by Bogdan Esipov in Novgorod times. Assuming a yield of three, the eleven *korobi* of rye sown in one field on their 2.5 tax unit *demesne* at Yug provided them with additional income equal to 440 Novgorod dengas at the price level prevailing in Novgorod in the first half of the sixteenth century. For their St Egor's at Terbuzhka returns, see *PKVP*, 145–6. Vasily's ten St Egor's at Terbuzhka tax units were located in the same volost of Bogdan Esipov and occupied by two peasant households paying 690.5 Novgorod dengas in annual dues; see *PKVP*, 144–45. Vasily's Gorodnia tax units were part of his *demesne*, on which fifteen *korobi* of rye were sown in each of two fields. Assuming a yield of three, Vasily would have had sixty *korobi* of rye left after seed, which equaled 600 Novgorod dengas. For the Gorodnia returns, see *PKVP*, 116. The two estates comprised Vasily's entire *dacha*.

22. For the returns from Gordei and Murza Neledinsky's *pridacha*, which was occupied by two peasant households paying annual dues of 201.45 dengas, see *PKVP*, 147. The *pridacha* was located on the lands confiscated from the Our Savior's monastery.

23. For the returns from 1500 for Volodimer Volynsky's pomestie, see *Vremennik*, XI, 74–77.

24. For the returns from 1540 for Afanasy and Semen Volodimerov deti Volynsky, see *PKVP*, 154–58. Although the two estates represented sections of their father's pomestie, each son had a separate manor (Afanasy at Pecheln'ia and Semen at Saria) and administered their lands as a separate estate.

25. See the following passage in *PKVP*, 298: “. . . pridano k staromu pomest'iu . . . braten zherebei Fedorov 10 obezh, potomu chto Fedora ne stalo.”

26. For the returns from 1500 for Loba Kalitin's pomestie, see *NPK*, III, 21 (St Andrew's at Gruzinsk), and 456–7, 460, and 464–65 (Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov). For the returns from 1540, see *PKVP*, 92 (St Andrew's at Gruzinsk) and 99–101 (Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov).

27. See *PKVP*, 91,102 for the returns for Fedor Vasiliev syn Kalitin's pomestie; for Stepan Ivanov syn Kalitin's returns, see *PKVP*, 101–102.

28. See *Vremennik*, XI, 87–90.

29. See *PKVP*, 158–59 for the Loptse returns from 1540 for Fedor Ivanov syn Ovt-syn's pomestie. See *PKVP*, 159–60 for the returns for Fedor Semenov syn Ovt-syn's pomestie.

30. See *Vremennik*, XI, 273–77 for the returns from 1500 for the pomestie then held by Peter Gridin syn Aminev and his elder son, Borisko.

31. See *PKVP*, 240–42, for the returns from 1540 for the pomestie of Ivan Borisov syn Aminev; for Kopt Petrov syn Aminev's returns, see *PKVP*, 238–40.

32. See *Vremennik*, XI, 44–45, for the returns from 1500 for Semen and Fedor Ivanov deti Ovt-syn's St Fedor's at Pesotsk pomestie.

33. See *PKVP*, 129, for Fedor Ivanov syn Ovt-syn's four tax units in St Fedor's at Pesotsk parish. Since Fedor Ivanov syn also held lands in Yarvosolsk parish, whose returns were recorded in the lost Valuev cadaster, his dacha cannot be compared to his nephew's.

34. In 1500 Ivan Mikhailovich Volynsky held 48.5 tax units in the volost of Ivan Ovinov in the Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish; the notation of the census-takers in Moscow, which is in different handwriting from the census-takers who recorded the returns, indicates the entire estate was granted to Stepan Porkhovskiy and his children shortly after 1505. See *NPK*, III, 423–28. Between 1510 and 1540 the Porkhovskiy pomestie was divided between the two sons of Vasily Korsakov and Luka Karpov. Semen Korsakov held eighteen tax units of this pomestie in 1540; see *PKVP*, 71–73. His brother Ivan held nine tax units from the same former Porkhovskiy pomestie in 1540; see *PKVP*, 73–74. Luka Vasiliev syn Karpov held the remaining 21.5 tax units in 1540; see *PKVP*, 69–71.

35. See, for example, the returns from 1540 for the 2.5 tax units held by Nekliud Koprjakov in the hamlet of Popovo in the St Nicholas's at Pidebsk parish in *PKVP*, 6. In 1500 the hamlet was part of the grand prince's obrok-paying crown lands. Shortly after 1505, the hamlet was "granted to the two Ivan Gridin deti Durovs" ("otdano dvema Ivantsom, Gridinym detem Durova.") See *NPK*, III, 18–19. The "two Durovs" had also received six tax units in the crown volost belonging in Novgorod times to the Annunciation (*Blagoveshchenskii*) monastery in Arkazha, which was regranted to Prince Ivan Ivanov syn Eletskey before 1540; see *PKVP*, 108, for the returns from 1540 and *NPK*, III, 480, for the returns from 1500. In 1540 Gregory Vasiliev syn Korsakov held 18.5 tax units in the Novgorod prelate's volost in the St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov parish, which had been crown land in 1500, before being granted to Vasily Ivanov Aksakov; see *Vremennik*, XI, pp. 94–95 (1500) and *PKVP*, 160–61 (1540). His brother, Ivan Korsakov, held 13.5 tax units in the same volost which was held by the crown in 1500 before being granted to Vasily Ivanov syn Aksakov; see *PKVP*, 167–68 (1540) and *Vremennik*, XI, 92,94,96. Although the 1500 and 1540 cadasters refer to "Aksakov" and "Korsakov (Karsakov)" respectively, the Muscovite custom of writing vowels above consonants and the Korsakov brothers' patronymic of "Ivanov" raise the possibility that Ivan and Gregory Vasiliev deti Korsakov were the sons of the Vasily Aksakov who received these former crown lands shortly after 1505.

36. On Ivan Grigoriev syn Solovtsov's pomestie, see the returns from 1540 in *PKVP*, 295, and those from 1500 in Gnevushev, *Otryvok*, pp. 62–63.

37. On Fedor Andreev syn Solovtsov's pomestie, see the returns from 1540 in *PKVP*, 295–96, and from 1500 in Gnevushev, *Otryvok*, pp. 62, 63.

38. For the returns from Ivan Ivanov syn Bastanov's St Ivan's at Kuivasha pomestie, which was held by the yeoman Rodivonko Kondratov syn Perzimiak in 1500, see *PKVP*, 229. The returns from Volodia Vlasev syn Bastanov's St Ivan's at Kuivasha pomestie are in *PKVP*, 221–22 (the returns for 1500 are in *Vremennik*, XI, 171).

39. Ivan Vlasov syn Bastanov's returns for the hamlet of Sarka, which was located in St Ilia's at Keltushi parish and held by the yeoman Esk Kostin in 1500, are in *PKVP*, 234 (see *Vremennik*, XI, 97, for the 1500 returns.) For the returns for his three hamlets in the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish, also held by Esk Kostin in 1500, see *PKVP*, 199–200 (see *Vremennik*, XI, 231, for the 1500 returns).

40. For the Chertov returns see *PKVP*, 15.

41. For the returns from Semen Ivanov syn Borkov's pomestie, see *PKVP*, 24–25. For the returns from Tretiak Nekrasov syn Kuzminsky's pomestie see *PKVP*, 23.

42. For the returns from Vasily Vysheslavtsov's pomestie see *PKVP*, 21–22. The remaining seven tax units had formerly been held in pomestie by Gregory and Kuzma Zabelin.

43. Ten families did not have descendants serving in 1540. They included (1) the Bibikovs of Dudorovo parish, (2) the Durovs of Pesotsk-on-the-Volkhov parish, (3) the Kolzakovs of St Egor's at Luzhsk parish, (4) the Princes Andrei Aleksandrov deti Rostovsky of Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish, (5) the Rzhevskys of St Egor's at Luzhsk parish, (7) the Shishelovs of Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish, (8) the Skhorniakov's of St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov parish, (9) the Voksherin's of St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda and Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parishes, and (10) the Zakharchichs of St Egor's at Lopsk parish.

44. On the English law of escheat, see Pollock and Maitland, Vol. I, p. 355, and Vol. II, p. 22.

45. For Ivan Matveev syn Bezstuzhev's 1500 returns, see *NPK*, III, 417–19. See *PKVP*, 67–69, for the 1540 returns, when Ivan Mikhailov syn Dubrovin held the estate. The other families with collateral branches serving from old pomesties included the (1) Achkasovs (*PKVP*, 170), (2) Klementievs (*PKVP*, 23, 48–52), (3) Pushkins (*PKVP*, 46–48, 209–10), (4) Shadrins (*PKVP*, 84–86), (5) Voronins (or "Vorobins;" *PKVP*, 7–9, 301–302), and (6) Mokeevs (*PKVP*, 28–30).

46. The returns from the pomestie of the four sons of Kostia Bormosov are in *Vremennik*, XI, 167–71.

47. The returns for Daniel Fedorov syn Bormosov's pomestie are in *PKVP*, 214–15. The returns for Ivan Ivanov syn Neledinsky's pomestie are in *PKVP*, 216–17.

48. For the returns from 1500 for the Ivan Bolshoi and Gridia Mikhailov deti Chiurkins, see *Vremennik*, XI, 315–21. For Boris Suponev's share of the estate, see *PKVP*, 288. Ivan Grigoriev syn Chiurkin's returns are in *PKVP*, 271–74 while Semen Ivanov syn Chiurkin's returns are in *PKVP*, 274–76. Six tax units of Ivan and Gridia's pomestie were briefly held as a maintenance pomestie by Stepanida Mikhailovskaia

zhena Chiurkina. The returns for Dmitry Ivanov syn Khomutov (*PKVP*, 279–82) refer to her as the former holder of four tax units that Dmitry received as a pridacha after her death. The returns for Boris Suponev also refer to her as the former holder of an additional two tax units he received in exchange for two tax units in the At Izhersk parish; see *PKVP*, 288. Since the 1540 returns mention Stepanida Mikhailovskaia zhena Chiurkina as the former holder of lands recorded under Ivan Bolshoi and Gridia Chiurkin in 1500, she may have been the widow of a third brother and not the widow of their father, Michael Chiurkin. However, it is possible that Ivan and Gridia's father was retired in 1500 and that the lands, which supported his retirement, were later given to his widow as a maintenance pomestie.

49. For the returns from Ivan Vlasov syn Bastanov's Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk pomestie, see *PKVP*, 199ff. The returns from Volodia Vlasov syn Bastanov's pomestie are in *PKVP*, 221–22.

50. For Tretiak Nekrasov syn Kuzminsky's "new" pomesties, see *PKVP*, 23 (St Egor's at Luzhsk parish) and *PKVP*, 66 (Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish). For Shiria Nekrasov syn Kuzminsky's "old" pomesties see *PKVP*, 23 (St Egor's at Luzhsk) and *PKVP*, 82–84 (Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov).

51. For the "new" pomestie of Ivan Grigoriev syn Solovtsov, see *PKVP*, 295. For the "old" pomesties of the Solovtsov family, all of which were located in Dudorovo parish, see *PKVP*, 290–95, 295–96.

52. For the returns from Ivan Ivanov syn Bastanov's St Ivan's at Kuivasha pomestie, see *PKVP*, 229. For those from Volodia Vlasov syn Bastanov's Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk pomestie, see *PKVP*, 221–22.

53. For the returns from Boris Suponev's pomestie, see *PKVP*, 288. The returns for Daniel Leventiev syn Suponev's Izhersk pomestie have not survived; see the reference to his Izhersk estate following the returns for his pridacha in the Pesotsk-on-the-Volkhov parish, *PKVP*, 107.

54. The remaining eight "new" pomesties were held by old families whose known representatives were serving from "new" pomesties in 1540. The following families were represented by one branch, whose members either served alone or as cotenants of their pomesties. (1) Ododurov (Agish Kudashov syn of the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda parish; *PKVP*, 57); (2) Pushchin (Gregory, also of the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda parish; *PKVP*, 23–24); (3) Skobeltsyn (Yury and Daniel Fedorov deti of St Egor's at Luzhsk (Luzhsk) parish; *PKVP*, 25); and (4) Zagoskin (Andrei and Suvor Kostiantinov deti of St Ivan's at Perezhsk parish; *PKVP*, 109). Two "old" families had two branches, each serving from new pomesties. The Sekirins included Ivan Mikhailov syn, who served alone from his pomestie in the St Fedor's at Pesotsk parish (*PKVP*, 133–4) and Osman and Nikita Grigoriev deti, who served from the pomesties they jointly held in the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda, Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov, and Ozeretsky Pokrovsky parishes. See *PKVP*, 58–59, and 76–77. The returns for the Ozeretsky Pokrovsk were recorded in the lost cadaster of Matvei Mikhailovich Meshok Valuev. The Vyshevslavtsovs were represented by Vasily and Zaleshen, who served together from their pomestie in the St Egor's at Luzhsk parish (*PKVP*, 21–22) and Matvei and Kostiantin, who served together from their Dudorovo pomestie (*PKVP*, 301–302.)

55. The t-test resulted in a t-ratio of 3.69, which is significant at the 0.01 level, indicating there is a 99 percent probability that the population correlation is equal to 0.409. See Bruning and Kintz, pp. 174 and 241.

56. The percentages of old pomesties in each category are given below. For the percentages in Shelonskaia province classified on the basis of distance from Novgorod, see chapter three. Parish-Percent Old-(Number Old/All Estates)-Distance from Novgorod in Versts

I. 9.59 to 46.232 versts

St Egor's at Luzhsk-0.41-(7/17)-28.77

St Ivan's at Pereezhsk-0.00-(0/1)-19.18

St Nicholas's at Pidebsk-0.60-(3/5)-9.59

St Anthony's-1.00-(1/1)-28.77

Pesotsk-on-the-Volkhov-0.00-(0/3)-23.975

Mean: 0.407 (11/27)

II. 46.3 to 82.874 versts

St Andrew's at Gruzinsk-1.00-(4/4)-67.13

St Dmitry's at Gdittsk-0.50-(1/2)-52.745

Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov-83.33-(5/6)-47.95

Mean: 83.33 (10.12)

III. 82.9 to 119.516 versts

St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda-0.61-(11/18)-91.10

Soltsa-on-the-Volkov-0.5-(7/14)-105.49

Mean: 0.5625 (18/32)

IV. 119.6 to 156.158 versts

St Egor's at Lopsk-88.8-(8/9)-139.05

St Egor's at Terbuzhka-1.00-(14/14)-143.85

St Ilia's at Keltushi-83.3-(5/6)-148.645

St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov-0.50-(1/2)-153.44

Lopets-1.00-(2.2)-143.85

St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov-0.44-(4/9)-143.85

St Nicholas's at Dudorovo-0.66-(20/30)-134.26

St Nicholas's at Gorodishche-0.50-(1/2)-143.00

Our Savior's at Gorodnia-0.70-(7/10)-143.85

Mean: 0.738 (62/84)

V. 156.2 to 191.8 versts

St Fedor's at Peski-0.66-(4/6)-158.235

Gorodnia-0.83-(10/12)-163.03

St Ivan's at Kuivasha-0.69-(9/13)-191.8

Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk-0.93-(15/16)-172.62

Mean: 0.8085 (38/47)

57. The pomeshchiks of 1500 who did not have descendants serving in 1540 in the parishes near Novgorod, were (1) Boris Rzhhevsky (see the reference in *PKVP*, 9); (2) Michael Kolychov (see the reference in *PKVP*, 25); (3) Ivan Voksherin (see *NPK*, III, 90); and (4) Ivan Durov (*NPK*, III, 18 and 478ff.).

58. PKVP, 20.

59. PKVP, 7.

60. PKVP, 19.

61. For the social origins of each pomeshchik holding Vodskaia pomesties, see below, appendix F. On the boyar families whose descendants were enfeoffed in the Novgorod land, see Vseselovsky, pp. 291ff. For the boyars sitting in the дума between 1462 and 1550, see the list in A.A. Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoï dumy v XV–XVI vekakh," *Arkheograficheskoï ezhegodnik*, 1957 g. (Moscow, 1958), pp. 83–87.

Seventeen new gentry families came from the household of Prince Semen Riapolovsky while nine had served Prince Ivan Yurievich Patrikeev, who was forced to become a monk in 1499. The Novgorod boyars whose former unfree servants became new dvoriane included Vasily Kazimier, Vasily Kuzmin, Bogdan Esipov, Yakov Fedorov, Guba Seleznev, Gregory Tuchin, Avraam Saryevsky, the "mayoress" Marfa Boretskaia, Michael Berdenov, Nikita Esipov, and Michael Seleznev. See K. A. Bazilevich, "Novgorodskie pomeshchiki iz poslužil'tsev v kontse XV veka," pp. 69–70. Also, see the list of poslužil'tsy from Dmitry Kitaev's cadaster printed in *Russkaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka*, XII (St. Petersburg, 1908), 30–31.

62. The multiple regression coefficients given below were computed from the Vodskaia models analyzing the data from all the pomestie parcels recorded in PKVP. The following key was used: Y = turnover; X1 = social origins; X2 = lords; X3 = income-producing ability; X4 = geographic location. B = beta, the slope of the regression line; A = the y-intercept; R = the multiple correlation coefficient and R! = the multiple coefficient of determination. X3 = farms in the first, rye in the second, tax units in the third, and peasants' dues in the fourth model.

Model-(B1)-(B2)-(B3)-(B4)-(A)-(R)-(R!)

I-(0.015)-(-0.0795)-(-0.003)-(-0.00189)-(1.718)-(0.34)-(0.12)

II-(0.0187)-(-0.069)-(-0.002)-(-0.0017)-(1.769)-(0.375)-(0.14)

III-(0.002)-(-0.067)-(-0.007)-(-0.00181)-(1.76)-(0.3707)-(0.13744)

IV-(0.0359)-(0.0816)-(0.0001)-(-0.0014)-(1.689)-(0.36)-(0.13)

63. The income producing ability of the demesne was calculated by multiplying the bushels of grain sown in the two fields under cultivation by the harvest less seed. The monetary value of the demesne represented the price of the bushels of grain remaining after seed. The multicollinear Pearson correlation of .9245 between peasants' dues (*obrok*) and total income caused the former's omission from the multiple linear regression equations.

64. The manor's distance from other major towns (Porkhov, Staraia Rusa, and Kursk) was eliminated from the Vodskaia model because of the province's northern location made Novgorod, which was located in the southeast, the only major town.

65. The correlations between farms, rye, tax units, and income are listed below.

R: farms, rye-0.6985

R: farms, tax units-0.6434

R: farms, income-0.4858

R: rye, tax units-0.8663

R: rye, income-0.6645

R: income, tax units-0.7176

66. An additional complete estate was entirely obtained by exchange. See Vasily Nekrasov syn Chastov's returns in *PKVP*, 80–81.

67. The slopes (B, beta) and y-intercepts (A, alpha) for the two Vodskaia linear regression models for the reconstructed estates are given below.

Model-(income/tax units)-(lords)-(relatives)-(pridacha)-(demesne)-(location)-(constant)

I-(0.00005)-(-0.09)-(-0.154)-(-0.0199)-(-0.0116)-(-0.0007)-(1.837)

II-(-0.000274)-(-0.085)-(-0.126)-(-0.052)-(-0.021)-(-0.00079)-(1.717)

68. The following partial correlation coefficients were computed from the two models for the reconstructed estates.

Model-turnover: (lords)-(relatives)-(demense)-(location)-(pridacha)-(income/tax units)

I-(-0.3495)-(-0.3405)-(-0.0511)-(-0.0871)-(-0.0197)-(-0.1147)

II-(-0.3296)-(-0.3012)-(-0.1255)-(-0.0951)-(-0.0593)-(-0.0082)

Chapter Nine

The Cadaster of 1582 and the Later Sixteenth Century Vodskaia Pomestie

INTRODUCTION

The severe economic dislocation of the 1570s and 1580s retarded the development of the Vodskaia pomestie after 1550. The Shapiro symposium's study of the surviving cadasters found that more than seventy-five percent of the pomesties occupied in the 1560s were abandoned by the 1580s. More than ninety (92.3) percent of the tax units no longer had known landlords in residence. The pomestie suffered more than other forms of landholding. On the crown lands only 45.1 percent of the settlements and 81.5 percent of the tax units were abandoned.¹

The causes of the economic dislocation are unclear. The poor harvest and epidemics referred to in the cadasters were not unusual occurrences in the sixteenth century and do not explain sufficiently the despoliation of the region's pomesties. The reverses suffered by Ivan IV in the Livonian War may be a more significant factor behind the peasants' flight from pomesties to crown lands.² There are frequent references to the invasion of the "*Nemtsy*," the Muscovite term for "foreigners" which in this instance referred to the Poles, Swedes, and Teutonic Knights of Livonia.³ The military situation was precarious, for the cadasters show that the Livonians and Swedes already occupied twenty-five and were operating in another thirteen of Vodskaia's thirty-eight western and northern parishes. The northern and western Baltic parishes were lost to Sweden after the defeat at Wenden in 1578, while the march of Poland's King Stephen Bathory on Pskov in 1581 compounded the tsar's reverses.

The dispossessed pomeshchiks of the western and northern parishes now had to be supported from the eastern parishes of the Ladoga and Novgorod

districts remaining under Muscovite control. Many old landlords were absent on active duty in the war. Some were prisoners of war in Livonia while others were absent for unknown cause. Other landlords had been dispossessed by the oprichnina, whose operations in the area began its economic decline. For five days in 1570, Ivan IV's oprichniki had sacked Novgorod and executed 40,000 residents suspected of collaborating with the Poles.⁴ The evidence in the census books on the abandonment of pomesties and the flight of the peasants seeking more favorable terms to the crown lands shows the economic dislocation caused by the excesses of the oprichnina and the reverses of the Livonian War.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE POMESTIES

The census-takers who conducted the census of 1582 classified the pomesties into four main categories. An estate had to remain in the same family for at least a generation to be "old." Pomesties held less than a generation by the same family were "new." Most new pomeshchiks were old lords from the Livonian towns who received compensation in the eastern parishes of the province after the Poles and Swedes occupied the western and northern parishes respectively.

The estates no longer occupied by a landlord and not administered as crown land were classified "abandoned pomesties" (*porozhye zemli*). The former landlords were not called "old" pomeshchiks unless they had held their land for a generation or more. The former St Nicholas's at Budkovo pomeshchik Rusa Gavrilov syn Elagin was "new" although he had received and abandoned his pomestie before 1582.⁵ The remaining abandoned estates, which the palace administered after their escheat to the crown, were designated "crown land."

The original parish returns record the total lords, manors, and tax units in each category of pomestie. The statistics for the "entire province" (the twenty-three parishes outside of the theatre-of-war and still under Muscovite administration in 1582) are given in the concluding paragraphs of the returns for the pomesties. Some published parish returns only give the totals for "all pomesties." The failure to publish the separate returns for the old and new estates in some parishes prevented the classification of twenty-nine lords occupying nineteen manors on 341.87 tax units.⁶

Comparing the totals calculated from the published parish returns with the census-takers' provincial totals permits the classification of all the pomeshchiks. The individual *parish* returns distinguish between forty-seven old and ninety-two new pomeshchiks. Another ten new pomeshchiks were

recorded in the category of “newly baptized Tatars,” who received eighteen tax units of abandoned fallow in St Anthony’s-on-the-Volkhov parish.”⁷ Adding the twenty-nine unclassifiable pomeshchiks to the above figures reveals that 178 lords held land in the twenty-three parishes surveyed in 1582. The *provincial* totals refer to fifty old lords living on 776.75 tax units (91.75 occupied arable and 685 abandoned fallow). Ten additional old pomeshchiks were prisoners-of-war while their wives and underage sons held their full pomestie (14.25 tax units of occupied arable and 279.792 of fallow). As a result, sixty of the 178 pomeshchiks occupying 1070.26 tax units were old (33.3%) while the remaining 118 (66.6%) lords assigned 948.445 tax units were new pomeshchiks.⁸

Only twenty-nine (24.6%) of the 118 new pomeshchiks, all of whom were from the Livonian towns under Polish and Swedish occupation, received “living tax units,” arable land cultivated by dues-paying peasants. Two additional pomeshchiks who held as prisoners-of-war in Livonia also received “living tax units.”⁹ The other new pomeshchiks had to attract peasants to their new estates before the land could support their military service.

The exact rate of turnover of pomesties is unknown because the abridgment only gives the number of lords rather than the number of pomesties and several lords often held the same estate as joint tenants or tenants in common. However, the percentage of tax units changing possession between 1540 and 1582 suggests a considerably higher rate of turnover after 1550. In 1582, thirty-four percent (948.445) of the province’s tax units were held by new pomeshchiks while another thirty-two percent (926.69 tax units) were abandoned former pomesties. In 1539 old pomeshchiks held more than half of the province’s tax units; in 1582 old pomeshchiks held thirty-five percent (1070.26), only slightly more than one third of the tax units. The higher rate of turnover prevailing in the second half of the sixteenth century may have been a temporary phenomenon. Despite the reverses of the war and terror campaign conducted by Ivan IV’s oprichnina in and around Novgorod, where most of parishes surveyed in 1582 were located, sixty of the eighty-nine lords residing in the province on “living land” were old pomeshchiks. If the abandoned land assigned to the old pomeshchiks is considered together with their “living lands,” old pomeshchiks still held more than half (53 %) of the 2018.7 tax units assigned to pomeshchiks in 1582.

Nearly all of the 1875.135 tax units no longer held by the families of the pomeshchiks of 1540 were abandoned pomesties no longer occupied by dues-paying peasants. The 831.19 tax units not yet reassigned to new pomeshchiks represent forty-seven percent of all abandoned pomesties surveyed in the census of 1582. This suggests that the lands were recently abandoned due to the economic dislocation of the oprichnina terror and reverses in the Livonian

war. Since the province's pomeshchiks did most of the fighting, it is reasonable to assume that many of the 114 lords who had held the abandoned land in 1540 were casualties of war, some of whom died without heirs, causing the land to escheat to the crown.

The higher rate of turnover does not mean that the Novgorod pomeshchiks lost their regional ties after 1550. Almost all the new pomeshchiks, who were displaced servingmen from the Livonian towns and northwestern parishes, preferred to remain in the region. Their new lands were as geographically close as possible to their old pomesties, often less than 100 versts from the northwestern Vodstva parishes along the Livonian border.

OLD POMESTIES

The abridgment of the cadaster of 1582 gives partial returns from ten old pomesties and two maintenance pomesties. Six of the nine families (the Kalitins, Kuzmins, Nashchokins, Novokshchenovs, Skudins, and Tolbugins) holding the ten old pomesties had representatives living in the province in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Boyar families (the Princes Cherkasky and the Yuriev) received two of the remaining old pomesties after 1540. The possession of the third old pomestie held by Peter Nevelov is not traceable because the 1540 returns from the St Nicholas's at Budkovo parish do not survive.¹⁰

The Kalitins of Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov parish were an old Vodstva family. In 1582, Semen Ivanov syn held an old pomestie that included the small village of Plotnichi.¹¹ Although not held by the family in 1540, the returns from 1500 do assign the village "to the Kalitins."¹² The lands therefore passed out of the control of the family after 1500 and were returned after 1540. The remainder of Semen's estate was continuously held by the Kalitin family after 1500. In 1539, Stepan Ivanov syn Kalitin held 10.5 Kolomna tax units together with his younger brothers Fedor, Michael, and Semen. Since Semen was listed last in 1539, he was the youngest brother and probably between fifteen and twenty years of age at the time. By 1582, he was at or near retirement and living on the portion of the estate retained as his share when the lands were separated administratively after his elder brothers died.¹³

The Kalitins were probably the most important landholding family in the Kolomna parish. In addition to Stepan Ivanov syn, three collateral branches held and resided on Kolomna pomesties in 1540. Fedor Vasiliev syn possessed seven old tax units and lived in Vergezha on the former lands of the Uspensky Prechistye Volotovsk monastery.¹⁴ Patreky and Andrew Peresvetov deti lived in the hamlet of Ostrov and held eleven old tax units on the same

former fifteenth century Novgorodian boyar land as their cousin Fedor.¹⁵ Their cousin Loba and his sons (Peter, Semen, Vasko, and Stepanka) held 20.5 old tax units and resided on their manor at Podberezhie on the former lands of the Novgorodian votchinniks Luka Mikhailov syn Guznishchev, Nefed Shapkin, and Kostia Bogdanov.¹⁶ The forty-nine tax units held by Kalitins, who had already resided in the parish for more than two generations by 1540, represented fifty-nine percent of the tax units held by pomeshchiks.¹⁷

The Nashchokins, who held an old pomestie in the St Dmitry's at Gditsk parish in 1582, were another old Vodskaia family with roots going back to the first generation of Muscovite pomeshchiks enfeoffed by Ivan III. The estate held by Fedor Andreev syn and his mother in 1582 belonged to Vasily Mokeev Nashchokin in 1540 and Timoshhka and Vasiuk (the pejorative of 'Vasily') Senkin deti Mokeev Nashchokin in 1500.¹⁸

The family's lands were concentrated in the Novgorod district, where the St Dmitry's at Gditsk parish was located. In 1540, Semen Fedorov syn Nashchokin held six old tax units in the St Egor's of Luzhsk parish, which were located twenty-nine versts to the southwest of St Dmitry's at Gditsk parish.¹⁹ The old pomesties of his cousin Vlas Semenov syn Motiakin Nashchokin consisted of fourteen tax units in the St Andrew's at Gruzinsk, twenty-one tax units in the Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov, and 29.5 tax units in the St Anthony's parishes.²⁰ The parishes were located along the Volkhov River; Kolomna was approximately thirty and St Anthony's forty versts respectively from St Dmitry's at Gditsk parish.

The Novokshchenovs of the Dormition Khrepelsk parish, which was located forty-three versts to the northwest of Novgorod, could also trace their roots back to the first Muscovite gentry settled in the region by Ivan III. In 1582, Ivan Alekseev syn Novokshchenov was holding a pomestie that had been in his family for nearly a century.²¹ Although the 1540 returns from the Dormition Khrepelsk parish are lost, the 1500 returns record his father or grandfather, Alexis Fedorov syn Novokshchenov, as the landholder of forty tax units formerly belonging to the archbishop of Novgorod.²² Alexis's brothers Yakov and Boris held twenty-seven and forty tax units respectively in the same volost.²³ Collectively the Novokshchenovs held 107 or 91.45 % of the 114 tax units assigned to the parish's pomeshchiks in 1500.²⁴

Gregory Terentiev syn Skudin held an of 3.5 tax units in St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov parish that had been in his family for three generations, all of whom had resided on the same manor at Liapunovo.²⁵ The returns from 1540 record Gregory and his older brothers, Nester and Ivan, as co-holders "of their father's pomestie."²⁶ Gregory's relationship to Vasiuk Striga Kostiantin syn Skudin, who held the same pomestie in 1500, is unclear because the returns

from 1540 do not mention Gregory's father by name.²⁷ Vasiuk Striga may have been Terenty's father and Gregory's grandfather, but this cannot be definitely established without Terenty's patronymic. The abridgment of the 1582 returns indicates that Gregory Skudin also held a pomestie of an unspecified number of tax units in the St Nicholas's at Gorodishche parish.²⁸ The returns from 1540 assigned the pomestie to Andrew and Ivan Achkasov and referred to their father, Prokofy, as the former landholder.²⁹ The clerk's notation on the 1500 cadaster indicates that Prokofy received the pomestie, which was located on the former lands of Fedor Seleznev retained by the crown after 1480, shortly after 1500.³⁰

In 1540, Andrew and Ivan Prokofiev resided on their manor at Tigori-on-the-Volkhov in the St Nicholas's at Gorodishche parish. They also held a small estate of 7.5 tax units in Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov to the south.³¹ Since the 1582 abridgment does not mention any Achkasovs and Skudin was the only landholder in the St Nicholas's parish, Achkasov's failure to produce a male heir capable of performing military service may have enabled him to obtain the land. However, an Achkasov may have continued to reside in Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov parish. Although the abridged Soltsa returns only refer to a Stepan Kuzmin by name, the parish totals cite five old pomeshchiks and two widows.³²

Skudin's acquisition of Andrew Achkasov's old pomestie illustrates the pomeshchik's continuing preference for lands near the manor. The St Nicholas's at Gorodishche estate was less than fifteen versts from his manor at Liapunovo. By approving the acquisition, the crown was allowing the land to remain within the possession of the families of the province's original Muscovite pomeshchiks.

The Tolbugins were another old family who acquired additional pomesties while retaining lands granted to the family by Ivan III in the 1480s. In 1582, Andrew Karmanov syn Tolbugin was living in the hamlet of Berezhok-on-the-Luga earlier belonging to his father, Karman, and in 1500 to Epishev Tolbugin. His remaining lands were taken from the eight tax units that had belonged to Ivan Vasiliev syn Veliaminov in 1500.³³ The abridged returns from 1582 include a reference to eight abandoned tax units, formerly belonging to Yury Epishev syn Tolbugin.³⁴ Since the Kositsk cadasters compiled in 1540 have not survived, Karman's patronymic is unknown. The possibility exists, however, that Karman and Yury were brothers. Beginning service earlier than Karman, Yury would have received part of his father's estate. He would not have received the manor, however, since his father still had to support his own service, as well as a family that included a younger son, Karman. Upon entering service, Karman would have received a small share of his father's land and whatever additional land was needed and available to support his military

service. Ivan Veliaminov death without heirs would have provided the necessary land. When Karman's father later died, he would have received a share of the manor retained by his father as his maintenance pomestie.

The Kuzmins (Kuzminskies) of Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov were another old Vodskaia family who received additional pomesties earlier belonging to other old families. The 1582 abridged cadaster refers to Stepan Tretiakov syn Kuzmin as the holder of the hamlet Olomna-on-the-Olomna, which the returns from the census of 1540 assigned to his father, Tretiak Nekrasov syn Kuzminsky.³⁵ Although Ivan Bezstuzhev held the pomestie in 1500, the Kuzmin (Kuzminskies) could trace their origins back to the first Muscovite pomeshchiks enfeoffed in the parish by Ivan III.³⁶ Shortly after 1500 Stepan's grandfather, Nekras Grigoriev syn, and his cousin, Ivan Alekseev syn, received forty-eight tax units. His grandfather's half was held by his son and Stepan's uncle, Shiria Nekrasov syn, in 1540.³⁷

While the above families of old pomeshchiks could trace their origins back to the original settlers, the Princes Cherkasky, who held an old pomestie and a maintenance pomestie in the Novgorod district, could not. The Cherkaskies were Tatar princes who entered the Muscovite service and attained boyar rank in the sixteenth century. Prince Michael Temriukovich Cherkasky was an oprichnik and boyar дума member in the late 1560s.³⁸ The 1582 cadaster records Prince Ivan Egupov syn Cherkasky as the holder of an "old" pomestie including the hamlet of Vodossy-on-the-Vodosa in the St Andrew's at Gruzinsk parish.³⁹ Since Fedor Ivanov syn Nozdrin Neledinsky held the hamlet in 1540 and the same family had to hold a pomestie for at least a generation before it could be considered old, Cherkasky must have acquired the estate shortly after 1540 and before 1560.⁴⁰ The same cadaster recorded Princess Orina Ilbekova Cherkaskaia as the holder of a maintenance pomestie in St Egor's of Luzhsk parish. Since the parish returns surviving from the census of 1540 do not refer to the Cherkasky princes, Princess Orina's husband acquired his pomestie after 1540.⁴¹

Although Prince Ivan Egupov syn Cherkasky also held pomesties in Shelonskaia province, most of the family's lands were located outside of the Novgorod region. The census of 1584–86 indicates that Princes Semen Ardasovich, Boris Kenbulatovich, Fedor Zheligetovich, and Ivan Sheliutiukovich held pomesties and votchinas near Moscow. Prince Semen Ardasovich had the largest pomestie in the late sixteenth century, 2000 cheti of arable and fallow in one field.⁴²

The boyar Nikita Romanovich Yuriev, the brother-in-law of Tsar Ivan IV and grandfather of Tsar Michael Romanov, held an old pomestie including the hamlet of Khotovichy in the St Ivan's at Perezhsk parish. Since Andrew and Suvor Kostentinov deti Zagoskin held the estate in 1540, Yuriev probably

received it before 1560. He entered the boyar дума after the death of his brother Daniel Romanovich Yuriev in 1565 and was named *okolnichii* in charge of the *dvorets*, the chancery that managed the crown lands.⁴³

The practice of granting pomesties in St Ivan's at Perezhsk to officials of the sovereign's court dates from the reign of Ivan III. Because of the parish's ideal location along the Volkhov River only fifteen versts to the north of Novgorod, all of the pomeshchiks were central government officials in 1500. Ivan Sumorok Voksherin, who held six tax units later belonging to Andrew Zagoskin and Nikita Romanovich Yuriev, was a state secretary.⁴⁴ Prince Vasily Lykov, who held eleven tax units in the parish, served as the grand prince's senior equerry (*koniushii*).⁴⁵ Prince Vasily Danilov syn Dmitrievich Kholm'sky, who held 6.5 tax units in the parish, was Ivan III's son-in-law and a member of the Boyar Duma.⁴⁶

NEW POMESTIES

The abridgment of the cadaster of 1582 gives the names of six families with representatives holding six new pomesties. Three families held new pomesties in St Dmitry's at Gorodnia parish, whose returns from the census of 1540 are lost. The absence of references in the 1500 and 1540 returns suggests that the Demenievs and Klemenievs did not settle in the province before 1550. Since sixteenth century spelling was not standardized, however, the possibility remains that the Demenev's and Klemenievs were relatives of the Dementievs and Klementievs referred to in the cadasters of 1500.⁴⁷

The 1540 cadaster refers to three Klementievs. Gregory Andreev syn held his father's old pomestie in the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda parish and a *pridacha* in the St Egor's of Luzhsk parish.⁴⁸ Timothy and Boris Ivanov syn Klementiev held the remainder of the St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda pomestie earlier held by Gregory's father.⁴⁹ The relationship between Timothy and Boris on the one hand and Gregory on the other hand is unclear. The practice of retaining land within the family and the division of Andrew Klementiev's estate between his son and Timothy and Boris suggests Andrew and Ivan Klementiev were brothers and that Gregory was the first cousin of Timothy and Boris.

The family of Fedor Guriev, a dispossessed pomeshchik from the Livonian towns who received a St Dmitry's at Gorodnia pomestie to compensate for the lands lost to the Lithuanians, had representatives in Vod'skaia before 1500. In 1500 Ivan and Andrew Vasiliev deti Guriev held thirty-two tax units in the volost of Dmitry and Dementy and Kondrat Ivanov deti Panteleev in our Sav-

ior's at Zaretsk parish. Their brothers, Stepan and Lev Vasiliev deti, held twenty-four tax units in the volost of Fedor, Zakhary, and Semen Onanin deti Popov and Alexander Timofeev in the neighboring St Gregory's parish.⁵⁰

Three families (the Akhlebaevs, Vastanovs, and Tulubievs) held new pomesties in parishes (St Egor's at Luzhsk, St Andrew's at Gruzinsk, and St Anthony's-on-the-Volkhov) for which returns also survive from the censuses of 1500 and 1540. None of the families had representatives residing in the parishes for which returns survive from 1540. The Tulubievs, but not the Akhlebaevs and Vastanovs, had representatives living in the province in 1500. In 1500 Vasily Tulubiev held twenty-seven tax units in the St Egor's at Ratchino parish of the Yama district.⁵¹ Ivan and Fedor Fedorov deti Tulubiev held six tax units in the Kargalsk parish of the Koporie district.⁵² Both of the parishes were near the Livonian border and were under Polish-Lithuanian occupation in 1582. Their proximity to Gavril's former Livonian pomestie suggests that he was either a direct descendant of Vasily, Ivan, and Fedor, or of a close relative.⁵³

Since the census-takers only calculated the number (92) of new pomeshchiks and estates were often held in common, the number of families holding new pomesties in 1582 is unknown and the degree to which the six families mentioned in the abridgment represent all of the families of new pomeshchiks is unclear. The sample of new families may not be representative because the editors did not insure that each new pomeshchik in each parish with new pomesties had an equal chance of being included in the sample. Instead of randomly selecting the first new pomeshchik listed in each parish, the number chosen varies from parish to parish. Three of the twelve St Dmitry's at Gorodnia, but only one of the thirty-six St Andrew's at Gruzinsk new pomeshchiks are mentioned.⁵⁴

While definitive conclusions cannot be reached without a careful examination of the original cadaster, the sample of new pomesties does suggest the possibility that many of the new pomeshchiks came from old provincial families. Two of the six families, the Gurievs and Tulubievs, had representatives in Vodskaia province in 1500. If the Klemenievs were relatives of the Klementievs, half of the sample of new pomeshchiks came from old families. The cadasters of 1500 and 1540 showed that family members preferred lands near one another. After the Muscovites moved into Livonia, many of the original Livonian pomeshchiks, like Michael or Gavril Mikhailov syn Tulubiev, may have been related to pomeshchiks holding land in the Vodskaia parishes closest to the Livonian border. When they lost their lands a generation later, they were granted new pomesties in the same province where their fathers and grandfathers had lived.

ABANDONED POMESTIES

The abridgment of the cadaster of 1582 refers to fifteen pomesties abandoned by thirteen pomeshchiks belonging to ten families. The former lords of two abandoned pomesties (Yakov Akhlebaev of St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov parish and Yury Epishev syn Tolbugin of Kositsk parish) belonged to families who still had representatives holding Vodskaia pomesties in 1582.⁵⁵ Lev Tretiakov syn Akhlebaev held a pomestie in St Egor's at Luzhsk parish while Andrew Karmanov syn Tolbugin held a Kositsk pomestie.⁵⁶

The remaining eight families formerly holding thirteen abandoned pomesties did not have known representatives in the province in 1582. Two families, the Baranovs of Our Savior's parish and the Chupriakovs of Klimetsk parish, did not hold pomesties in 1500.⁵⁷ Since the returns for Our Savior and Klimetsk parishes from the census of 1540 do not survive, their presence in mid-century cannot be verified.

Two families had representatives living on the same pomestie in 1500. The estate abandoned by Vasily Mokeev in the St Dmitry's at Gditsk parish was held by Timoshka and Vasiuk Senkin deti Mokeev around 1500 and by Vasily Mokeev in 1540.⁵⁸ The former pomestie of Eremai Trusov Vorobin in Zaveriazhie was held by Eremai alone in 1500 and in joint tenancy with his sons Gridia, Vasily, Lev, and Gridia the Younger in 1540.⁵⁹

Nine pomesties were abandoned by seven pomeshchiks from four families who had representatives living on other Vodskaia pomesties in 1500. The estates of Rusa Gavrilov syn Elagin in St Nicholas's at Budkovo and of his brother Michael in the Soltsa, Kolomna-on-the-Volkov, and St Andrew's at Gruzinsk parishes were abandoned in 1582.⁶⁰ All of the lands held by the Elagins in 1500 were located in the St Nicholas's at Suidovsk parish of the Koporie district, which was occupied by the Poles and Lithuanians in 1582. Matvei Mikhailov syn Elagin and his brother Michael held twelve tax units in the volost of Eremai Krasov.⁶¹ Ivan Meshok and Yakush Elagin held twenty-four tax units in the volost of Pavel Fedorov syn Gorbatyi.⁶²

Prince Ivan Ivanov syn Eletsy's former pomestie was located in the St Peter's-on-the-Volkhov parish.⁶³ All of the Princes Eletskie mentioned in the 1500 cadasters, however, held pomesties in the St Nicholas's at Budkovo parish, which exclusively consisted of crown land in 1582. Prince Ivan Seleznev Ivanov syn held fifty tax units, while his brothers (Peter, Dmitry, and Semen) held fifty-one, forty-five, and 70.5 tax units respectively.⁶⁴

None of the pomesties held by the Princes Putiatin in 1500 were located in the parishes where family members abandoned pomesties after 1550. The returns from 1582 refer to abandoned Putiatin pomesties in St Gregory's at Krechnevo,

St Nicholas's at Pidebsk, and St Nicholas's at Peredolsk parishes.⁶⁵ All the lands held by the Princes Putiatin in 1500 were located in the neighboring parish of St Dmitry's at Gorodnia, where the Princes Vasily and Peter (Prince Mikita's sons) held 16.5 and 29.5 tax units respectively.⁶⁶

The returns from the census of 1500 show the Miakinins did not have representatives in the Klimetsk parish, where Ivan Mitrofanov syn abandoned his pomestie before 1582.⁶⁷ The only Miakinin referred to in 1500, Semen Lukin syn, held twenty-two tax units in the volost of Ofimi Goroshkov and Ivan Yazhinsky in the St Dmitry's at Gorodnia parish.⁶⁸

The absence in 1500 of family members in the parishes where they later abandoned pomesties suggests that the pomeshchiks preferred to abandon lands recently acquired by the family. A comparison of the 1540 and 1582 returns supports this theory. Returns from the censuses of 1540 and 1582 survive for nine of the fifteen abandoned pomesties referred to in the abridgment of the cadaster of 1582. In five cases the pomeshchiks abandoned estates acquired after 1540.⁶⁹ In two cases pomeshchiks abandoned land acquired after 1500 and before 1540.⁷⁰

Vasily Mokeev and Eremai Trusov abandoned pomesties that had remained in their families since 1500; but both landlords had the same name as the original pomeshchiks referred to in the 1500 cadasters. Since the 1582 cadaster omitted their patronymics, they may have been second generation pomeshchiks who carried the same Christian name as their fathers. However, military service began at fifteen and ended at sixty in the Muscovite state. If they were in their late teens when the census of their parish was conducted between 1500 and 1505, they would have reached retirement age after the census of 1540. Without surviving adult sons to take care of them in their old age, it is reasonable to assume they would have left their estates to live with other relatives. It is therefore possible that the Vasily Mokeev and Eremai Trusov referred to in the 1582 cadaster as the former lords of abandoned pomesties were first generation pomeshchiks.

CONCLUSION

The abridgment of the Vodskaia cadaster of 1582 does not support the historians' traditional view that the pomestie became hereditary in the second half of the sixteenth century. The number of old and new pomesties in 1540 and 1582 cannot be compared because the abridgment of the 1582 cadaster only gives the number of pomeshchiks and several pomeshchiks often held the same estate in common or in joint tenancy. However, the rate of turnover had

to be significantly higher in the second half of the century because more than half of the tax units before 1550 and only slightly more than one-third after 1550 remained in the same family.

The higher rate of turnover after 1550 does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that the sixteenth century pomestie was conditional rather than hereditary in practice. While the number of new pomeshchiks was considerably higher after 1550, old families still held most of the tax units assigned to pomeshchiks. Many of the new pomeshchiks, moreover, came from old families with representatives in the province before 1500. Although most of the new pomeshchiks were the former residents of the Livonian towns now under Polish-Lithuanian occupation, the former Livonian pomeshchiks were often related to old Vodskaia families. Their enfeoffment in the Vodskaia province, frequently in the parishes closest to the Livonian border, shows that they wished to retain their regional and family ties.

Old pomeshchiks also developed regional ties during the century. Most of the old pomeshchiks referred to in the abridgment of the 1582 cadaster came from families holding Vodskaia pomesties before 1500. They were now old residents who continued to occupy the same manors as their fathers and grandfathers before them.

Despite the regional ties of the old pomeshchiks, a third of the province's pomesties were abandoned in the 1560s and 1570s. The reasons for this are unclear since the abridgment of the cadaster of 1582 only gives the name of the pomeshchik who abandoned his estate and omits the returns from the individual hamlets. Yet the census-takers' inability to survey most of the parishes because they were either occupied by the Poles, Lithuanians, and Swedes or the scene of military operations shows the severity of the crisis experienced by the later sixteenth century Vodskaia province. The economic dislocation caused by the oprichnina, which sacked Novgorod and executed 40,000 residents in 1571, compounded the region's problems. To continue to hold a pomestie, the landlord had to retain his old peasants or attract new peasants to replace them. This meant giving more favorable terms to the peasants who were willing to remain. However, these concessions reduced the landlord's income during wartime, when he could least afford it. Since the lord was expected to serve in the cavalry and had to defend the province from invasion, he could not personally cultivate the estate and earn enough to support military service. If he could not attract the peasants needed to till the land, he had to abandon it.

The pomeshchik's family's possession of most of the abandoned pomesties for less than a generation may be significant. If the sample of abandoned pomesties recorded in the cadaster is representative of the population of all Vodskaia abandoned pomesties, the pomeshchiks preferred to abandon new rather than old estates. This suggests that the pomeshchiks of 1582, like those of

1540, preferred to keep the land that had been in the family for the longest period of time.

The government's failure to reassign nearly half of the abandoned pomesties to new pomeshchiks or administer the estates as crown lands is significant. Despite the influx of dispossessed pomeshchiks from the Livonian towns, more than 800 abandoned tax units had not been reassigned to new pomeshchiks by 1582 and the cadaster referred to the abandoned estates by the former pomeshchik's name. This implies that the former pomeshchiks had abandoned their lands because they could no longer attract enough peasants to cultivate their holdings. Since the lords abandoned their pomesties on their own initiative, the large tracts of pomesties abandoned after 1540 cannot be cited as proof the government believed the pomestie was a conditional, non-hereditary estate capable of being repossessed at the pleasure of the crown.

It is doubtful that the pomeshchiks would have relinquished "living tax units," lands occupied by peasants, on their own initiative since the peasants' dues supported their families and military service. The crown's appropriation and subsequent reassignment of large tracts of "living tax units" to new pomeshchiks could be cited as proof that the government considered the pomestie conditional; the confiscation of land as a punishment for treason is an exception since allodial as well as conditional land could be confiscated in cases of treason. The redistribution of living tax units would have been appropriate in wartime since many pomeshchiks did not have enough land to serve. The lands could have been reassigned to new pomeshchiks or taken into the fund of obrok-paying crown lands. The dues paid by the peasants could have been converted into cash payments for the pomeshchiks who did not have enough land to support the purchase of weapons and armor. Yet only 27,156 living tax units, less than one percent of the 2945,395 tax units found in the twenty-three parishes surveyed in 1582, were reassigned to new pomeshchiks. The source of these lands (old pomesties or old crown land) cannot be determined from the abridgment because the returns from the individual hamlets and the names of the volosts are omitted. However, even if all of the living tax units had been taken from old pomesties, the percentage of total provincial tax units would still have been small enough to represent escheated pomesties regranted to new pomeshchik's after the former pomeshchik's death without heirs.

NOTES

1. Shapiro, II: 170–71.
2. See V.I. Koretsky, *Zakreposhchenie krestian i klassovaia bor'ba v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XVI v.* (Moscow, 1970), pp. 72–73.

3. Shapiro, II, 173. Also, see the following documents in the Central State Archive of Old Documents (TsGADA) f. 1209, no. 958, ll. 15, 23, 84, 178, 457 ob., 458, 463, 475, 477 ob.

4. Heinrich von Staden, a German mercenary and one of the oprichniki, described the sack of Novgorod and the despoliation of the surrounding region in his memoirs. See his *Aufzeichnungen über den Moskauer Staat*, edited by F. Epstein (Hamburg, 1930), pp. 191, 194–95.

5. *Vremennik*, VI, 9.

6. See *Vremennik*, 40–43, for the total lords, manors, and tax units calculated by the census-takers. The lords and tax units for each category calculated from the published parish totals are given below:

Category-Lords-(% in service estates)-(% all estates)-tax units-(% all estates)

Old-47-(16)-(16)-826.36-(27)

Old widows-7-(0)-(2.3)

New-102-(35)-(33.7)-922.1-(31)

Abandoned-113-(39)-(37)-831.19-(28)

Crown-1-(0.3)-(0.3)-95.5-(3)

Unclassified-29-(10)-(10)-341.87-(11)

Unclassifiable widows-3-(0)-(0.9)

Note: NPR” (“not a *prozhitok*” or maintenance pomestie) refers to the pomesties of military servingmen, excluding land held by the widows and underage children of deceased pomeshchiks. None of the published parish returns distinguish between the widows’ and servingmen’s tax units. The concluding paragraph of the pomestie returns states that eleven widows and one underage male (*nedorosl*) lived on 71.625 tax units.

7. On the newly baptized Tatars (*novokreshchenny*) see the returns for the St Anthony’s-on-the-Volkhov parish in *Vremennik*, VI, 34. Also see the provincial totals in *ibid*, 41.

8 The following list gives the lords and tax units computed after comparing the published parish returns and the census-takers’ totals for the entire province.

Estates Assigned to Pomeshchiks in 1582

Lords or Tax units-Number-Percent O/N-Percent All

Old Lords-60-34-21

New Lords-118-66-40

Old Tax Units-1070.26-53–35

New Tax Units-948.445-47-34

Former Pomesties

Abandoned: lords-113-99-39

Crown: lords-1-1-0.3

Abandoned: tax units-831.19-90-28

Crown: tax units-95.5-10-3

Note: All crown lands were abandoned pomesties before being reassigned to a crown volost.

9. *Vremennik*, VI, 41. Most new pomeshchiks received abandoned tax units. The 27.156 “living tax units” received by twenty-nine new pomeshchiks represents 0.92% of the 2945.395 tax units surveyed in the twenty-three parishes in 1582.

10. Peter Nevelov's old pomestie, which included the village of Khobolino Gora, was held by Prince Ivan Mikhailov syn Gagarin in 1500. For the 1500 returns, see *NPK*, III, 278–358; the reference to Nevelov's "old" pomestie is in *Vremennik*, VI, 17.

11. *Vremennik*, VI, 30.

12. The returns from 1500 mention two parish settlements with the name Plotichno. The original settlement, a "small village" (*seltso*) was held by Samoilek Verevkin syn Mokeev Nashchokin; see *NPK*, III, 467. The small village was held by Ivan Dmitriev syn Motiakin Nashchokin in 1540; see *PKVP*, 94–96. The second settlement, a hamlet that may have been founded by settlers from the original Plotichno, was held by the Kalitins in 1500. See *NPK*, III, 457, which assigned the village to the Kalitins but omitted the landlord's Christian name.

13. *PKVP*, 101–102.

14. For the 1539 returns, see *PKVP*, 102; for the 1500 returns see *NPK*, III, 459.

15. For the 1539 returns, see *PKVP*, 98–99. For the 1500 returns, see *NPK*, III, 457–60.

16. For the 1539 returns see, *PKVP*, 99–101. For the 1500 returns, see *NPK*, III, 456–57, 460, and 464–65.

17. In 1540, the Motiakin Nashchokins and Bolandins held the other thirty-four Kolomna tax units. Ivan Dmitriev syn Motiakin Nashchokin held twenty-one old tax units and resided at Olkovo while Ivan Bolandin, a new pomeschchik, held thirteen tax units and resided in the small village of Plotichno held in 1500 by Samoilets Verevkin syn Mokeev Nashchokin. See *PKVP*, 94–96 for the Nashchokin and *ibid*, 97–98, for the Bolandin returns from the census of 1539.

18. For the 1582 returns, see *Vremennik*, VI, 36–37. The 1540 returns are in *PKVP*, 28–30. The 1500 returns for the Mokeev Nashchokin lands are in *NPK*, III, 56–65.

19. *PKVP*, 19.

20. See *PKVP*, 89–91 (St Andrew's at Gruzinsk), 94–96 (Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov), and 102–105 (St Anthony's).

21. *Vremennik*, VI, 10–11.

22. *NPK*, III, 147–149. Since Ivan Alekseev syn inherited his estate after the death of his brothers, Michael and Daniel, he may have been the youngest son and Alexis Fedorov syn could have been his father.

23. See *NPK*, III, 149–52 for Yakov Novokshchenov's lands and *ibid*, 152–54, for Boris Novokshchenov's lands.

24. The only other pomeschchik holding lands in the parish in 1500 was Ivan Gagarin, who held seven tax units on the former lands of Ofimia Goroshkov and Matvei Teliatov. See *NPK*, III, 145–47.

25. *Vremennik*, VI, 38–39.

26. *PKVP*, 128.

27. *Vremennik*, XI, 37.

28. *Vremennik*, VI, 40.

29. *PKVP*, 171.

30. *Vremennik*, XI, 109.

31. *PKVP*, 65–66.

32. *Vremennik*, VI, 28–30.

33. For the 1582 returns, see *Vremennik*, VI, 12. For the 1500 returns, see *NPK*, III, 155–156.

34. *Vremennik*, VI, 12.

35. *Vremennik*, VI, 28; *PKVP*, 66.

36. *NPK*, III, 416.

37. For Nekras and Ivan Kuzminsky's pomestie, see *NPK*, III, 420ff. For Shiria Nekrasov syn's share, see *PKVP*, 82–84.

38. Prince Michael Temriukovich perished in 1571 under mysterious circumstances, possibly connected with the attack on Moscow of the Crimean Tatar Khan Devlet-Girei. See Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoi dumy," 75. Princes Alexis and Gavril Cherkasky were prominent defectors in 1563. In July, the tsar used his ambassador, Andrew Klobukov, to find out why the two princes had defected to the Polish King. See G. Vernadsky, *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*, p. 238.

39. *Vremennik*, VI, 24.

40. *PKVP*, 86–88.

41. *Vremennik*, VI, 22.

42. Rozhdestvensky, p. 216. Since the three-field system prevailed in Muscovy, 2000 cheti or (chetverts) was the equivalent of 3000 desiatins in all three fields. Since there were 2.7 acres to the desiatin, Prince Semen held a pomestie of 8100 acres. On the *chet* or *chetvert*, see S. Pushkarev, *Dictionary*, pp. 7–8.

43. Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoi dumy," p. 73.

44. *NPK*, III, 490–91.

45. *NPK*, III, 486–88.

46. *NPK*, III, 489–90. The service register (*razriadnaia kniga*) referred to Prince Vasily Kholm'sky as a member of the boyar duma in June 1504. See Pavel Miliukov, ed., *Drevneishaia razriadnaia kniga*, Moscow, 1901, p. 9, cited in Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoi dumy," p. 48.

47. The 1500 cadasters mention four Dementievs (Andrew, Martemian, Pavel, and Semen); if Dementiev is a corruption of Dementiev, they could be relatives of Funik Grigoriev Dementiev, who held a St Dmitry's at Gorodnia pomestie in 1582. However, this is unlikely since none lived in Vod'skaia province. On Funik Dementiev, see *Vremennik*, VI, 15. For the cadastral references to the Dementievs, see the *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 20. Six Klementievs are mentioned in the cadasters of 1500. The only Klementiev mentioned in connection with Vod'skaia province was the former Novgorod boyar Luka, who was exiled with the other Novgorod votchinniks after the Muscovite victory in 1478. Even if Klementiev is a corruption of Klementiev, Luka was probably not a relative of the Fedor Semenov syn Klementiev who held a St Dmitry's at Gorodnia pomestie in 1582. For the references to the Klementievs in the 1500 cadasters, see *NPK*, Index, I–VI, 35.

48. The 1540 cadaster refers to Gregory's father as Andrew Klementiev; see *PKVP*, 48. The 1500 cadaster assigned the pomestie to Andrew Klimov syn Tolmachev. Since "tolmach" means "translator," the 1500 cadaster could have been referred to Andrew as the son of Klementy the Tolmach or "translator." By 1540, however, Andrew's son, Gregory, chose to use Klementiev rather than Tolmachev as the family name. For the returns for 1540 from Gregory's St Ilia's-on-the-

Tigoda pomestie, see *PKVP*, 48–50. For his St Egor's at Luzhsk pridacha, see *PKVP*, 23.

49. For returns from the pomestie of Timothy and Boris Ivanov deti Klementiev, see *PKVP*, 50–52.

50. For the returns from 1500 for Ivan and Andrew Vasiliev deti Guriev's pomestie, see *NPK*, III, 737–39. For those from Stepan and Lev Vasiliev deti Guriev's pomestie, see *NPK*, III, 808–10.

51. *NPK*, III, 951.

52. *NPK*, III, 534–35.

53. Gavril Mikhailov syn Tulubiev was a former St Yury's parish pomeshchik compensated for the loss of his pomestie with eight abandoned tax units in the St Anthony's on the Volkhov parish. See *Vremennik*, VI, 33.

54. See *Vremennik*, VI, 15 (St Dmitry's at Gorodnia parish), and 25 (St Andrew's at Gruzinsk parish).

55. On the abandoned pomesties see *Vremennik*, VI, 39, for the returns from Yakov Akhlebaev's former pomestie and *ibid*, 12, for the returns from Yury Epishev syn Tolbugin's former pomestie.

56. See *Vremennik*, VI, on the Akhlebaev pomestie and *ibid*, 12, on the Tolbugin pomestie.

57. On Nikifor Fedorov syn Baranov's abandoned pomestie see *Vremennik*, VI, 7. On Nekliud Chupriakov's abandoned pomestie see, *ibid*, 2.

58. *NPK*, III, 56–63; *PKVP*, 28–30.

59. *NPK*, III, 25–27; *PKVP*, 7–9. In 1540 the estate was administered as one unit from the manor in the small village of Koptsy, where Eremai lived with his four sons.

60. On Rusa Gavrilov syn Elagin's abandoned St Nicholas's at Budkovo pomestie, see *Vremennik*, VI, 19. On Michael Gavrilov syn Elagin's abandoned pomesties, see *ibid*, 29–30.

61. *NPK*, III, 698–700.

62. *NPK*, III, 706–709.

63. *Vremennik*, VI, 36.

64. The 1500 returns for the St Nicholas's at Budkovo pomesties of the sons of Prince Ivan Eletskey (Ivan Selezen, Peter, Dmitry, and Semen) are in *NPK*, III, 341–53. The Eletskeys were serving princes who did not attain boyar rank in the sixteenth century. See Zimin's list of boyar дума members in "Sostav boiarksoi dумы," 83–87. On the Eletskeys also see Rozhdestvensky, pp. 211–13.

65. On the abandoned estates of Princes Gregory Vasiliev syn and Ivan Davydov syn Putiatin see, *Vremennik*, VI, 28. On Prince Ivan Yakovlev syn Putiatin's abandoned pomestie, see *ibid*, 13. On the Putiatin princes, who governed several Livonian towns after 1550, see Rozhdestvensky, 213.

66. *NPK*, III, 237–44.

67. See *Vremennik*, VI, 5, on Ivan Mitrofanov syn Miakinin's abandoned pomestie.

68. *NPK*, III, 227–32.

69. There were no Elagins in 1540 in any of the parishes (Soltsa, St Andrew's at Gruzinsk, and Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov) where the three pomesties abandoned by

Michael Gavrilov syn Elagin after 1540 and before 1582 were located. See *PKVP*, 65–86, 86–94, and 94–102. The family of Yakov Akhlebaev, who abandoned a St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov pomestie, did not have any representatives in the parishes for which returns survive from 1540. There were Putiatin princes among the pomeshchiks of St Gregory's at Krechnevo parish in 1540, where Princes Ivan and Gregory, the sons of Prince David Putiatin, held a pridacha of three tax units; see *PKVP*, 1–2. Prince Gregory Vasiliev syn, however, is not mentioned in the 1540 cadasters and therefore acquired his St Gregory's at Krechnevo pomestie after 1540. The hamlet at Vezhakh, referred to as Gregory Vasiliev syn's abandoned pomestie, was not part of his cousins' lands and may have been crown land in 1540. Gavril Vasiliev syn was therefore not abandoning old family land.

70. Prince Ivan Ivanov syn Eletsy's pomestie was held by Ivan Durov in 1500. See *NPK*, III, 480. The 1540 returns are in *PKVP*, 108. The reference to the abandoned pomestie in 1582 is in *Vremennik*, VI, 36. In 1500, the pomestie abandoned by Princes Ivan and Matvei Davydov deti Putiatin after 1540 and before 1582 consisted of the crown volost of Ofimi Goroshkov and the hamlets of Gavril Kozhyn granted shortly after 1500 to Gregory Shushchev Tovarkov. See *NPK*, III, 14–16.

Chapter Ten

Conclusion

The unification of Russia around Moscow confronted the Russian government with the problem of integrating Novgorod and the other newly annexed territories into the state. Ivan III sought to solve the problem by making Muscovite law the common law of the realm and relying on his loyal cavalrymen to provide the state with military service. The *Sudebnik* issued by Ivan III in 1497 was Russia's first "national" code of laws. The Muscovite census-takers who traveled to Novgorod to enforce the law and conduct the censuses of the 1480s, 1500, 1540, 1552, 1571, 1576, and 1582 resembled the circuit judges who enforced the English common law and prepared the *Domesday Book* (1087) for William I. The references to their adjudication of disputes between pomeshchiks and the use of the term "judicial circuit" for the districts of Vodskaia province confirm their status as traveling justices authorized to hold court.

The integration of Novgorod into the realm required cavalrymen whose loyal state service could defend the region from its neighbors (Sweden, Livonia and Poland) and prevent Novgorod's tradition of local autonomy from reasserting itself. Like William I of England, who replaced the Anglo-Saxon thegns with Norman barons and knights, Ivan III of Russia replaced the Novgorod boyars with two thousand gentry from the center of the state around Moscow and a few representatives of older Muscovite boyar families. He placed the former unfree servants of the exiled Novgorodian and disgraced Muscovite boyars along the northwestern border of Vodskaia province.

The new pomeshchiks of Shelonskaia and Vodskaia provinces held their estates in return for cavalry service. The land remained in the family as long as they or their male heirs served. Otherwise, it escheated, reverted to the grand prince as the Norman knight's fee reverted to the crown upon the knight's failure to serve or on default of male issue. The grand prince did not

issue a decree in his council (Boyar Duma) defining the rules governing the possession of the pomestie, but they were understood by the community of the realm (boyars, government officials, and pomeshchiks) and enforced by the state secretaries and clerks of the Service Land Chancery.

The description of the pomestie given above suggests Ivan III created a new conditional tenure in sharp contrast to the old allodial votchina. The grand princes of Moscow had been giving their servants land attached to the palace and administered by the royal household since the fourteenth century. The idea of supporting military service with the pomestie was a logical extension of the custom of supporting household service with land. The sources of the new estates were evidence of the new tenure's conditionality. If the grand prince could confiscate old, patrimonial estates and then give the land to state servants in return for military service, the state had supreme proprietorship (*eminent domain*). Possession belonged to the pomeshchik, ownership to the state.

Traditional historians used the distinction between ownership and possession to explain the difference between the votchina and the pomestie. The votchina was a patrimonial estate inherited from one's ancestors. The term itself came from *votets*, the Old Slavonic word for "father." The pomestie was a conditional estate resembling the Western European military fief that did not become inheritable under customary law until the later sixteenth century and under statutory law until the reign of Alexis I.

A.A. Zimin's research on the confiscation of votchinas weakened the traditional distinction between the conditional pomestie and the allodial votchina. The confiscated votchinas found in the older regions of the Muscovite state outside of Novgorod during the second half of the fifteenth century show the state's position as the ultimate owner of the land. Ivan III's confiscation of the votchinas of the exiled Novgorod boyars is additional evidence that the distinction between the votchina and pomestie based on ownership and possession does not apply to the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The examples of confiscated boyar votchinas suggest that Muscovite land law was moving toward a single, conditional tenure and away from the traditional distinction between the private patrimonial land of the boyars and the public crown lands of the Russian state. The attachment of the service obligation to the votchina in 1556 also implied that the sixteenth century votchina was conditional. Yet the votchina retained several definitive characteristics of allodial tenure. The votchinnik could still inherit his land and bequeath it to children or other relatives. He could also sell the land to another votchinnik or donate it to a church or monastery. It is also important to remember that the confiscation of votchiny was an infrequent occurrence connected with the

sovereign's authority to punish treason. Ivan III's confiscations were necessary to secure the loyalty of the Novgorod land after two rebellions in a decade. Indeed, the extraordinary character of these confiscations resembles the operation of the law of eminent domain. For most legal purposes, the late fifteenth and sixteen-century votchina remained an allod.

Although the same characteristics defining the votchina as an allod were present in the early sixteenth century pomestie system, traditional historians failed to perceive a resemblance between the two tenures before the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries. The provisions of the original enfeoffment charters requiring forfeiture of the estate for evasion of military service and the absence of legislation defining the legal character of the pomestie supported them. The decree authorizing the exchange of pomesties between pomeshchiks issued by Tsar Michael in 1636 and Chapter Sixteen of the *Law Code* prepared by the Assembly of the Land in 1649 allowing the transference of land between pomeshchiks and votchinniks were the first statutory references to the exchange of pomesties.

The cadasters surviving from censuses of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century in Shelonskaia and Vodskaia provinces, however, show that the early pomestie displayed many attributes of an allod. The pomeshchik's ability to exchange his pomesties with other pomeshchiks without the crown's prior consent is an important characteristic of allodial property. The exchange of conditional property without the prior consent of the owner is illegal because the transference of the land alienates the estate from the original lord. Yet the surviving cadasters of 1500 refer to several exchanges between pomeshchiks while the cadasters of 1539 and 1540 frequently refer to such transactions. None of the citations either before or after 1500 refers to the grand prince's approval, which could have come from a charter prepared in Moscow, by a state secretary or undersecretary during the annual muster and enrollment, or a census-taker during the census. As the grand prince's representative the census-takers were omnicompetent; the occasional references to their adjudication of disputes between pomeshchiks represents the exercise of the sovereign's judicial power. If the exchange of pomesties were extraordinary events requiring the state's prior permission, the historian would surely find references to the government's approval in the cadasters.

The exchange of pomesties between pomeshchiks did not alienate the land from service because the new landlord had to perform cavalry service to retain his land. Yet both provinces' cadasters refer to the donation of pomesties to monasteries. Since the monasteries did not have to furnish the sovereign with cavalymen, these donations completely alienated the donated land from service. Since the ability to alienate land from service is an attribute of

allodial property, the early sixteenth century pomestie resembled the votchina in this respect.

The ability to sell land is another attribute of allodial property. Despite the lack of references to the “sale” of pomesties in the Shelonskaia and Vodskaia cadasters, the references to the unequal exchange of tax units resemble sales. The exchange of ten units in a remote parish for eight units in the parish of the landlord’s residence, for example, involves the payment of two tax units for a more favorable location. Menshoi Aigustov’s exchange of two tax units and five rubles in Efremovo parish for three tax units in Cherenchitsy parish is evidence of the payment of five rules for one tax unit. Although these transactions were not widespread, the cadastral references show their legality. If the unequal exchanges were unlawful, the census-takers would have invalidated them and recorded their decision in the cadasters.

The attributes of allodial property displayed by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century pomestie do not justify the conclusion that the pomestie tenure no longer involved service. A pomeshchik who failed to appear at the annual muster and enrollment or refused to serve in a military campaign could forfeit his land. The lack of cadastral references to the confiscation of pomesties for evasion of state service only shows the pomeshchiks’ loyalty; it does not prove their ability to avoid military service without forfeiting their land. The government’s legal authority to confiscate the lands of servingmen who failed to serve supports the thesis that the state held ownership of the land while the pomeshchik held possession. This is clear from the cadasters, which place the pomestie returns immediately after the obrok-paying crown lands, before the small votchinas of the petty landowners and ahead of the monastic estates.

The state’s legal authority to confiscate pomesties did not prevent it from recognizing the family’s interest in its land. This is evident from the provisions for setting aside part of a serving man’s pomestie for his retirement or the support of his widow and children after his death.

The lands of other family members were an important source for the pridachas, the additional land received when the estate could no longer support the landlord’s service (usually when the eldest son reached adulthood, entered military service and began his own family). The Shelonskaia and Vodskaia pridachas usually came from deceased relatives’ estates. When family land was unavailable, the pomeshchik received a nearby parcel that had belonged to a deceased pomeshchik from another family without relatives in the parish.

The low rate of turnover of pomesties in the two provinces is the most important evidence of the family’s desire to retain its land. The same families held most estates in 1500 and 1540. Sixty percent of the classifiable pomesties in Shelonskaia and sixty-nine percent of the parcels surveyed in Vod-

skaia province were “old” by 1540. Although forty percent of the Shelonskaia pomesties and thirty-one percent of the Vodskaia parcels did not remain in the same family, most of the earlier landlords did not have any known descendants serving in 1540. The “new” pomesties therefore represent land that had reverted (*escheated*) to the crown after the original pomeshchik’s death without heirs.

The revisionary Shelonskaia cadaster of 1552 supports the earlier conclusions on the pomestie’s resemblance to an allod. Exchanges of pomesties without the state’s prior permission continued to be widespread, occurring in eight of the nine parishes with surviving returns. Like their fathers and grandfathers, the pomeshchiks of 1552 wanted to consolidate their holdings by exchanging distant land for parcels in the parish of their residence. The higher incidence of new pomesties involved in these transactions is evidence of the pomeshchik’s desire to consolidate his holdings as soon as possible. The pomeshchiks receiving *pridachas* also preferred to obtain lands near their residence; all but three of the twelve *pridachas* included lands in the same parish as the landlord’s residence.

The low rate of turnover found by comparing the revisionary census of 1552 with earlier censuses is additional evidence that pomesties remained in the original landlord’s family as long as the adult males between fifteen and sixty served the state. The high percentage (84%) of old pomesties and incidence of new pomesties held by old families (43%) shows that the landlords considered their estates family land. The succession of 65% of the pomeshchiks by their sons implies recognition of hereditary succession in customary if not written law.

The low rate of turnover characteristic of the mid-century pomestie does not extend to the later sixteenth century. The references in the Shelonskaia cadaster of 1576 to the confiscation or abandonment of a third of the parcels and nearly half the manors in the Porkhov district in northwestern Russia mirrors Kobrin’s findings on the higher rate of turnover in the central region of the state near Moscow. The abandonment of a third of the pomesties recorded in the abridged Vodskaia cadaster of 1582 provides additional evidence.

The higher rate of turnover of the later sixteenth century does not disprove the state’s continuing recognition of the family’s interest in retaining their pomesties from generation to generation. Instead of granting the abandoned or confiscated estates to other families, the state allowed the former Shelonskaia pomesties to remain abandoned six years after the *oprchnina*. The census-takers’ use of the former pomeshchik’s name to refer to these estates permits the historian to trace their possession from the eve of the *oprchnina* back to the late fifteenth century, when Ivan III made the first grants in Shelonskaia province. The percentage of definitely classifiable parcels (86.7%) remaining

in the same family for more than a generation approximates the percentage of old pomesties found in the cadaster of 1552. Since most of these parcels were already old in 1539, the pomeshchiks residing in the province on the eve of the oprichnina were the direct descendants of the original families enfeoffed by Ivan III nearly a century earlier. The confiscations later conducted by his grandson Ivan IV during the oprichnina were the product of the sovereign's fear of treason rather than a conscious desire to enforce the pomestie's status as a conditional tenure. Since traitors lost their allodial votchinas too, the confiscations are not proof that the pomestie was conditional property in unwritten, customary law.

The higher rate of turnover found in later sixteenth century Vodskaia province also fails to prove the pomestie's conditionality in customary law. Although old families only held slightly more than a third of the estates surveyed in 1582, they continued to possess most of the tax units held in pomestie tenure. Most of the new pomeshchiks from the towns recently lost in the Livonian War belonged to old Vodskaia families. Their enfeoffment near other family members is evidence of the desire to retain their old regional family ties. A government concerned about the old families' loyalty would have given them lands elsewhere, especially during a war going badly. It could have reassigned the abandoned land to loyal Muscovites from the central region, as Ivan III had done a century earlier. Instead, most were unassigned. The old families' continuing possession of most cultivated and the state's failure to reassign most abandoned land to new families supports the thesis that the pomestie continued to be considered family land in customary law.

The surviving sixteenth century cadasters from the Shelonskaia and Vodskaia provinces prove that the descendants of the original pomeshchiks continued to hold their pomesties from generation to generation as long as the adult males served the crown. In the majority of cases, the sons of the deceased servingman received all or most of their fathers' old pomesties, including the family manor where the administrative center (*bol'shoi dvor*) of the estate was located. When the pomeshchik was childless, his brothers or nephews usually received the share of the estate that would have gone to the pomeshchik's son. In a few cases, the new lord does not appear related to the old pomeshchik. Yet some of the pomeshchiks without adult sons probably had daughters of marriage age. If the daughter married the son of a pomeshchik who already had or would have adult sons in service, it is reasonable to expect the son-in-law to serve from his father-in-law's rather than his father's estate. Although the sources for this period rarely allow us to trace marriages, the possibility remains that some new pomeshchiks were relatives of the old pomeshchiks by marriage.

A comparison of the Shelonskaia and Vodskaia cadasters indicates that the pomestie system functioned in the same way in both provinces. When the Ivan III needed to secure the loyalty and defend his newly won Novgorod land from the threat of foreign invasion, he settled Muscovite gentry and the former unfree servants of the boyars on crown land. Most of the original grants came from the confiscated votchinas of the exiled Novgorod boyars. Some grants also came from confiscated monastic land. Regardless of the source, the land was legally part of the crown domain before being granted to pomeshchiks. The confiscated parcels of the Novgorodian boyars, prelate, and monasteries retained by the state in 1500 were recorded as “crown land.”

Although all of the Shelonskaia and Vodskaia pomesties passed through this intermediate stage of crown land before being granted to the original pomeshchik, the new landlords enjoyed most of the attributes of ownership; they could exchange or donate their land and could expect to be succeeded by a son or other close relative after their death. The absence of references to the heirs’ payment of a special assessment indicates that they did not have to pay an inheritance tax when they received their land.

From the viewpoint of the Muscovite government, the pomestie system created by Ivan III was a success. The new pomeshchiks who settled on the conquered land of the former Novgorod republic supported the state because they owed their estates (and, in the case of the former unfree servants, even their personal freedom) to the sovereign. Novgorod’s boyars had revolted twice in the 1470s, but the middle service class remained loyal throughout the first century of the pomestie system’s existence. The pomestie system enabled the Muscovite ruler to defend the region from the Poles and Swedes. The landlords residing in the area could easily be mobilized for cavalry service in the event of invasion. The pomeshchiks, who shared the state’s interest in keeping the pomestie in the original landlord’s family, loyally served the state instead of transferring their allegiance to Poland or Sweden.

Appendix A

The Shelonskaia and Vodskaia Cadasters, 1480–1576

Part I. The Survival of the Sixteenth Century Cadasters

Shelonskaia Province (73 parishes)

Date: Census-takers-Publication/Archival Location

District(s) (number of parishes)

1495–1505: Matvei Ivanovich Valuev-*NPK*, IV, 1–232; V, 1–315, 332–427

Novgorod (38), Porkhov (17), Staraia Rusa (14)

1539: Gregory Sobakin-*NPK*, IV, 237–522

Novgorod (6), Porkhov (10), Staraia Rusa (9)

1552–53: Ivan Beleutov-*NPK*, IV, 530–84; V, 325–32

Novgorod (16)

1552–53: Alexis Zhrebtsov and Nikita Kuzmin-TsGADA, f. 1209, No. 17144

Porkhov (9)

1571: Yanush Muraviev-*NPK*, V, 428–571

Novgorod (8)

1576: Volodimer Bezobrasov-*NPK*, V, 571–696

Porkhov (11)

1582: Leonty Aksakov-TsGADA, f. 1209. No. 957

Novgorod (29)

1584: Prince Vasily Zvenigorodsky and Elizar Staryi-TsGADA, f. 1209, No. 8549

Porkhov (17 parishes, crown land)

1585: Gregory Bundov and Zhdan Alabukhin-TsGADA, f. 1209, No. 967

Porkhov (17 parishes, pomesties and clerical land)

Note: TsGADA refers to the Central State Archive of Old Documents (*Tsentral'nyi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Drevnykh Aktov*).

Vodskaiia Province (59 parishes)

Date: Census-taker

District-Publication/Archival Location

1495–1505: Dmitry Kitaev

Novgorod (20)-*NPk*, III, 1–494Koporie (13)-*NPk*, III, 494–879Yama (3)-*NPk*, III, 878–958Ladoga (6)-*Vremennik*, XIOrekhov (8)-*Vremennik*, XIKorela (7)-*Vremennik*, XII

1540–41: Semen Klushin and Shemet Rezanov

Novgorod (11)-*PKVP*, 1–109Ladoga (7)-*PKVP*, 110–171Orekhov (7)-*PKVP*, 171–304

Orekhov (2)-(TsGADA, f. 137,

Korela (3)-*Boiarskie i gorodovy knigi*, Novgorod)

1540–41: Gregory Valuev-TsGADA, f. 1209, no. 17145

Novgorod (6), Yama (1)

1568–69: Ivan Ziuzin-TsGADA, f. 137, Novgorod, kn. 1-B

Novgorod (5), Koporie (6)

1568–69: Insh Vasiliev syn Bulgakov and Posnik Shepelev-TsGADA, f. 137,
Novgorod, 7

Novgorod (6), Orekhov (1), Korela (4), Ladoga (6)

1582–84: Samson Dmitriev, Elizar Staryi, and Semen Kiselev-*Vremennik*, VI

Novgorod (20), Ladoga (3)

Note: Zhdan Alabukhin, Posnik Shepelev, and Semen Kiselev were assistants
to the census-takers.

Part II. The Survival of the Sixteenth Century Shelonskaia Returns

Returns from four censuses:

Parish-Dates of Censuses

Degzha-1500, 1539, 1551, 1576

Returns from three censuses:

Parish-Dates of Censuses

Belsky-1500, 1539, 1571/76

Yasno-1500, 1539, 1551

Mustsa-1500, 1539, 1552–53

Okolorusie-1500, 1539, 1551

Pazherevitsy-1500, 1539, 1576

Porkhov area-1500, 1539, 1576

Retno-1500, 1539, 1552–53

Nativity-1500, 1539, 1576
Shchepetsk-1500, 1551, 1571
Shniatinsk-1500, 1539, 1552–53
Smolna-1524, 1552–53, 1576
Strupinsk-1500, 1539, 1552–53
Svinort-1500, 1539, 1552–53
Vyshgorod-1500, 1539, 1552–53
Zhedritsy-1500, 1539, 1552–53

Returns from two censuses:

Parish-Dates of Censuses

Bolchino-1500, 1539
Buregi-1500, 1551
Bystreevsk-1500, 1571
Cherenchitsy-1500, 1539
Dolzhino-1500, 1539
Dremiatsk-1500, 1571
Dubrovno-1500, 1576
Golino-1500, 1551
Karachunsk-1500, 1576
Kolomna-1500, 1539
Korostynia-1500, 1551
Kuretsk-1500, 1551
Liadtsk-1500, 1571
Lositsk-1500, 1571
Lubinsk-1500, 1551
St Michael's-1500, 1539
St Nicholas'-1500, 1551
Obluchie-1500, 1552–53
Efremovo-1500, 1539
Opoka-1500, 1576
Paozerie-1500, 1551
St Peter's-1500, 1571
Porkhov-1500, 1576
Ramyshevo-1500, 1539
Sabelsk-1500, 1571
Snezhsk-1500, 1539
Sutotsk-1500, 1551
Uzhin-1524, 1551
St Vasily's-1500, 1551
Resurrection-1500, 1539

Returns from one census:

Parish-Date of Census

Bereza-1500

Borotno-1500

Charkovitsk-1500

Chertitsk-1500

Dovorets-1500

Dretno-1500

Frolovsk-1500

Gorodnia-1524

Ilemno-1500

Ivangorod-1571

Khmer-1500

Kositsk-1500

Kotorsk-1500

Liubyni-1500

Lagoveshchsk-1500

Lorsk-1539

Medved-1500

St Michael and St George's-1576

St Michael's-on-the-Uza-1576

Pavy-1500

Peredolsk-1500

Pribuzh-1500

Ruchaisk-1500

Ruchie-1576

Shchirsk-1500

Slaviatinsk-1500

Sumersk-1500

Tursk-1500

Note: The fifth volume of the *Novgorodskye Pistsovye Knigi* gives 1524 as the date of the surveys of Bystreevsk, Degzha, Dremiatsk, Yasno, Khmer, Liadtsk, Lositsk, St Nicholas', St Peter's, Zhedrity and Porkhov area parishes. References to the termination of tax exemptions in 1501 and 1503, however, indicate that the census-takers surveyed these parishes during the "new census" conducted between 1495 and 1505. See A. A. Kaufman, *Novgorodskii pistsovyia knigi v statisticheskoi obrabotke* (1915), p. 5.

Appendix B

The Shelonskaia Pomesties of 1539

Pomesties in Service: Parish-New-Old-Total

Belsky-6 (50%)-6 (50%)-12

Bolchino-2 (50%)-2 (50%)-4

Cherenchitsy-3 (60%)-2 (40%)-5

Degzha-6 (40%)-9 (60%)-15

Dolzhino-1 (50%)-1 (50%)-2

Kolomna-0-2 (100%)-2

Los-0-3 (100%)-3

Mustsa-0-1 (100%)-1

Nativity-2 (40%)-3 (60%)-5

Ofremovo-1 (17%)-5 (83%)-6

Okolorusie-4 (80%)-1 (20%)-5

Pazherevitsy-3 (17%)-15 (83%)-18

Porkhov/Our Lady's-1 (12%)-7 (88%)-8

Ramyshevo-1 (20%)-4 (80%)-5

Resurrection-6 (75%)-2 (25%)-8

Retno-5 (100%)-0-5

Shniatinsk-2 (67%)-1 (33%)-3

Snezhsk-1 (50%)-1 (50%)-2

St. Michael's-0-2 (100%)-2

Svinort-4 (100%)-0-4

Vyshgorod-1 (33%)-2 (67%)-3

Yasno-2 (29%)-5 (71%)-7

Zhedritsy-0-3 (100%)-3

Total pomesties in service-51 (40%)-77 (60%)-128

Note: Incomplete returns prevented five additional pomesties in service from being classified. See the fragmented Kolomna returns for Bogdanok and Mikula

Vasiliev syn Popadin-Kvashnin in *NPK*, IV, 474–476. Also see Gavril Muranov, Fedor Vasiliev syn Miachkov, and Prince Michael's partial Zhedritsy returns in *NPK*, IV, 513, 520–522.

Maintenance Pomesties (*Prozhitki*): Parish-Total

Bolchino-1

Cherenchitsy-1

Degzha-3

Okolorusie-1

Porkov/Our Lady's-2

Resurrection-1

Snezhsk-1

Yasno-1

Total maintenance pomesties-11

Total old and maintenance pomesties: 88 (63% of 139 pomesties with complete surviving returns).

Appendix C

The Shelonskaia Pomeschchiks, 1539

Old Pomesties in Service

Family Head-Parish-Sources (1539: *NPK*, IV; 1500: *NPK*, V)

(Earlier landlords)

Beloselsky, Prince Vasily Slitok-Belsky-IV, 432

(Beloselsky, Prince Vasily Slitok; Yuriev monastery)

Beloselsky, Pr. Vladimir Ivanovich-Belsky-IV, 419

(Beloselsky, Prince Vladimir Ivanovich; Yuriev monastery)

Buturlin, Andrew Ivanovich Poleukhtov-Bolchino-IV, 410

(Buturlin, Andrew Ivanovich Poleukhtov; Archbishop of Novgorod)

Buturlin, Daniel Ivanov Poleukhtov-Zhedritsy-IV, 514; V, 63

(Buturlin, Ivan Poleuktov)

Cheglov, Vladimir Afanasiev-Belsky-IV, 425

(Cheglov, Ivan)

Chetverkin, Dmitry-Pazherevitsy-IV, 398; V, 60

(Chetverkin, Dmitry; Terpigorev, Timothy-Kostelov volost parcel; crown;
Yuriev monastery)

Erokhov, Gridia Elizarov-Ramyshevo-IV, 329

(Erokhov, Gridia Elizarov)

Erokhov, Ivan Elizarov¹-Ramyshevo-IV, 328

(Erokhov, Ivan Elizarov)

Erokhov, Ivan Vladimirov-Cherenchitsy-IV, 339; V, 48

(Erokhov, Ivashko Volodin-Iakov Fedorov volost)

Erokhov, Mitrofan Elizarov-Ramyshevo-IV, 330

(Erokhov, Mitrofan Elizarov)

Evreev, Vasily Borisov-Shniatinsk-IV, 496; V, 40

(Evreevs: Elizar-nonresidential Vecheslavl volost; Boris Vasiliev-Struzhsky
residential volost; Elizar Vasiliev-nonresidential Vecheslavl volost)

- Evsiukov, Ivan²-Nativity-IV, 289; V, 58
 (Esiukov, Filia)
- Glotov, Boris Grigoriev-Kolomna-IV, 472, V, 49
 (Glotov, Gridia Semenov)
- Karkmazov (Kartmazov), Semen Ivanov³-Yasno-IV, 441; V, 69
 (Karkmazov, Semen Ivanov; crown-Ofonosov volost)
- Karpov, Ivan Lopak Ivanov⁴-Pazherevitsy-IV, 391
 (Karpov, Ivan Lopak Ivanov)
- Khlopov, Gavril Danilov-Bolchino-IV, 414
 (Khlopov, Gavril Danilov; Poleukhtov Buturlin, Potap)
- Khludenev, Michael Chebotaev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 311; V, 66
 (Khludenev, Chebotai Andreev)
- Khludenev, Yury Botaev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 321; V, 66
 (Khludenev, Chebotai Andreev)
- Khlusov, Ivan Istomin-Los-IV, 244; V, 53
 (Khlusov, Ivan Istomin; 1500 volost returns lost.)
- Kobylin, Ivan Ivanov-Ramyshevo-IV, 332-33; V, 47
 (Kobylin, Kuzma Ivanov; crown)
- Kolosov, Vasily Ivanov⁵-Ofremovo-IV, 347, V, 50
 (Kolosov, Vasily Ivanov; Miakinin, Shikh)
- Kostin, Semen Dmitriev-Degzha-IV, 271; V, 59
 (Kostin, Mitia Semenov)
- Kostin, Yakov Dmitriev-Degzha-IV, 270; V, 59
 (Kostin, Mitia Semenov)
- Kriukov, Afanasy Vasiliev-Mustsa-IV, 502; V, 58
 (Kriukov, Afanasy Vasiliev; crown: Spassky hamlets)
- Kvashnin, Gregory Nikiforov-Nativity-IV, 283; V, 58
 (Kvashnin, Nikifor Vasiliev)
- Kvashnin, Likach Nikiforov-Belsky-IV, 422
 (Kvashnin, Likach Nikiforov; Yuriev monastery)
- Lazorev, Alabysh Andreev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 305; V, 65
 (Lazorev, Andrew Danilov)
- Lazorev, Fedor Ivanov-St. Michael's-IV, 292
 (Lazorev, Ivan)
- Lazorev, Saltan Andreev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 306; V, 65
 (Lazorev, Andrew Danilov)
- Meliukov, Fedor Saikov-Ofremovo-IV, 349; V, 51
 (Meliukov, Saiko Fedorov)
- Meshcherinov, Semen Fedorov Gridiukin-Zhedritsy-IV, 517; V, 63
 (Meshcherinov, Fedor Grigoriev)
- Miachkov, Stepan Vasiliev-Zhedritsy-IV, 519; V, 63

- (Miachkov, Stepan Vasiliev; crown)
Miakinin, Fedor Neveia Ivanov-Ofremovo IV, 343; V, 50
(Miakinin, Neveia Ivanov)
Moseev, Nekliud Ivanov⁶-Degzha-IV, 264; V, 59
(Moseev, Nekliud Ivanov; no 1500 Esipov volost returns)
Moseev, Peter Afanasiev-Degzha-IV, 278; V, 59
(Moseev, Peter Afanasiev; crown: no 1500 Esipov volost returns)
Nazimov, Andrew Shirshik Surin-Pazherevitsy-IV, 375; V, 60
(Nazimov, Andrew Shirshik Surin; crown; Yuriev monastery)
Nazimov, Andrew Surin-Pazherevitsy-IV, 370
(Nazimov, Andrew Surin; crown; Yuriev monastery)
Nazimov, Peter Yuriev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 387, 388; V, 60
(Nazimov, Yury; Nazimov, Iushka)
Nazimov, Semen Ivanov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 388; V, 60
(Nazimov, Ivashko)
Nazimov, Vasily Bolshoi Yuriev⁷-Pazherevitsy-IV, 405, 406; V, 61
(Nazimov, Ivan Nekrasov-uncle; Nazimov, Ivashko Nekrasov)
Nazimov, Vasily Menshoi Yuriev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 386, 387; V, 60
(Nazimov, Yury; Nazimov, Yushko)
Nazimov, Vasily Suvorov-Vyshgorod-IV, 483; V, 63
(Nazimov, Vasily Suvorov; Terpigorev, Gavril; Terpigorev, Alexis Timofeev⁸)
Nazimov, Veshniak Ivanov⁹-Pazherevitsy-IV, 368
(Nazimov, Veshniak Ivanov; Ovtsyn, Andrew; Yuriev monastery)
Ogarov, Ivan Ivanov-Degzha-IV, 247; V, 39
(Ogarov, Ivan Ivanov, crown-Bogdan Esipov volost; no 1500 returns)
Ovtsyn, Ivan Andreev syn Volodimerov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 378; V, 60
(Volodimerov, Andrew Ivanov)
Ovtsyn, Semen Vasiliev Volodimerov-Snezhsk-IV, 322; V, 54
(Volodimerov, Vasily Ovtsa Ivanov)
Palitsyn, Matvei Mikhailov-Degzha-IV, 261; V, 59
(Palitsyn, Matvei Mikhailov; no 1500 Esipov volost returns)
Parfeniev, Peter Afanasiev-Ofremovo-IV, 352; V, 50–51
(Parfeniev, Peter Afanasiev; no 1500 Esipov volost returns)
Piatin, Nikita Bulgakov-Ofremovo-IV, 354
(Piatin, Bulgak Timofeev)
Pleshcheev, Alfery Vorupaev-St. Michael's-IV, 297; V, 44
(Pleshcheev, Alfery Vorupaev; Yuriev monastery)
Pustoshkin, Ivan Bolshoi Ivanov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 392; V, 60
(Pustoshkin, Ivan Bolshoi Ivanov; Volokhov, Fedor and Matvei)
Ragozin, Fedor Denisev¹⁰-Pazherevitsy-IV, 373
(Ragozin, Fedor Denisev)

Rezzantsov, Yakov Osipov-Kolomna-IV, 476; V, 49
 (Rezzantsov, Yakov Osipov; no 1500 St. Nicholas on Lipna volost returns)
 Riapolovsky, Prince Semen Golitsyn-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 305; V, 65
 (Golitsa Vasiliev, Prince Semen)
 Samarin-Kvashnin, Mikula Ivanov-Dolzhino-IV, 436 ; V, 55
 (Samarin, Ivan Stepanov)
 Selivanov, Alexis Andreev-Belsky-IV, 427; V, 61
 (Selivanov, Alexis Andreev; Yuriev monastery)
 Selivanov, Ilia Andreev-Belsky-IV, 416; V, 61
 (Selivanov, Ilia Andreev; Yuriev monastery)
 Shablykin, Subbota Yuriev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 382; V, 60
 (Shablykin, Subbota Yuriev; crown-Alexander Timofeev volost)
 Shcherbinin, Postnik Dmitriev¹¹-Los-IV, 240
 (Shcherbinin, Postnik Dmitriev; Sofonov, Sviaga (palace secretary,
dvortsovyi diak)
 Shishkin, Michael Andreev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 316; V, 65
 (Shishkin, Andrew & Michael Vasiliev)
 Snazin-Mikulín, Fedor Grigoriev-Degzha-IV, 268; V, 59
 (Mikhulin, Gregory Danilov)
 Tatianin, Dmitry Ivanov-Pazherevitsy-IV, 403; V, 61
 (Tatianin, Ivan)
 Tatianin, Ivan Andreev-Pazherevitsy-IV, 394; V, 61
 (Tatianin, Andrew)
 Terpigorev, Fedor Semenov-Yasno-IV, 449; V, 69
 (Terpigorev, Senka Semenov)
 Terpigorev, Ivan Davydov-Yasno-IV, 451; V, 69
 (Terpigorev, Ivan & Ostash Davydov)
 Terpigorev, Kelar Semenov-Yasno-IV, 446; V, 69
 (Terpigorev, Senka Semenov)
 Tulupov, Prince Andrew Vasilievich-Vyshgorod-IV, 478; V, 62
 (Tulup, Prince Ivan Dmitrievich)
 Turgenev, Semen Iakimov-Los-IV, 237; V, 53
 (Turgenev, Gregory & Iakimets)
 Turov, Gregory Alekseev-Resurrection-IV, 464; V, 52
 (No returns for Alfery Ivanov Afanosov volost in 1500)
 Tyrtov, Yury Vasiliev-Degzha-IV, 274; V, 59
 (Tyrtov, Vasily)
 Tyrtov, Zuk Semenov¹²-Yasno-IV, 453
 (Tyrtov, Zuk Semenov)
 Unkovsky, Yury Aleksandrov-Nativity-IV, 281; V, 58
 (Unkovsky, Yury Aleksandrov; crown-Luka Fedot'in volost)

Vseslavin, Semen Vasiliev¹³-Degzha-IV, 263; V, 59
 (Vseslavin, Senka Vasiliev)
 Zamutsky, Michael Timofeev¹⁴-Cherenchitsy-IV, 335; V, 17, 48
 (Blagovo, Zamiatna-Cherenchitsy manor; Zamiatna Samarin; Zamutsky,
 Michael Timofeev-Belsky; Yuriev monastery-manor; Zamutsky,
 Michael Timofeev-Belsky land)
 Zasekin, Prince Vasily Dmitriev-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 313; V, 65
 (Zasekin, Prince Vasily Dmitriev; Rumiantsov, Mitia Aleksandrov)
 Zverev, Andrew Ivanov-Okolorusie-IV, 358; V, 46
 (Zverev, Ivashko Ivanov)
 Zverev, Ivan Ivanov-Resurrection-IV, 460; V, 52
 (Zverev, Dmitry; Zverev, Ivashko)

New Pomesties in Service

Afanasiev, Inka the Clerk (*Podiachii*)-Bolchino-IV, 413; V, 61, 70
 (Yuriev Monastery)
 Agarev, Vasily Andreev-Cherenchitsy-IV, 340; V, 48
 (Morkov, Menshoi)
 Aigustov, Menshoi Grigoriev-Cherenchitsy IV, 337; V, 48
 (Erokhov, Mitia; Erokhov, Ivashko Volodin)
 Bundov, Matvei Vasiliev¹⁵-Okolorusie-IV, 365
 (Spassky Khutynsky monastery)
 Buzheninov, Ignaty Leontiev the Sytnik-Svinort-IV, 555; V, 38
 (Miloslavsky, Kozel)
 Chikhachev, Semen Ilin-Retno-IV, 494; V, 39
 (Sakhovo, Ivan Iakovlev; Evreev, Boris; Kolochev, Fedok; Zverev, Gridia;
 crown)
 Dobrynia, Vasily Alekseev the Podiachii-Belsky-IV, 432; V, 18, 61
 (No 1500 returns for hamlet)
 Dubrovsky, Yury Semenov-Svinort-IV, 510; V, 38
 (Kuzmin, Lavrenty-*zemets*; crown)
 Dudin, Elka Afanasiev-Snezhsk-IV, 325; V, 54
 (Telekhtemerev, Izmalok; no volost returns, 1500)
 Fedkov, Nikita Andreev & mother Anna-Ofremovo-IV, 356; V, 50
 (Lazorets the Interpreter (*Tolmach*); crown-1500; earlier Vlas the Interpreter)
 Golodnoi, Ivan Fedorov-Resurrection-IV, 471; V, 52
 (Zverev, Gridia)
 Ievlev, Torzhok the Clerk-Resurrection-IV, 470; V, 51
 (Crown)
 Kharlamov, Ivan Kolmak Andreev-Cherenchitsy-IV, 342; V, 48
 (Yuriev Monastery)¹⁶

- Kropotov, Gavril Ivanov-Retno-IV, 493 ; V, 39
(Crown)
- Kropotov, Matvei Ivanov-Shniatinsk-IV, 500; V, 39
(No 1500 volost returns)
- Kropotov, Peter Mikhailov-Retno-IV, 488; V, 39
(Crown)
- Kropotov, Tretiak Ivanov-Retno-IV, 492; V, 39
(Crown)
- Kurtsov, Nikita Afanasiev-Yasno-IV, 455; V, 69
(Terpigorev, Ivan Zlobin; Terpigorev, Ivan & Ostash, sons of David)
- Likharev, Kuzma Astafiev-Svinort-IV, 509; V, 36
(Crown)
- Mordvinov, Ivan Meshcherinov-Okolorusie-IV, 360; V, 46
(Bogdan Esipov volost returns lost)
- Molchanov, Matvei Filipov-Shniatinsk-IV, 500; V, 40
(Evreev, Boris)
- Molchanov, Timothy Vasiliev¹⁷-Okolorusie-IV, 361; V, 46
(Bestush, Mitia; Kvashnin, Fedor Vasiliev)
- Molchanov-Kuchetskoi, Ivan Yakovlev-Nativity-IV, 285; V, 58
(Evreev, Michael; Evreev, Ivan Bolshoi & Michael-Kuzmin volost; crown-Fedot'in volost)
- Moseev, Michael Afanasiev-Nativity-IV, 287; IV, 276; V, 58
(Evreev, Ivan Bolshoi & Michael)
- Moseev, Mikula Podosenov-Degzha-IV, 259; V, 59
(Crown; no Esipov volost returns, 1500)
- Moseev, Nekras Afanasiev-Degzha-IV, 258; V, 59
(Crown; no Esipov volost returns, 1500)
- Nazimov, Gregory Matveev¹⁸-Pazherevitsy-IV, 401; V, 60–61
(No Luka Kipreanov volost returns, 1500)
- Nazimov, Ivan Suvorov (Surin)-Pazherevitsy-IV, 372; V, 60
(Volokhov, Matvei)
- Nekliudov, Vasily Ivanov the Clerk-Svinort-IV, 509; V, 39
(Vologzhaninov, Semen Ievlev; crown)
- Oboturov, Dmitry Ivanov-Resurrection-IV, 458; V, 51
(Kolachev, Fedok-Markov volost; no 1500 returns for Ofonosov volost)
- Ogarov, Stepan Sudakov¹⁹-Degzha-IV, 267
(Nativity monastery)
- Palitsyn, Vasily Alekseev-Degzha-IV, 260; V, 59
(No earlier landlord cited; 1500 Esipov volost returns lost)
- Pervoi, Yakov Savin-Retno-IV, 490; V, 39

- (Crown-Svinoretsky, Shimsky & Grigoriev volosts; Evreev, Boris Vasiliev-Struzhsky volost)
- Piatin, Boris Fedorov-Okolorusie-IV, 365; V, 46
(No earlier landlord cited; 1500 Esipov volost returns lost)
- Pleshcheev, Ratman Borisovich-Belsky-IV, 434; V, 61
(Crown; Yuriev monastery)
- Pustoshkin, Iev²⁰-Pazherevitsy-IV, 393; V, 60; V, 15
(Volokhov, Matvei-Pazherevitsy manor; Pustoshkin Pribuzhsky land)
- Pustoshkin, Semen Semenov-Bolchino-IV, 407; V, 61, 70
(1500 Ofonosov volost returns lost)
- Rogotin, Ivan Yakovlev-Ramyshevo-IV, 331; V, 48
(Erofeev, Andrew Vasilev)
- Sablin, Posnik Ivanov-Yasno-IV, 455; V, 68; V, 62
(Archbishop of Novgorod; Terpigorev, Boris-Kostelev volost, Oblutsky parish; crown-formerly the Archbishop's in Yasno; Terpigorev, Timothy & son Aleshka-Kostelev volost)
- Shablykin, Piatoi-Belsky-IV, 418; V, 61
(Yuriev Monastery; crown land after Yuriev Monastery)
- Shablykin, Shestoi-Belsky-IV, 430; V, 61
(Yuriev Monastery; crown after Yuriev Monastery)
- Shablykin, Tretiak Ivanov-Belsky-IV, 421; V, 61
(Yuriev Monastery; crown after Yuriev Monastery)
- Shablykin, Ushak Ivanov-Belsky-IV, 429; V, 61
(Yuriev Monastery; crown after Yuriev Monastery)
- Shchulepnikov, Daniel Ivanov²¹-Vyshgorod-IV, 486; V, 63
(Nazimov, Alfery Suvorov; Terpigorev, Alexis Timofeev)
- Sukov, Stepan Sviagn-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 301; V, 65
(Lazorev, Gridia Danilov)
- Tonkov, Piatoi Vasiliev-Resurrection-IV, 468; V, 52
(Crown)
- Tonkov, Semen Vasiliev-Resurrection-IV, 469; V, 52
(Crown)
- Uskoi, Rium Fedorov²²-Degzha-IV, 257; V, 59
(Nativity Monastery-Degzha-and Blagoveshchenskii Monastery-NIK)
- Voronov, Ivan Fedorov²³-Degzha-IV, 254; V, 59
(Nativity Monastery volost; no 1500 volost returns)
- Vseslavin, Alexis Ivanov-Dolzhino-IV, 439; IV, 461
(Archbishop of Novgorod)
- Zverev, Peter Ivanov-Resurrection-IV, 461; V, 52
(Nativity Monastery; crown)

Pomesties in Service with Incomplete Returns

Bogdanok-Kolomna-IV, 476

Miachkov, Fedor Vasiliev²⁴-Zhedritsy-IV, 520

Michael, Prince²⁵-Zhedritsy-IV, 522

Muranov, Gavril-Zhedritsy-IV, 513; V, 35

(Pakh the Steward-Bogdan Esipov volost)

Popadin-Kvashnin, Mikita Vasiliev-Kolomna-IV, 474

(Erokhov, Mitia)

Maintenance Pomesties (Prozhitki)

Beloselskaia, Princess Ekaterina Shafrova-Bolchino-IV, 408

Cheglukova, Evdokiia-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 302

Kostina, Uliana Mikitinskaia-Degzha-IV, 271

Miakinina, Fetinia Shikhovskaia-Snezhsk-IV, 327

Moseeva, Nastasia Zlobinskaia-Degzha-IV, 265

Ogarova, Fedosia Vasilievskaia-Degzha-IV, 280

Rumiantsova, Ovdotia Matfeevskaia-Porkhov/Our Lady's-IV, 309

Simanskaia, Evfimia Mitrofanova-Yasno-IV, 445

Tatarinova, Irina Tinekovskaia-Okolorusie-IV, 363

Vysheslavtsova, Matrena Yakovlevskaia-Cherenchitsy-IV, 342

Zvereva, Fedosia Semenovskaia-Resurrection-IV, 463

NOTES

1. The abridged 1500 returns for Ramyshevo record an Ivashko Volodin syn Erokhov and his brother as the holder of one and a third sokhas in the volost of Isaak Bogdanov; see *NPK*, V, 48. Ivan Elizarov syn Erokhov's Ramyshevo pomestie (*NPK*, IV, 327-329) was located in the Ivan Mednikov and Semen Krivoshein volosts, whose 1500 returns are lost.

2. Although the beginning of the Evsiukov returns is lost, the returns for most of the hamlets in the pridacha and summary of tax units, homesteads, and the peasants' dues for the whole estate survive. The census-taker's reference to the estate as an "old" pomestie justifies its inclusion among the old pomesties. The pridacha in St. Michael's-on-the-Uza earlier belonged to Ivan's "uncle Andrew Soshok Aleksandrov syn Evsiukov." See *NPK*, IV, 289 and V, 58.

3. Ivan Aleksandrov Karkmazov was in same parish, but a different volost (Samsonov) in 1500. See *NPK*, V, 69.

4. The estate included a pridacha from Odash Karpov. See *NPK*, IV, 391.

5. Vasily lived on land formerly held by Shikh Miakinin in pomestie tenure, but the estate was called old by the census-taker, who assigned the hamlet of Skvorovo to

Vasily which he had not declared at the last, revisionary census (*peresmotr*). See *NPK*, IV, 348.

6. The pomestie included a pridacha from Zuk Moseev. See *NPK*, IV, 264.

7. The 1539 returns state that Vasily Bolshoi gave his father's old pomestie to his brother in return for his uncle's land. See *NPK*, IV, 406.

8. Neither Alexis nor Gavril had descendants living in 1540. The three collateral Terpigorevs lived on old Yasno pomesties. See *NPK*, IV, 483 and V, 63 for the Vyshgorod returns from 1540 and 1500 respectively, and IV, 456–451 for the 1540 Yasno returns.

9. The estate included Veshniak's "old Yuriev monastic hamlets." His father Ivan Nazimov lived in the same parish but different (Kipreanov) volost in 1500. Andrew Ovtsyn's son was living in the same parish on an "old" pomestie in 1539. Therefore Andrew died early enough for the census-taker to consider Veshniak's manor "old" by 1539. See *NPK*, IV, 368 and V, 60.

10. Although the 1539 returns do not name the volost, the estate was called "old" by the census-taker, indicating the same landlord held the estate at the most recent earlier census.

11. The 1500 returns for the Gregory Koshurkin volost are lost. A Sviaga the Clerk lived in Stepan Sarsky volost in 1500. See *NPK*, IV, 240.

12. Ivan Aleksandrov syn Karkmazov lived in same volost in 1500, but not cited as the former landlord in 1539, when the census-taker referred to the estate as "old." See *NPK*, V, 69.

13. Although not called "old" by the census-taker, the estate was included in the old pomesties because Senka Vasiliev syn Vseslavin lived in the same Medvedev volost in 1500. See *NPK*, V, 59. The use of the pejorative 'Senka' for Semen in 1500 is indicative of his youth and status as a relatively new pomeschchik.

14. Although the Cherenchitsy manor was acquired by exchange with Zamiatna Vasiliev syn Blagovo and the Belsky parish hamlets located in Anton Kisliakov's volost were acquired by exchange with Zamiatna Samarin, the estate included hamlets in the same Ivan Kisliakov volost of Belsky parish where a Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky held land in 1500. See *NPK*, V, 18 for the 1500 Belsky returns and V, 48 for the 1500 Cherenchitsy returns. Since the manor was located in Cherenchitsy land, the census-taker failed to refer to the estate as "old." The inclusion of the Ivan Kisliakov hamlets earlier belonging to Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky in the original pomestie, however, justifies including the estate with the old pomesties. The substantial estate already held in 1500 (thirty-three tax units or eleven sokhas) suggests the elder Michael Timofeev syn Zamutsky was probably already in his late twenties by 1500 and would have been past the service age of sixty forty years later. The lack of references to a pridacha in 1540 suggests that the younger Michael Timofeev syn was probably a new servingman and the elder Michael's grandson.

15. Although the estate includes hamlets obtained by exchange with Matvei Vasiliev syn Bundov's nephews, the failure of the census-taker to call it "old" indicated the landlord's possession for less than a generation.

16. Although his volost was not named, Ivan Kharlamov held shares in the same volost as Michael Zamutsky, Ivan Oboturov and Menshoi Aigustov. Their Cherenchitsy returns refer to the Yuriev monastery as the original landlord. See *NPK*, IV, 335, 337.

17. Although the 1540 cadaster cites Mitia Bestuzh as the former holder of Timothy Molchanov's pomestie in the volost of Timothy Gruzov, the 1500 abridgement assigned the volost to Fedor Vasiliev syn Kvashnin. The relative size of the two pomeshchik's holdings (12.5 and 13.5 tax units in 1500 and 1540) suggests that the pomestie passed from Kvashnin to Bestuzh to Molchanov during the two generations between the censuses. See *NPK*, IV, 361 and V, 46.

18. The 1500 returns assign Kuzma Kipreanov's volost to the Nazimovs, including Gregory's father Matiushka Pestrikov syn Nazimov. But the 1539 returns do not refer to Gregory's estate as "old" and the pomeshchik's manor house was located in the Luka Kipreanov volost, whose 1500 returns do not survive.

19. The returns refer to the granting of Stepan Sudakov syn Ogarev's new settlements (*pochinki*) to his cousin Ivan Ivanov syn Ogarev. The ability to establish new settlements suggests that Stepan had occupied his pomestie for a considerable period of time, perhaps a decade. The census-takers' failure to classify the pomestie as "old," however, indicates less than a generation of residence.

20. Iev Pustoshkin's estate looks old because both Iev and his kinsman Ivan Bolshoi Pustoshkin both received part of Matvei Volokhov's former Pazherevitsy parish pomestie. Since Ivan's estate was considered "old" by the pisets in 1539, Volokhov could have died early enough for Iev to have held in Pazherevitsy manor for more than a generation. The pisets' failure to call Iev's estate "old" and Iev's lack of adult sons indicates less than a generation of residence on the land. Iev's estate could have included some family land. Several hamlets were located the same Pribuzhsky parish where Mitia, Ivashko, and Pronia Pustoshkin resided in 1500. But the abridged 1500 returns do not include the hamlets. If Iev did have some of the Pribuzhsky land earlier held by relatives, the pisets' failure to call his pomestie old suggests the determining factor was the manor or *bolshoi dvor* where the pomeshchik actually resided. See *NPK*, IV, 393 and V, 15.

21. The entire estate (located in the Vasily Kostelev volost) was obtained from Alfery Suvorov syn Nazimov by exchange of the old Shchulepnikov estate in Shirsky for Nazimov's Vyshgorod land. Daniel Shchulepnikov's father was an old Shirsky pomeshchik (*NPK*, V, 10).

22. The lack of references in the 1500 abridgement to the volosts of the Nativity and Blagoveshchensky monasteries in their respective Degzha and St. Nicholas returns (see *NPK*, V, 59 for both parishes) suggests the crown's confiscation and reassignment of the land as pomestie came later, less than a generation before the 1539 census. This explains the *pisets*' failure to call the estate "old."

23. The 1500 returns for Degzha parish give Ignaty Mikhailov syn Voronov as the holder of eleven and five sixths sokhas in Vasily Isakov's volost on the Shelon at Vysotsky Gorodok in neighboring St. Nicholas' parish. The Degzha returns from the 1539 census give Gorodok on the Shelon as the site of the manor house. The estate could be called "old" if the parish boundaries were adjusted.

24. Only the first part of the returns survive, but the reference of the pisets to Fedor's "old" pomestie suggests the land was probably old.

25. Only fragments of the summary of Prince Michael's returns survive in *NPK*, IV, 522. Although they do not refer to any "old" parcels, an unspecified obrok was levied on a pridacha of five tax units, suggesting the original pomestie was probably old. The absence of any references to a "prince" in the 1500 Zhedrity abridgement (*NPK*, V, 63-64) prevents the historian from determining Prince Michael's surname.

Appendix D

The Classification of the Vodskaia Pomesties, 1540

Ladoga Judicial District¹

Parish-Distance from Novgorod

ET St Egor's at Terbuzhka (*Egor'evskii Terebuzhskii*) 143.85²

Exchanged-1 (5%)

Old-14 (70%)

Pridachas-5 (25%)

FP St Fedor's at Peski (*Fedorovskii Pesotskii*) 158.235

New-2 (33%)

Old-3 (50%)

In litigation-1 (17%)

G Gorodnia (*Gorodenskii*) 163.03

New-2 (15.38%)

Old-10 (76.92%)

Pridacha-1 (7.69%)

IV St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov (*Il'inskii na Volkhove*) 153.44

New-1 (50%)

Old-1 (50%)

LL Lopets (*Lopets*) 143.85

Old-2 (100%)

MV St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov (*Mikhailovskii na Volkhove*) 143.85

New-4 (40%)

Old-5 (50%)

Pridacha-1 (10%)

NG St Nicholas' at Gorodishche (*Nikolskii z Gorodishche*) 143

New-1 (33.3%)

Old-1 (33.3%)

Pridacha-1 (33.3%)

Novgorod Judicial District

Parish-Distance from Novgorod

AG St Andrew's at Gruzinsk (*Andreevskii Gruzinskii*) 67.13

Old-4 (50%)

Pridacha-4 (50%)

DG St Dmitry's at Gdittsk (*Dmitrievskii Gditskii*) 52.745

Old-1 (100%)

ELU St Egor's at Luzhsk (*Egor'evskii Luzhskii*) 28.77

Exchanged-2 (7.14%)

New-10 (35.71%)

Old-7 (25%)

Pridachas-8 (28.57%)

Prozhitok-1 (3.5%)

GK St Gregory's at Krechnevo (*Grigor'evskii Krechnevskii*) 10

Exchanged-1 (50%)

Pridacha-1 (50%)

IP St Ivan's at Perezhsk (*Ivanovskii Perezhskii*) 19.18

New-1 (50%)

IT St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda (*Il'inskii Tigodskii*) 91.105

Exchanged-1 (4.76%)

New-7 (33.33%)

Old-11 (52.38%)

Pridachas-2 (9.52%)

KV Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov (*Kolomenskii Volkhovskii*) 47.95

New-1 (16.66%)

Old-5 (83.33%)

NP St Nicholas's at Pidebsk (*Nikol'skii Pidebskii*) 9.59

Exchanged-1 (14.28%)

New-2 (28.57%)

Old-3 (42.85%)

Pridacha-1 (14.28%)

ONT St Anthony's (*Ontonovskii*) 28.77

Old-1 (100%)

PV St Peter's-on-the-Volkhov (*Petrovskii na Volkhove*) 23.975

New-3 (60%)

Pridacha-2 (40%)

SV Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov (*Soletskii na Volkhove*) 105.49

Exchanged-1 (5.26%)

New-7 (36.84%)

Old-7 (36.84%)

Pridachas-4 (21.05%)

Orekhov Judicial District

Parish-Distance from Novgorod

EL St Egor's at Lopsk (*Egor'evskii Lopskii*) 139.05

Exchanged-1 (5%)

New-1 (5%)

Old-8 (40%)

Pridacha-10 (50%)

IK St Ivan's at Kuivasha (*Ivanovskii Kuivashskii*) 191.8

New-4 (25%)

Old-9 (56.25%)

Pridachas-2 (12.5%)

Prozhitok-1 (6.25%)

ILK St Ilia's at Keltushi (*Il'inskii Kel'tushskii*) 148.645

New-1 (11.11%)

Old-5 (55.55%)

Pridacha-1 (11.11%)

Unclassified-2 (22.22%)

ND St Nicholas' at Dudorovo (*Nikol'skii Dudorovskii*) 134.26

New-10 (25%)

Old-19 (47.5%)

Pridachas-9 (22.5%)

Prozhitok-1 (2.5%)

In litigation-1 (2.5%)

NI St Nicholas' at Izhora³ (*Yzherskii*) 123.71

Old-1 (Unknown)

SG Our Savior's at Gorodnia (*Spasskii Gorodenskii*) 143.85

New-3 (27.2%)

Old-7 (63.63%)

Pridacha-1 (9.09%)

VK Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk (*Vozdvizhenskii Korbosel'skii*)

172.62

New-1 (5%)

Old-16 (80%)

Pridachas-2 (10%)

Prozhitok-1 (5%)

NOTES

1. The census-takers who surveyed Vodskaia, unlike those who recorded the returns from Shelonskaia, referred to the districts as *prisudy* or Judicial Districts, rather

than *uezdy*, the customary term for an administrative district including several *pogosty* (parishes). The use of the term judicial circuit is appropriate, however, for the Vodskaia returns refer to two cases (one in St Fedor's at Peski and the other in St Nicholas at Dudorovo parish) adjudicated by the census-takers acting as circuit judges representing the Muscovite government. The parishes of Vodskaia were administrative subdivisions of the Judicial District.

2. The distance from Novgorod is given in versts (one verst equals 0.663 miles.)
3. Since the returns from St Nicholas at Izhora parish are fragmentary, the percentage of old pomesties is unknown.

Appendix E

The Vodskaia Pomeshchiks of 1540

Family Heads with Complete Returns for All Parcels

Family Head-Parish-Source-Class-Lords-Manor House

Achkasov, Andrew Prokofiev-NG-*PKVP*, 171-Old-2-Tigori-on-the Volkhov

Aksakov, Dmitry Ivanov-MV-*PKVP*, 164–166-Old-3-Manushkino

Aksakov, Karp Vasiliev-MV-*PKVP*, 162–163-Old-1-Vyndin Ostrov

Aminev, Ivan Borisov-EL-*PKVP*, 240–242-Old-1-Vitkhokula

Aminev, Kopt Petrov-EL-*PKVP*, 238-240-Old-1-Leadenka

Barykov, Obliaz Bogdanov-IK-*PKVP*, 227-220-Old-3-Parikino

Bastanov, Ivan Vlasov-VK-*PKVP*, 199-200-New-1-Gitola

Bastanov, Volodia Vlasov-VK-*PKVP*, 194–197-Old-4-Volkasora

Bezstuzhev, Kostiantin Afanasiev-ND-*PKVP*, 260–262-Old-4-Khimino
Veresovich

Bolandin, Yury Vasiliev¹-KV-*PKVP*, 97-98-New-2-Plotichno

Bormosov, Daniel Fedorov-IK-*PKVP*, 214–215-Old-1-Mustela

Brusilov, Andrew Grigoriev-ELU-*PKVP*, 15–17-Old-1-Dekhovo

Bukalov, Zloba Andreev-IV-*PKVP*, 127-128-New-1-Fominskoe

Bulgakov, Ivan Isakov-IT-*PKVP*, 59-60-Old-4-St. Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda

Chastov, Nekras Vasiliev-ET-*PKVP*, 141-144-Old-6-Liutchik

Chastov, Vasily Nekrasov²-SV-*PKVP*, 80-81-Exc.-1-Babino Zadnee

Chebotov, Nikita Ivanov-ND-*PKVP*, 267-269-Old-6-Gorka³

Chiurkin, Gavril-ND-*PKVP*, 270-271-Old-4-Fedorovo

Chiurkin, Ivan Grigoriev-ND-*PKVP*, 271-274-Old-2-Kiriakino

Chiurkin, Semen Ivanov-ND-*PKVP*, 274–276-Old-1-Ivashkov Ostrov
Bol'shoi

Chupriakov, Nekliud Petrov-PV-*PKVP*, 105–107-New-1-Glinnitsa on the
Volkhov

Dubrovin, Ivan Mikhailov-SV-*PKVP*, 67-69-New-1-Melkhovo
 Golovin, Fedor Ivanov-SG-*PKVP*, 177-178-Old-3-Poch on the Neva
 Groznov, Semen Alekseev-ILK-*PKVP*, 229-232-Old-1-“Bolshoi Dvor”
 Kalitin, Fedor Vasiliev-KV-*PKVP*, 102-Old-1-Vergezha
 Kalitin, Loba Grigoriev-KV-*PKVP*, 99-101-Old-5-Podberezie
 Kalitin, Patreky Peresvetov-KV-*PKVP*, 98-99-Old-2-Ostrov
 Kalitin, Stepan Ivanov-KV-*PKVP*, 101-102-Old-4-Bor
 Karpov, Luka Vasiliev-SV-*PKVP*, 69-71-New-1-Sol'tsa
 Khomutov, Fedor Ivanov-ND-*PKVP*, 277-279-Old-2-Skomantovo⁴
 Khomutov, Mochal Nikitin-ND-*PKVP*, 282-284-Old-3-Gogoleva
 Khoroshev, Semen Nekliudov-SG-*PKVP*, 171-173-Old-4-Ust' Okhty on the
 Neva
 Klementiev, Gregory Andreev-IT-*PKVP*, 48-50-Old-3-Kholm
 Klementiev, Timothy Ivanov-IT-*PKVP*, 50-52-Old-2-“Manor at St. Ilia's”
 Korsakov, Gregory Vasiliev-MV-*PKVP*, 160-161-New-1-“Manor at St.
 Michael's”
 Korsakov, Ivan Vasiliev-SV-*PKVP*, 73-74-New-1-Kholm
 Korsakov, Semen Vasiliev-SV-*PKVP*, 71-73-New-1-Sol'tsa
 Kuchetsky, Ivan Kostiantinov-SG-*PKVP*, 178-179-Old-2-Viazniki
 Kuchetsky, Volodia Kostiantinov-SG-*PKVP*, 174-175-Old-1-Zapolie on the
 Neva
 Kushelev, Daniel Vasiliev-ET-*PKVP*, 136-138-Old-1-Zarechie
 Kushelev, Fedor Kostiantinov-IT-*PKVP*, 35-38-Old-4-Luchkino Field on the
 Tigoda
 Kushelev, Fedor Vasiliev-ET-*PKVP*, 149-152-Old-Rechka⁵
 Kushelev, Ivan Vasiliev-SV-*PKVP*, 78-80-Old-3-Olomno
 Kushelev, Nikita Romanov-ET-*PKVP*, 138-139-Old-1-Kobona on the
 Kobona
 Kuzminsky, Shiria Nekrasov-SV-*PKVP*, 82-84-Old-2-Ostrov on the Olomna
 Lopukhin, Semen Nikitin-IK-*PKVP*, 224-227-Old-2-Lembogale
 Maslenitsky, Vasily Afanasiev-G-*PKVP*, 110-113-New-3-Gorka on the
 Kobona
 Meshchersky, Prince Ivan Ivanov-VK-*PKVP*, 185-188-Old-4-unknown⁶
 Munzirin, Matvei Vasiliev-IT-*PKVP*, 54-55-New-1-Dobroe on the Tigoda
 Myshetsky, Prince Daniel Fedorov-EL-*PKVP*, 249-251-Old-1-Leghola
 Myshetsky, Prince Murza Ivanov-EL-*PKVP*, 247-249-Old-3-Sakhalavo
 Nashchokin, Semen Fedorov-EL-*PKVP*, 19-Old-1-Myselka
 Nashchokin, Vasily Mokeev-DG-*PKVP*, 28-30-Old-5-Chervino
 Nashchokin, Vlas Timofeev Motiakin-KV-*PKVP*, 94-Old-3-Olkovo
 Nefedev, Vasily Vasiliev-SG-*PKVP*, 175-176-Old-1-Dubrovo on the Neva
 Nefedev, Zakhar Vasiliev-SG-*PKVP*, 179-180-Old-1-Ovseevykh

Neledinsky, Gordei Danilov-ET-*PKVP*, 145–147-Old-2-Yug
 Neledinsky, Peter Stepanov Serafimov-G-*PKVP*, 117–118-Old-2-Bogdan Es-
 ipov's volost
 Neledinsky, Vasily Danilov-G-*PKVP*, 116-Old-1-Ozerts⁷
 Okliachev, Domash-EL-*PKVP*, 242–243-Old-1-Nakhkula Goluksova
 Otiaev, Afanasy-G-*PKVP*, 113–114-Old-1-Pobedishcho at Ladoga
 Otiaev, Istoma-G-*PKVP*, 114–116-Old-1-Virola
 Ovtsyn, Fedor Semenov-EL-*PKVP*, 245–247-Old-1-Palatula
 Pechenegov, Ivan Semenov-G-*PKVP*, 125–127-Old-5-Trusovo
 Pushkin, Yury Andreev-IK-*PKVP*, 209–210-New-1-Kokorino
 Rakhmanov, Istoma Ievlev-VK-*PKVP*, 202–205-Old-2-Volkovo Valakala
 Rokhmanov, Gregory Vasiliev-ND-*PKVP*, 276–277-Old-1-Gorka
 Saburov, Daniel Fedorov-FP-*PKVP*, 132–133-Old-1-Zaruchie
 Sekirin, Ivan Mikhailov-FP-*PKVP*, 133–134-New-1-Kipuia
 Shadrin Tuchkovsky, Istoma Zlobin-SV-*PKVP*, 84–86-Old-4-Bor Seliatin-
 skoi
 Shamshov, Vasily Alekseev-VK-*PKVP*, 197–198-Old-5-Afanasovo⁸
 Skobeev, Nesyt-ND-*PKVP*, 264–265-New-1-Gorakh
 Skudin, Fedor Terentiev-IV-*PKVP*, 128-Old-4-Liapunovo
 Solovtsov, Nikita Brekhov-ND-*PKVP*, 292–293-Old-3-Morie
 Teleshov, Michael Agafonov-FP-*PKVP*, 131–132-Old-1-Mikhailovskoe
 Terkov, Gridia Semenov-VK-*PKVP*, 190–192-Old-6-Berezovo
 Terkov, Vasily Ivanov-IK-*PKVP*, 222-Old-1-Ofremoveevo
 Tetkin, Gribak Grigoriev-IT-*PKVP*, 32–35-Old-4-Kunestna on-the-Tigoda
 Uvarov, Daniel Nikitin-ND-*PKVP*, 286–287-Old-1-Karguevo
 Volynsky, Afanasy Volodimerov-ET-*PKVP*, 154–156-Old-1-Pechelnia
 Volynsky, Semen Volodimerov-ET-*PKVP*, 156–158-Old-1-Soria
 Voronin, Vasily Ivanov-ND-*PKVP*, 296–299-Old-5-Berekh
 Zabelin, Ivan Grigoriev-IT-*PKVP*, 52–54-Old-3-Glupovo
 Zholtukhin, Rium Gubin-MV-*PKVP*, 166–167-Old-3-Mimina
 Zuev, Ivan Ivanov-ND-*PKVP*, 165–167-Old-1-Savrova

NOTES

1. The two sons of Vasily Bolandin, Yury and Ivan, jointly held the manorial parcel in Kolomna and lived in the family seat at Plotichno. Ivan also had a parcel in St. Ilia's on the Tigoda (*PKVP*, 55–57), where he maintained but did not reside in a separate manorial household at Smerdynia. Since Yury was listed as the senior pomeshchik on the jointly held parcel and their father was deceased, he must be considered head of the Bolandin family.

2. Nekras Chastov lived in his manor house on the parcel from an exchange with Fedor Vasiliev syn Kushelev. Since there are no references to other parcels in the Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov returns, the estate of twelve tax units could have represented his entire dacha. See *PKVP*, 81.

3. The five cousins who shared the parcel represented two sets of brothers. The family head Nikita (Ivan Chebotov's son) lived with his brother Sumgor in the small village (*sel'tso*) of Gorka while Temir, Fedor, and Andrew (Nikita Chebotov's sons) lived in a new settlement (*pochinok*) of Temniki. The fact that Ivan's sons lived in a village suggests they represented the senior branch of the family. See *PKVP*, 269.

4. Although the brothers Fedor and Yakov Khomutov jointly held the thirty-four tax units in St. Nicholas at Dudorovo parish, they lived in separate manor houses: the family head (first listed pomeshchik) Fedor lived at Skomantovo while Yakov lived in Kokolino. See *PKVP*, 277-279. Fedor also had a pridacha of three tax units in Our Savior's at Gorodnia parish shared with his sons Selian and Rot rather than his brother; see *PKVP*, 182.

5. Fedor Vasiliev syn Kushelev lived at Rechka on the part of his father's former St. Egor's at Terebuzhka parcel received as a pridacha.

6. The location of the manor house is unknown since the beginning of the returns are lost, but the entry for Prince Meshchersky's St Ivan's at Kuivasha parcel of eight tax units refers to his manor house in Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish. See *PKVP*, 219-220.

7. All four manorial tax units in Bogdan Esipov's volost were in the lord's demesne. See *PKVP*, 116. The only other reference to Vasily Danilov syn Neledinsky is found in St Egor's at Terebuzhka parish, where none of the 10.5 tax units earlier held by his father in Bogdan Esipov's Liutchik volost were in demesne; see *PKVP*, 144-145.

8. The sons of Odinets Shamshov (Vasily, Mitka, Yushko, and Borisko) held two manorial parcels in different parishes. Their Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish parcel of nine tax units (*PKVP*, 197-198) was shared with the second oldest brother Alexis while the Our Savior's at Gorodnia parcel of eleven tax units (*PKVP*, 173-174) was held with their youngest brother Davyd. Since both parcels' returns list Alexis first, the two parcels were part of the dacha of the Shamshov family head.

Appendix F

Linear Regression Variables

A. Shelonskaia Linear Regression Variables, 1539

Family Head-Type-OFM-Lords-Income-DN-Frag-ACD-Pridacha-Farms-Tax
Units-Rye

Afanasiev, I.-2-0-1-477-124.67-11.99-18.19-0.00-10-5.5-34

Agarev, V.-2-0-1-764-82.09-19.18-27.29-0.00-31-21.5-80

Aigustov, M.-2-0-1-804.28-82.09-9.59-27.29-0.00-27-22.5-76.

Beloselsky, V.I.-1-2-1-1038-110.48-26.37-19.18-1-32-25-14

Beloselsky, V.S.-1-2-1-1257.9-110.48-1-19.18-1-24-17-104.5

Bulgakov, N.-1-0-3-1034-88.61-1-27.29-1-34-25-79.5

Bundov, M.-1-0-1-492-67.13-16.78-0.00-1-19-15-52

Buturlin, A.I.-1-1-1-1904.5-124.67-1-18.19-1-54-40-189

Buturlin, D.I.P.-1-1-2-2197.12-153.44-14.39-32.01-1-61-48-227

Buzheninov, I.L.-2-0-1-951.8-62.53-9.59-38.36-0.00-12-10.5-85.5

Chebotaev, M.-1-0-3-1695-124.67-1-0.00-1-45-30-136

Cheglakov, V.A.-1-0-1-1418.2-110.48-26.37-19.18-0.00-37-20-97.5

Chetver(t)kin, D.-1-0-5-1971.6-143.85-11.99-27.29-1-59-46-177.5

Chikhachev, S.I.-2-0-1-623.82-84.01-1-47.94-0.00-12-17-51.5

Dobrynia, V.A.-2-0-1-477.38-110.48-1-19.18-0.00-5-5.5-33

Dubrovsky, I.S.-2-0-1-1015.98-62.53-50.35-38.36-0.00-52-14.5-103.

Dudin, E.A.-2-0-1-507-93.6-14.39-47.94-0.00-18-15-63

Erokhov, G.E.-1-2-1-314-76.72-9.59-38.36-1-11-10.33-42.5Erokhov ,I.E.-1-
2-1-345.17-76.72-9.59-38.36-1-11-10.30-35

Erokhov, I.V.-1-1-1-378-82.09-14.39-27.29-0.00-9-16-52.5

Erokhov, M.E.-1-2-1-482.41-76.72-1-38.36-1-11-10.83-42

Evreev, V.B.-1-0-2-2580.18-76.72-29.97-47.94-0.00-47-49.25-212

Evsiukov, I.-1-0-2-2047-117.38-21.58-33.67-1-56-43.75-190

Fedkov, N.A.-2-0-2-930.5-88.61-1-27.29-0.00-20-23-88

Glotov, B.G.-1-0-2-1247.3-103.19-22.78-9.59-1-29-26-91.5
Golodnoi, I.F.-2-0-1-686.14-74.72-19.18-28.75-0.00-15-15.5-50
Gridiukin, S.F.-1-0-1-829.18-153.44-14.39-32.01-0.00-21-21-83
Ievlev, T.-2-0-3-731.5-74.42-1-28.75-0.00-12-16-45
Karkmazov, S.I.-1-0-3-2480.74-139.25-12.79-19.18-1-60-61-208.5
Karpov, I.L.I.-1-0-1-1294-143.85-1-27.29-1-24-20-107.5
Kharlamov, I.K.A.-2-0-1-640-82.09-1-27.29-0.00-16-10-30
Khlopov, G.D.-2-0-1-1491.3-124.67-7.19-18.19-0.00-44-25.5-148
Khludenev, I.B.-1-0-1-587-124.67-83.11-0.00-0.00-10-15.5-88
Khlusov, I.I.-1-0-6-2889.91-95.9-71.93-27.29-1-61-60-203.5
Kobylin, I.I.-2-0-1-931-76.72-28.77-38.36-0.00-30-22.5-60
Kolosov, V.I.-2-0-3-1242-88.61-14.39-27.29-0.00-25-22-87
Kostin, I.D.-1-2-1-1118.5-122.37-21.58-38.36-1-14-13-64
Kostin, S.D.-1-2-1-703-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-11-13-54.5
Kriukov, A.V.-1-0-2-5301-64.83-1-47.94-1-143-66.5-397.5
Kropotov, M.I.-1-1-1-135-76.72-1-47.94-0.00-4-4-30
Kropotov, G.I.-2-2-1-731.66-84.01-9.59-47.94-0.00-8-7.5-54.5
Kropotov, P.M.-2-2-1-1422-84.01-9.59-47.94-0.00-25-25.25-115.5
Kropotov, T.I.-2-2-2-802.29-84.01-9.59-47.94-0.00-12-16.75-70
Kurtsov, N.A.-2-0-3-1628.5-139.25-107.08-19.18-0.00-62-47-127.5
Kvashnin, L.N.-1-1-2-1536.95-110.48-30.35-19.18-1-37-31.25-160
Kvashnin, G.N.-1-1-3-2325.91-117.38-27.17-33.67-1-43-50-221.5
Lazarev, A.A.-1-2-1-400-124.67-28.77-0.00-1-16-14-44
Lazarev, F.I.-1-2-1-1891.5-115.08-1-9.59-0.00-65-32.5-195
Lazarev, S.A.-1-2-3-1874.24-124.67-23.98-0.00-0.00-41-40.5-155
Likharev, K.A.-2-0-1-382-62.53-1-38.36-0.00-17-14.5-58
Meliukov, F.S.-1-0-1-873.5-124.67-1-27.29-0.00-38-38.75-120
Meshcherinov, I. Mordvinov.-2-0-1-736-67.13-16.78-0.00-0.00-15-13.5-39.5
Miachkov, S.-1-0-1-1023-153.44-1-32.01-0.00-20-19.5-96
Miakinin, F.N.I.-1-0-3-1867.65-88.61-14.39-27.29-1-45-39.5-149
Molchanov, M.F.-2-1-2-905.5-76.72-22.78-47.94-0.00-18-15-64
Molchanov, T.V.-2-1-2-849.5-67.16-37.16-0.00-0.00-29-28-98
Molchanov-Kuchetskoi, I.-2-0-1-1030.45-117.38-19.18-33.67-0.00-24-19-98.5
Moseev, M.A.-2-1-1-351-117.38-1-33.67-0.00-8-8-27
Moseev, M.P.-2-2-1-138-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-2-2-4.5
Moseev, N.A.-2-2-1-641.25-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-9-15-58
Moseev, N.I.-1-2-3-1262-122.37-1-38.36-1-23-22-85
Moseev, P.A.-1-2-1-404.25-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-8-9-2.39
Nazimov, A.S.-1-2-3-1292.75-143.85-57.54-27.29-1-33-30-105.5
Nazimov, A.S.S.-1-2-2-846.9-143.85-1-27.29-1-21-23-73

Nazimov, G.M.-2-2-1-953-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-30-19-80
Nazimov, I.S.-2-2-1-876-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-28-16-82.5
Nazimov, P.I.-1-2-1-797.8-143.85-57.54-27.29-0.00-18-13.5-62.5
Nazimov, S.V.-1-2-1-800.73-143.85-1-27.29-1-20-19-77
Nazimov, V.B.I.-1-2-1-742-143.85-1-27.29-1-25-13-70
Nazimov, V.I.-1-2-1-1038.3-143.85-1-27.29-1-26-26-93.5
Nazimov, V.M.I.-1-2-1-685-143.85-57.54-27.29-0.00-14-13.5-54
Nazimov, V.S.-1-2-2-1078.8-143.85-4.8-27.29-1-37-20-91.5
Nekliudov, V.I.-2-0-1-518.25-62.53-1-38.36-0.00-10-8-45
Oboturov, D.K.-2-0-1-578.25-74.42-29.57-28.75-0.00-14-14.5-55
Ogarev, I.I.-1-2-6-5001.3-122.37-43.16-38.36-1-109-106.5-391.5
Ogarev, S.S.-1-2-1-835-122.37-19.18-38.36-0.00-13-15-54.5
Ovtsyn, I.A.V.-1-1-1-2480-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-73-45.75-186
Ovtsyn, S.V.V.-1-1-1-1332.27-93.63-33.57-47.94-0.00-30-32-117
Palitsyn, M.M.-2-2-1-866.75-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-17-23-60
Palitsyn, V.A.-2-2-2-483-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-6-22-65
Parfeniev, P.A.-1-0-3-1121-88.61-14.39-27.29-1-29-28-100
Pervoi, I.S.-2-0-1-870-84.01-1-47.94-0.00-18.13.5-58
Piatin, B.F.-2-0-1-576.5-67.13-1-0.00-0.00-11-11.5-40
Pleshcheev, A.V.-1-1-2-1603.25-115.08-1-9.59-1-67-34-193.75
Pleshcheev, R.B.-2-1-1-1211-110.48-1-19.18-0.00-29-25-121
Pustoshkin, I.B.I.-1-2-2-974.15-143.85-1-27.29-1-23-19.5-73
Pustoshkin, I.-1-2-1-685.04-143.85-153.44-27.29-0.00-14-13.5-50
Pustoshkin, S.S.-1-1-1-488.5-124.67-13.19-18.19-0.00-25-17.5-80
Ragozin, F.-1-0-1-1042.5-143.85-1-27.29-1-28-19-97.5
Rezantsov, I.O.-1-0-1-746-103.19-95.9-9.59-1-28-23-104
Riapolovsky, S.G.-2-0-1-1045.5-124.67-1-0.00-0.00-12-15-70
Rogotin, I.I.-2-0-2-379-76.72-9.59-38.36-0.00-13-11.5-53
Sablin, P.I.-2-0-1-428-139.25-9.59-19.18-0.00-7-5-27.5
Samarin-Kvashnin, M.I.-1-0-3-2133.18-93.6-55.14-63.67-1-83-55-246.5
Selivanov, A.A.-1-2-1-1387.8-110.48-1-19.18-0.00-19-20-127
Selivanov, I.A.-1-2-1-1329.8-110.48-35.96-19.18-1-44-20-124.5
Shablykin, P.-2-2-1-945.5-110.48-33.56-19.18-0.00-19-3-83
Shablykin, S.-2-2-1-1258.5-110.48-33.56-19.18-0.00-21-18.25-77.50
Shablykin, S.I.-1-1-3-2063.56-143.85-11.99-27.29-1-63-46-179
Shablykin, T.I.-2-2-1-790-110.48-33.56-19.18-0.00-21-16-80.55
Shablykin, U.I.-2-2-1-1007.3-110.48-31.17-19.18-0.00-16-15.12-73
Shcherbinin, P.D.-1-0-4-2016-95.9-43.16-27.29-1-56-50-167
Shchulepnikov, D.I.-2-0-1-123-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-11-6.5-26
Shishkin, M.A.-1-0-2-2813-124.67-31.17-0.00-1-87-65-297
Snazin-Mikulín, F.-1-0-1-1435.35-117.38-23.98-38.36-0.00-39-42-162

Sukov, S.S.-2-0-1-1189-124.67-1-0.00-0.00-27-20-102.5
 Tatianin, D.-1-2-1-2079.8-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-40-40-154.5
 Tatianin, I.A.-1-2-1-2190-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-59-38-189
 Terpigorev, I.D.-1-2-2-1311-122.37-1-19.18-0.00-26-28.5-105
 Terpigorev, F.S.-1-2-1-1211.14-139.25-14.39-19.18-1-34-23.5-115.5
 Terpigorev, K.S.-1-2-1-1855.5-139.25-23.98-19.18-1-34-35.5-160
 Tonkov, P.-2-2-1-406.4-74.42-1-28.75-0.00-10-10-43.5
 Tonkov, S.V.-2-2-1-446-74.42-14.39-28.75-0.00-10-11-37.5
 Tulupov, A.V.-1-0-2-4836.43-143.85-1-27.29-0.00-142-121-563
 Turgenev, S.I.-2-0-2-1625.4-95.9-19.18-27.29-0.00-43-31-120
 Turov, G.A.-1-0-3-2164.95-74.42-15.58-28.75-1-56-45-148
 Tyrto, I.V.-1-1-3-1803-122.37-9.59-38.36-1-54-45-185
 Tyrto, Z.S.-1-1-1-1115.87-139.25-9.59-19.18-1-31-22.5-114.5
 Unkovsky, I.A.-1-0-1-1316.25-117.38-1-33.67-0.00-31-28-135.5
 Uskoi, R.F.D.-2-0-1-1078-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-38-31-106
 Voronoi, I.F.-2-0-1-2377.5-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-33-30.5-122.5
 Vseslavin, A.-2-1-1-574.75-93.6-1-63.67-0.00-23-23.5-71
 Vseslavin, S.V.-1-1-1-1449-122.37-1-38.36-0.00-33-25.5-115.5
 Zamutsky, M.I.-1-0-1-1301.25-82.09-86.31-27.29-0.00-31-33-127.5
 Zasekin, V.D.-2-0-1-2000.34-124.67-28.77-0.00-0.00-48-33-160
 Zverev, A.I.-1-2-1-887.43-67.13-19.18-0.00-0.00-22-22-64.5
 Zverev, I.I.-1-2-1-688-74.42-1-28.75-0.00-37-22-76
 Zverev, P.-2-2-7-556-74.42-1-28.75-0.00-15-18-48

KEY:

Type: 1 = old, 2 = new

OFM: Other family members (0 = none in province, 1 = family in province,
 2 = family in parish)

Income: annual peasant dues

DN: Location (distance from Novgorod)

Frag: Fragmentation index (other parcels' mean distance from manor)

ACD: distance from the nearest administrative center

Pridacha: additions to the estate

Farms: peasant farms or homesteads (dvory)

B. Vodskaja Linear Regression Variables, 1540

Reconstructed Pomesties¹

Family Head

(Parcel: Family Origins-Classification-Lords-Farms-Rye-Tax Units-Quitrent)

Estate: Family Origins-Classification-Lords-Farms-Rye-Tax Units-Quitrent-

All Income

Estate: Relatives-Pridacha-Fragmentation-Demesne-Distance from Nov-gorod

Achkasov, Andrew Prokofiev

(D-OR-2-8-32-7.5-374.6²)

(D-O-2-6-20.5-6-58)

D-O-2-14-52.5-13.5-432.6-792.2

1.00-0.00-37.50-3.50-143.00

Aksakov, Dmitry Ivanov

(BF-P-3-6-34-6.5-388.03*)

(BF-O-3-33-90-30-455.1)

(BF-P-3-2-3.5-1-52.6)

BF-O-3-41-127.5-37.5-895.73-1953.73

2.00-1.00-11.99-4.00-143.85

Aksakov, Karp Vasiliev

BF-O-1-29-118-30.5-1692-2052

2.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-143.85

Aminev, Ivan Borisov

D-O-1-22-74.5-17-1277.46*³-1677.46

2.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-139.05

Aminev, Kopt Petrov

D-O-1-16-67.5-14.5-1086.3*-2026.3

2.00-0.00-0.00-5.50-139.05

Barykov, Obliaz Bogdanov

P-O-3-9-45.5-10.5-776.22-1116.22

0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-191.80

Bastanov, Ivan Vlasov⁴

(P-N-1-5-12-3-212)

(P-N-1-1-4-1-71)

(P-N-1-7-28-7-481*)

(P-N-1-1-5-1-89.6)

P-N-1-14-49-12-853.6-1093.6

2.00-0.00-28.77-1.50-172.63

Bastanov, Volodia Vlasev

(P-O-1-13-77.5-17-1212.28)

(P-N-4-2-14-3-198.6)

P-O-4-15-91.5-20-1410.88-1610.88

2.00-0.00-26.37-1.50-172.63

Bezstushev, Konstantin Afanasiev

(D-O-4-34-173-44-IPD)

(D-U-4-3-24-4-150)

D-O-4-37-197-48-IPD-IPD
0.00-0.00-14.38-13.00-134.26
Bolandin, Ivan Vasiliev
(D-NE-1-9-40-9-880.4)
(D-N-2-15-44-13-826.6)
D-N-2-24-84-22-1707-2227
1.00-0.00-57.54-3.50-47.95
Bormosov, Daniel Fedorov
D-OE-1-13-69-17.5-2157.58-3077.58
0.00-0.00-0.00-6.00-191.80
Brusilov, Andrew Grigoriev.
D-O-1-22-70.5-21-1093.35-1333.35
0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-28.77
Bukalov, Zloba Andreev.
(D-E-1-19-32-7-163)
(D-N-1-8-30-7-766.75)
(D-N-1-6-20.5-5-61.1)
D-N-1-33-82.5-19-990.85-990.85
0.00-0.00-74.12-0.00-153.44
Bulgakov, Ivan Isakov syn Malygin
(D-O-4-3-16-4-272.3)
(D-O-4-5-26-8-341.5)
D-O-4-8-42-12-613.8-1173.8
0.00-0.00-19.18-2.00-91.11
Chastov, Nekras Vasiliev.
(D-P-6-4-24-5-349.98)
(D-O-7-16-81-25-1098.05)
D-O-7-20-105-30-1448.03-2588.03
1.00-1.00-0.00-9.00-143.85
Chastov, Vasily Nekrasov
D-E-1-12-39.5-12-226.75-506.75
Chebotov, Nikita Ivanov
D-O-5-33-160.5-39.5-IPD
0.00-0.00-0.00-3.00-134.36
Chiurkin, Gavril
D-O-4-40-177-45-IPD
2.00-0.00-0.00-5.00-134.36
Chiurkin, Ivan Grigoriev
(D-P-1-3-12.5-3.5-IPD)
(D-O-2-25-76.5-25-194)
D-O-2-28-89-28.5-IPD

2.00-1.00-0.00-3.00-134.36
 Chiurkin, Semen Ivanov.
 D-O-1-21-68-18.5-IPD
 2.00-0.00-0.00-2.50-134.36
 Chupriakov, Nekliud Petrov
 D-N-1-12-64.5-15-776.85
 0.00-0.00-0.00-3.00-23.98
 Dubrovin, Ivan Mikhailov
 D-N-1-65-96-24-725.6-1085.6
 0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-105.49
 Golovin, Fedor Ivanov
 (BF-O-3-9-53-11-353)
 (BF-O-3-8-57-12-980)
 BF-O-3-17-110-23-1333-2173
 0.00-0.00-38.36-3.50-143.85
 Groznov, Semen Alekseev
 D-O-1-15-91.5-20.5-IPD
 0.00-0.00-0.00-3.00-148.65
 Kalitin, Fedor Vasiliev
 (D-O-1-6-23-7-284)
 (D-O-1-15-20-5-212.5)
 D-O-1-21-43-12-496.5-896.5
 2.00-0.00-23.98-2.50-47.95
 Kalitin, Loba Grigoriev
 (D-O-5-5-7.5-2-28.75)
 (D-O-5-20-97.5-20.5-1117.2)
 (D-O-1-5-13-4-175)
 D-O-5-30-118-26.5-1320.95-1680.95
 2.00-0.00-23.98-3.00-47.95
 Kalitin, Patreky Peresvetov
 (D-O-2-29-52-14-321.75)
 (D-O-2-13-42.5-11-658.4)
 D-O-2-42-94.5-25-980.15-1300.15
 2.00-0.00-23.98-2.50-47.95
 Kalitin, Stepan Ivanov
 D-O-4-11-41-10.5-236.75-616.5
 2.00-0.00-0.00-1.50-47.95
 Karpov, Luka Vasiliev
 D-N-1-43-96-21.5-1197.3-1997.3
 0.00-0.00-0.00-3.50-105.49
 Khomutov, Fedor Ivanov

(D-P-1-3-12-3-193)
(D-O-2-39-133.5-34-IPD)
D-O-2-42-145.5-37-IPD
2.00-1.00-47.95-4.00-134.26
Khomutov, Mochal Nikitin
(D-O-3-33-106.5-26.5-1943.5)
(D-PE-3-2-7-1.5-117)
D-O-3-35-113.5-28-2060.5-2380.5
2.00-1.00-0.00-2.00-134.26
Khoroshev, Semen Nekliudov
(D-O-4-5-24.5-6-390.45)
(D-O-4-26-67.5-13.5-IPD)
D-O-4-31-92-19.5-IPD-IPD
0.00-0.00-38.36-3.00-143.85
Klementiev, Gregory Andreev
(P-O-3-14-63-14.5-965.7)
(P-P-3-1-2.5-0.5-14)
P-O-3-15-65.5-15-979.7-1339.7
2.00-1.00-67.13-3.00-91.11
Klementiev, Timothy Ivanov
P-O-2-14-55-14-1100.84-1660.84
2.00-0.00-0.00-3.50-91.11
Korsakov, Gregory Vasiliev
D-N-1-18-53-18.5-976.3-1316.3
1.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-143.85
Korsakov, Ivan Vasiliev
(D-N-1-14-35-9-332.5)
(D-N-1-11-56.5-13.5-608.95)
D-N-1-25-91.5-22.5-941.45-1241.45
2.00-0.00-47.95-2.00-105.49
Korsakov, Semen Vasiliev
D-N-1-28-75-18-947.25-1667.25
2.00-0.00-0.00-2.50-105.49
Kuchetsky, Ivan Kostiantinov
D-OE-2-9-47.5-12.5-786.36*-1026.36
2.00-0.00-0.00-3.00-143.85
Kuchetsky, Volodia Kostiantinov
D-O-1-12-54-13-567.25*-887.25
2.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-143.85
Kushelev, Daniel Vasiliev
(D-O-1-9-58-14.5-1064)

(D-P-1-3-9-4-76)
D-P-1-12-67-18.5-1140-1500
2.00-1.00-0.00-3.00-143.85
Kushelev, Fedor Kostiantinov
D-O-4-38-121-30-2938.15-3258.15
1.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-91.11
Kushelev, Fedor Vasiliev
(D-P-1-1-1-0.25-18)
(D-OE-1-4-13-3-183)
(D-PE-1-4-18-4-105.00)
(D-E-1-10-43-12.25-IPD)
D-O-1-19-75-19.5-IPD-IPD
2.00-1.00-25.57-2.00-143.85
Kushelev, Ivan Vasiliev
(D-P-3-2-8-2-108)
(D-O-3-11-57.5-16-353)
(D-P-1-7-24.5-6.5-296.5)
D-O-3-20-90-24.5-757.5-2037.5
2.00-1.00-20.37-8.00-105.49
Kushelev, Nikita Romanov
D-O-1-6-50-14.5-728.2-1648.2
2.00-0.00-0.00-6.00-143.85
Kuzminsky, Shiria Nekrasov
(D-O-2-17-83.5-24-622.25)
(D-O-2-5-25-6-194)
D-O-2-22-108.5-30-816.25-1456.25
2.00-0.00-86.31-4.00-105.49
Lopukhin, Semen Nikitin Belyi
D-O-2-33-130-34.5-2157.88-2337.88
0.00-0.00-0.00-1.50-191.80
Maslenittsky, Vasily Afanasiev
D-N-3-40-153-41-1496.1-1856.1
0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-163.03
Meshchersky, Pr. Ivan Ivanov
(D-P-4-4-12.5-3-IPD)
(D-P-4-9-29.5-8-452.56)
(D-O-4-19-117-23-2440)
(D-P-4-2-18-4-257.5)
(D-O-4-1-3-0.5-45.5)
D-O-4-35-180-38.5-IPD
2.00-1.00-17.98-1.50-172.63

Munzirin, Matvei Vasiliev
D-N-1-12-44.5-10.5-157.8-517.8
0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-91.11
Myshetsky, Pr. Daniel and Boris Fedorov
(D-P-2-10-23-6-373)
(D-O-2-19-93-25.5-1899.6)
(D-U-1-2-9-2-104)
(D-E-1-3-11-3.5-222.3)
(D-O-2-5-25.5-7-537.00)
(D-O-1-2-17-3-255)
D-O-2-41-178.5-47-3390.9-4530.9
2.00-1.00-19.18-8.50-139.05
Myshetsky, Pr. Murza Ivanov
(D-O-3-5-29.5-7-578.5)
(D-P-3-10-32-9.5-248)
(D-O-3-24-102.5-27.5-1669)
(D-P-3-4-17-5-127)
(D-O-3-5-23-5-315.3)
D-O-3-48-204-54-2937.8-3417.8
2.00-1.00-26.37-5.00-139.05
Nashchokin, Semen Fedorov
(D-O-1-5-28-6-261.75)
(D-PE-1-41-92-24-1702)
D-O-1-46-120-30-1963.75-3803.75
1.00-1.00-115.00-6.00-28.77
Nashchokin, Vasily Mokeev
D-O-5-22-125-36.5-1590.42-1910.42
0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-52.75
Nashchokin, Vlas Timofeev and Ivan Dmitriev⁵
(D-O-3-19-53-14-411.74)
(D-O-3-32-104-29.5-1487)
(D-O-3-24-84-21-1166)
(Incomplete Data-D-N-1-2-7-2-84)
(Incomplete Data-D-N-1-1-6-1-59.1)
D-O-3-78-254-67.5-3207.84-4147.84
1.00-0.00-23.98-2.00-47.95
Nefediev, Vasily Vasiliev
(D-OE-1-19-73.5-17.5-1014.48*)
(D-O-1-1-3-1-70)
D-O-1-20-76.5-18.5-1084.48-1444.48
2.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-143.85

Nefediev, Zakhar Vasiliev
 (D-OP-1-11-46-11-806.3*)
 (D-O-1-10-32.5-8.5-586)
 D-O-1-21-78.5-19.5-1392.3-1712.3
 2.00-0.00-38.36-2.00-143.85
 Neledinsky, Gordei Danilov Bykov
 (P-O-2-15-71-17.5-1223.95)
 (P-P-1-2-9-2-201)
 P-O-2-17-80-19.5-1424.95-1864.95
 2.00-1.00-0.00-2.50-143.85
 Nelendinsky, Peter Stepanov
 (P-O-2-32-105-29-2484)
 (P-O-2-7-28-6.5-411)
 P-O-2-39-133-35.5-2895-3075
 1.00-0.00-19.18-1.00-163.03
 Neledinsky, Vasily Danilov Bykov
 (P-O-1-2-32-10.5-0)
 (P-O-1-1-15-4-0)
 P-O-1-3-47-14.5-0-680⁶
 2.00-0.00-19.18-2.00-163.03
 Okliachev, Domash Ivanov
 (D-O-1-13-54.5-13.5-838.6*)
 (D-O-1-1-3.5-1-51)
 D-O-1-14-58-14.5-889.6-1229.6
 0.00-0.00-23.98-2.00-139.05
 Otiaev, Afanasy
 BF-O-3-10-69.5-16-582-1622
 2.00-0.00-0.00-6.00-163.03
 Otiaev, Istoma Ivanov
 BF-O-1-12-67.5-16-1026-1226
 2.00-0.00-0.00-1.50-163.03
 Ovtsyn, Fedor Semenov
 (D-O-1-9-39-10-417.90)
 (D-O-1-2-8.5-2-160.33)
 (D-O-1-27-94.5-24.5-2184.91)
 D-O-1-38-142-36.5-2763.14-3483.14
 2.00-0.00-26.34-5.00-139.05
 Pechenegov, Ivan Semenov
 P-OE-5-15-83-18.5-1239.65-2039.65
 0.00-0.00-0.00-3.00-163.03
 Pushkin, Yury Andreev

BF-N-1-12-60-13-910.50-1110.5
1.00-0.00-0.00-1.00-191.80
Rakhmanov, Istoma Ievlev
D-O-2-23-100-22-IPD
1.00-0.00-0.00-0.00-172.63
Rokhmanov, Gregory Vasiliev, Stepan Poryvaem et al
(P-P-7-7-17.5-6.5-136.25)
(P-O-7-15-84-25-1201.9)
(Stepan: P-P-4-24-17.5-5-344.58)
(Stepan: P-P-4-7-17.5-6.5-181.8)
P-O-7-53-136.5-43-1864.53-2364.53
2.00-1.00-85.11-3.00-134.26
Saburov, Daniel Fedorov
(BF-OP-1-2-6.5-1.5-149.00)
(BF-OE-1-12-34.5-8.5-565.42*)
(BF-O-1-8-34.5-8-651.16)
(BF-P-1-3-13-3.5-229)
BF-O-1-25-88.5-21.5-1594.58-1954.58
1.00-1.00-11.19-2.00-158.24
Sekirin, Ivan Mikhailov
D-N-1-11-76-15-1399-1759
1.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-158.24
Shadrin Tuchkovsky, Istoma Zlobin
(P-P-4-3-12-3-286.5)
(P-O-4-21-68-12-1162)
P-O-4-24-80-15-1448.5-1968.5
0.00-1.00-0.00-3.00-105.49
Shamshov, Vasily Alekseev
(P-O-5-6-37-9-327.55)
(P-O-5-1-10-11-756)
P-O-5-7-47-20-1083.55-1643.55
1.00-0.00-38.36-1.00-172.63
Skobeev, Nesyt
D-N-1-14-72-15-845.5-1345.5
0.00-0.00-0.00-4.00-134.26
Skudin, Fedor Terentiev
(D-O-4-14-60.5-14.5-769)
(D-O-4-5-29-7.5-655)
(D-O-4-4-10.5-2.5-184.6)
D-O-4-23-100-24.5-1608.6-2328.6
0.00-0.00-0.00-1.00-153.44

Solovtsov, Nikita Brekhov
(BF-O-3-24-81-20.5-617)
(BF-P-3-2-6-2-63.75)
BF-O-3-26-87-22.5-680.75-960.75
2.00-1.00-0.00-1.50-134.26
Teleshov, Michael Agafonov
(D-O-1-7-23.5-4-313.33)
(D-O(L)-1-8-32-11.5-384.35)
D-O-1-15-55.5-15.5-697.68-1017.68
0.00-0.00-9.59-2.00-158.24
Terkov, Gridia Semenov
(P-P-6-1-11-2.5-96.18)
(P-OF-6-8-42-10-413)
(P-OE-6-19-40-9-IPD)
P-O-6-28-93-21.5-IPD
2.00-1.00-23.98-1.00-172.63
Terkov, Vasily Ivanov
(P-O-1-8-40-11.5-IPD)
(P-O-3-2-9-2-IPD)
P-O-3-10-49-13.5-IPD
2.00-0.00-23.98-1.50-191.80
Tetkin, Gribak Grigoriev
(P-P-4-15-67-17.5-IPD)
(P-O-1-26-82-20-1336.33)
(P-P-4-4-5.5-1.5-67)
P-O-4-45-154.5-39-IPD
0.00-1.00-67.13-4.00-91.11
Uvarov, Daniel Nikitin
D-O-1-11-37-11-615-1095
2.00-0.00-0.00-4.50-134.26
Volynsky, Afanasy Volodimerov
BF-O-1-16-60.5-18.5-1197.6-1557.6
2.00-0.00-0.00-3.00-143.85
Volynsky, Semen Volodimerov
BF-O-1-16-60.5-17-1321-1501
2.00-0.00-0.00-1.50-143.85
Voronin, Vasily Ivanov
(D-O-5-38-146-49-2473.05)
(D-P-4-11-42-10-170)
D-O-5-49-188-59-2643.05
1.00-1.00-0.00-0.00-134.26

Zabelin, Ivan Grigoriev

(D-O-3-2-8.5-2-70)

(D-O-3-6-20-6-165)

(D-OE-3-18-77-19.5-639.23)

D-O-3-26-105.5-27.5-874.23-1234.23

1.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-91.11

Zholtukhin, Rium Gubin Ivanov

(D-O-3-6-23-7-261.7)

(D-OF-3-2-9-2-134)

D-O-3-8-31-9-395.7-655.7

0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-143.85

Zuev, Ivan Ivanov

D-N-1-19-69.5-18-1245-1565

0.00-0.00-0.00-2.00-134.26

Reconstructed estates: 85

Old estates-69 (80.7%)

New estates-15 (18.3%)

Entire estate by exchange-1 (1%)

Parcels belonging to reconstructed estates: 163

Original parcels: 126 (78%)

Old original-102 (81% O.P.)

New original-24 (19% O.P.)

Later additions (pridachi): 30 (18%)

Entire parcels obtained by exchange: 4 (2%)

Parcels in litigation: 1 (1%)

Unclassifiable parcels: 2 (1%)

Parcels Belonging to Estates with Lost Returns

Family Head-Origins-Classification-Lords-Farms-Rye-Tax Units-Quitrent

Aprelev, N.-D-O-1-1-4-1-53.4*

Bazlov, F.-D-N-2-3-10.5-3-333.96*

Beloselsky, I.-D-N-2-4-12.5-3-257

Borkov, S.-D-N-3-15-49.5-15.5-539

Brovtsyn, M.-D-L(O)-1-1-9-3-165

Brovtsyn, I.F.-D-P-1-1-4.5-1.5-80

Brovtsyn, I.F.-D-O-1-18-42-13-500

Brovtsyn, I.K. (Pel'd)-D-OE-1-3-21-5.5-105.5

Brovtsyn, I.K.-D-O-2-4-11.5-2.5-98

Brovtsyn, M.K.-D-PE-1-2-5-1.5-38.5

Buinosov, Pr. I.-D-O-1-1-13-3-IPD

Buturlin, M.-BF-P-2-3-7.5-2.5-156

Chernoi, S.-D-N-1-13-25-6-533
 Chertov, Semen K.-D-N-1-16-58-15-933.3
 Chertov, Stepen K.-D-O-3-(part of record lost)
 Chertov, T.-D-N-3-6-42-9-258.25
 Chiupriakov, Nekliud⁷-D-N-2-1-9-2-210
 Dubasov, S.-D-O-1-16-67.5-17-823.5
 Ekhidinov, S.-P-O-2-27-97.5-20-989.8
 Elagin, G.-D-P-3-2-18-4-222
 Elagin, M.-D-N-7-9-41-10-450
 Elagin, S.-D-N-1-1-13.5-3.5-184
 Eletsy, Pr. I.-SB-N-1-6-23-6-384
 Eletsy, Pr. M.-D-NE-1-12-76-20-1629.3
 Foladin, I.-D-O-6-17-57-35.5-1134
 Kalzakov, G.B.-D-N-1-2-1-0-28.00
 Kalzakov, G.B.-D-N-1-6-21.5-5-300.50
 Kartmazov, I.-D-N-2-3-12-3-93*
 Khomutov, D.Iv.-D-P-3-3-16-3-194.5
 Khomutov, D.Iv.-D-P-3-4-14-4-258
 Khomutov, D.Iv.-D-O-6-26-103.5-30-IPD
 Khomutov, Usk-D-P-1-1-4-1-54
 Khvostov, D.-BF-P-1-10-22-5-337
 Khvostov, F.-BF-OE-1-15-36-12-331
 Kolzakov, G.-D-P-1-7-19-6-101.4
 Kopriakov, N.-D-N-2-1-10-2.5-143
 Kortmazov, I.-D-N-1-3-16-4-282.25
 Krenev, I.-D-P-3-4-12-4-179.5
 Kuzminsky, T.-D-N-1-2-5-1.5-28
 Kuzminsky, T.-D-N-1-7-38-8.5-373.25
 Likhorev, G.-D-N-1-14-58-14-818.32*
 Lizunov, D.G.-D-N-2-10-45-11-699.5
 Lizunov, D.G.-D-N-2-4-18-4.5-320.5
 Lugevenev, M.-D-OP-2-9-49-11.5-908.75
 Meshchersky, Pr. Ivan Matfeev-D-U-2-1-3-0.5-15.5
 Myshetsky, Pr. Andrew Semenov-D-O-1-3-18-4-259.88
 Myshetsky, Pr. Andrew Semenov-D-O-1-20-109.5-26-1590.84
 Myshetsky, Pr. Andrew Semenov-D-O-1-6-27-5-404*
 Nashchokin, D.F.-D-P-3-6-37.5-10-442
 Neledinsky, F.I.-D-PE-1-51-39-10-67.7
 Neledinsky, F.I.-D-E-1-2-15-5-8.5
 Neledinsky, F.I.-D-P-1-8-13-3-173
 Neledinsky, Iu.-P-N-1-1-7-2-3.5

Neledinsky, Ivan-P-N-1-8-30.5-10.5-911.58
Nesterov, S.-P-O-1-6-19-4.5-132.8
Ododurov, A.-D-N-1-3-10-2-240.65
Okunev, A.-D-O-1-5-12-4-84
Ovtsyn, F. Ivanov-D-O-1-26-101-24.25-2035.9
Ovtsyn, F. Ivanov-D-O-1-2-17.5-4-380.3
Ovtsyn, F. Ivanov-D-O-1-9-31.5-8-705.3
Prasolov, I.-D-O-1-19-60-15.5-927.25
Pushchin, G.-BF-N-1-5-14.5-5.5-245
Pushkin, G.-BF-O-1-38-153.5-32.5-1380
Putiatin, Pr. G.-D-P-1-2-11-3-269
Putiatin, Pr. I.-D-E-1-19-36.5-10-414
Putiatin, Pr. I.-D-P-3-7-17.5-5-249
Putiatin, Pr. I.-D-P-1-7-12.5-3-219
Putilov, N.-P-O-2-4-17-4-397.5
Putilov, N.-P-O-1-28-123.5-27.5-IPD
Saburov, B.-BF-N-3-17-56-18-655.3
Saburov, I.-BF-PE-2-1-5-1-96
Saburov, P.-BF-OE-4-20-82.5-21.5-1641.16
Saburov, P.-BF-P-4-14-44.5-15-948
Saburov, P.-BF-P-4-2-7-1.5-99
Savin, V.-D-OE-2-14-53.5-12.25-IPD
Sekirin, O.-D-E-2-8-34-8-688.5
Sekirin, O.-D-N-2-31-45-10-594.95
Shepiakov (Sheviakov), B.⁸-D-E-2-12-33.5-8-171.2
Sheviakov (Shepiakov), B.-D-O-2-9-76.5-9-757.5
Sheviakov, P.-D-N-2-40-44.5-10.5-618.26
Skobeltsyn, Iu.-D-N-2-7-41-10-335.5
Skrypinin, A.D.-D-P-4-3-8.5-2-65.25
Skrypinin, A.D.⁹-D-P-3-62-93.5-24-1132.7
Solovtsov, F.-BF-O-3-6-19-5-82.2
Solovtsov, I.G.-BF-N-1-6-27-7-151.15
Solovtsov, I.S.-BF-O-3-21-68.5-17.5-904
Solovtsov, I.S.-BF-P-3-2-20-8-212.25
Solovtsov, L.-BF-NE-1-17-53.5-15-623.5
Suponev, B.-D-NE-3-1-7-2-56.5
Suponev, D.-D-P-2-15-42-10.5-625.6
Suponev, D.-D-P-2-28-16-5-159.55
Terkov, U.-P-O-2-2-9-2-IPD
Terkov, U.-P-O-1-10-36.25-9-IPD
Terkov, V. Shestiakov-P-O-2-2-9-2-70

Terkov, V. Shestiakov-P-O-2-5-21-8.5-448.46
 Uvarov, A.-D-N-1-6-20-6.5-113.88
 Uvarov, M.-D-N-1-8-13.5-9-270.25
 Uvarov, S.-D-O-3-22-86-23.7-1463.38
 Volynsky, N.-BF-O-1-4-25.05-5.5-562.59
 Vorobin, E.-D-O-5-12-56-14-1121.4
 Vorobin, E.-D-P-5-20-63-25-540.5
 Voronin, I.E.-D-O-3-32-166.5-46-2126
 Vysheslavitsev, M.-D-N-2-6-30-7-482
 Vysheslavitsev, V.-D-N-2-22-97-27-857
 Zabelin, K.-D-P-1-3-7.5-2-113
 Zagoskin, A.-D-N-2-7-18-6-295.2
 Zybin, M.-D-E-1-14-52-14-449

Parcels belonging to estates with lost returns: 107
 Original parcels: 74 (69%)
 Old-37 (50%)
 New-37 (50%)
 Later additions (*pridachi*): 26 (24.3%)
 Entire parcels obtained by exchange: 5 (4.7%)
 Parcels in litigation: 1 (1%)
 Unclassifiable parcels: 1 (1%)

All Parcels: 270
 Original parcels: 200 (74.3%)
 Old parcels-139 (69.5%)
 Complete old returns-138
 Incomplete old returns-1
 New parcels-61 (30.5%)
 Later additions (*pridachi*): 56 (20.7%)
 Parcels in litigation: 2 (0.7%)
 Entire parcels obtained by exchange: 9 (3.3%)
 Unclassifiable parcels: 3 (1%)

Key:

Social Origins:

BF = Boyar family (1)

SB = syn boiarskii (2)

D = dvoriane (2)

P = posluzhiltsy (3)

Parcels:

E = exchange

L = in litigation

P = pridacha

*Income includes sigi

NOTES

1. The parcels belonging to the estates with complete returns for all of the landlord's holdings were reconstructed from the references in the cadaster to parcels in other parishes. Other parcels could not be reconstructed because of their location in parishes without surviving returns.

2. The incomes represent the peasant's dues (quitrent, *obrok*) payable in money and the monetary value of the payments in kind received by the landlord. The latter include the percentage of the harvest (*izdol'e*) and bushels of grain (*posp*) as well as eggs, cheeses, rams, sheepskins and other small items (*melkii dokhod*) payable around St. George's Day (November 26). Twelve reconstructed pomesties and seven parcels belonging to estates with lost returns were excluded from the equations using income as an independent variable because of the absence of prices for hares, grouse, wool, sides of beef, and cartloads of firewood considered *melkii dokhod*. *IPD* was used to designate incomplete price data.

3. Incomes marked with an asterisk (*) included salmon trout (*sigi*). The conversion of the *sigi* into early sixteenth century Novgorodian prices was based on the price per *bochka* (40 vedras or 131.5 gallons) given in A.L. Shapiro, *Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii: Vtoraia polovina XV – nachalo XVI v.* (1971), 33. Since a gallon of water weighs 8.34 pounds, the *bochka* held 1097 pounds of water. The *Sovetskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, edited by A.M. Prokhorov (1984), 1199, gives the average size of a sigi at eight kilograms or 17.64 pounds. This suggests that the *bochka* of sigi that sold for 42 dengas held 62 fish.

4. The last parcel listed above is recorded in the St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish returns (*PKVP*, 229) under "Ivan Ivanov syn Bastanov" while the three tax units in the Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk parish (*PKVP*, 199-200), one tax unit in St. Ilia's at Keltushi parish (*PKVP*, 234) and seven tax units in Our Savior's of Gorodnia parish (180-181) refer to "Ivan Vlasov syn Bastanov." The references in Ivan Vlasov syn's parish returns to an additional tax unit in St Ivan's at Kuivasha parish and the absence of any references in the latter to an Ivan Bastanov except Ivan "Ivanov syn" suggest that the two Ivan Bastanov's were really the same pomeshchik.

5. The first three parcels in St Andrew's at Gruzinsk (*PKVP*, 89-91), St Anthony's (*PKVP*, 102-105), and Kolomna on-the-Volkhov (*PKVP*, 94-96) respectively were jointly held by "Vlas Timofeev syn, Ivan Semenov syn, and Ivan Dmitriev syn Motiakin, the Nashchokins." The last two in St. Nicholas of Pidebsk (*PKVP*, 7) and St Egor's at Luzhsk (*PKVP*, 20) were held by Ivan Dmitriev syn Motiakin Nashchokin alone. Since Ivan Dmitriev syn lived with Vlas Timofeev syn (the first listed and therefore senior pomeshchik and family head) at Korolevichi in St Anthony's parish, the five Nashchokin parcels were probably administered as one estate.

6. Vasily Danilov syn Bukov Neledinsky's entire income came from the demesne because all but one of the 10.5 tax units held in St. Igor's of Terebuzh parish was abandoned and the entire parcel given a five year tax exemption. The two bushels of rye sown on the one tax unit still under cultivation generated an income of 80 dengas per year; see *PKVP*, 144–145. His four tax units in Gorodnia parish, which were part of the demesne, provided an additional 600 dengas; see *ibid*, 116.

7. The similarity in name between “Nekliud Chiupriakov” of St. Ilia's on the Tigoda parish (*PKVP*, 57-58) and “Nekliud Petrov syn Chupriakov” of St. Peter's-on-the-Volkhov parish (*PKVP*, 105–107) raises the possibility that the two pomeshchiks were really the same person. The location of both parcels on the former pomestie of “the two Ivan Durovs” is additional evidence. The failure of both sets of returns to refer to other parcels, however, prevents the theory from being conclusively proven.

8. The family name is spelled Shepiakov in this entry for the St. Egor's at Lopsk parcel obtained by Boris and Stephan, the sons of Kostiantin Shepiakov, by an exchange with Daniel and Ivan Suponev; see *PKVP*, 257–258. Although the cadaster refers to additional land in St. Ilia's on the Tigoda, latter fails to mention Boris and Stepan Shepiakov. The reference to a “Boris and Stepan, the sons of Kostiantin Sheviakov” (who held eight tax units earlier belonging to Mikhailo Shepiakov) suggests, however, that Boris and Stepan Shepiakov of St. Igor's and Boris and Stepan Sheviakov of St. Ilia's were really the same brothers. See *PKVP*, 31-32. For this reason both parcels belong to their dacha.

9. The records for St. Andrew's at Gruzinsk parish cited here (*PKVP*, 93–94) refer to Afanasy, Michael, and Ivan Menshoi, the sons of Denis Skrypitsyn as the holder of a twenty-four tax unit pridacha. The returns for the two tax units held by Afanasy, Michael, and Ivan Menshoi, the sons of Denis Skrypinin, in the St. Peter's-on-the-Volkhov parish (*PKVP*, 107-108) refer to additional land in St. Andrews. Since there are no Skrypinins in the complete St. Andrew's cadaster, the Afanasy, Michael and Ivan Menshoi Skrupitsyn mentioned there were probably the same brothers referred to in the St. Peter's cadaster.

Appendix G

**The Shelonskaia Pomeshchiks
of 1552–53**

Family Head-Parish-Type-Source

- Bachin, Semen Ivanov-SMOL-Uncl.-IV, 564–65
Bachin, Svoitin Shchavov-SMOL-Old-IV, 565
Bulgakov, Ragoza-STR-New-IV, 561
Buturlin, Daniel Ivanov syn Poleukhtov-ZHE-Old-IV, 570–71
Buzheninov, Ignaty Leontiev-SVI-Old-IV, 556–56
Chikhachev, Ivashko Semenov-RET-Old-IV, 536
Dubrovsky, Veshniak-SVI-Old-IV, 553–54
Evreev, Vasily-SKN-Old-IV, 539–41
Ezhov, Vasily Borisov-STR-New-IV, 560–61
Gridiukin, Vasily Ivanov-ZHE-Old-IV, 576
Gridiukin, Semen Fedorov-ZHE-Old-IV, 572
Yakov-OBL-Old-IV, 529
Kalitin, Vasily-SMOL-New-IV, 566
Karkmazova, Ofimia (Gregory)-OBL-Prozhitok-IV, 529–30
Kartmazov, Yury Semenov-ZHE-New-IV, 582
Kriukov, Afanasy-MUS-Old-IV, 549–50
Kropotov, Matvei Ivanov-SKN-Old-IV, 541
Kropotov, Fedor Ivanov-SKN-Old-IV, 542–43
Kropotov, Mitka Petrov-SKN-Old-IV, 543–44
Kropotova, Agrafena (Gavril)-SKN-Prozhitok-IV, 543–44
Kuleshin, Ivan Vasiliev-ZHE-Old-IV, 576
Lazorev, Gregory Menshikov-ZHE-Old-IV, 577–78
Levshin, Gridia Afanasiev-ZHE-Old-IV, 579
Levshin, Timothy Ivanov-ZHE-Old-IV, 580
Levshin, Stepan-ZHE-Old-IV, 581
Levshin, Nenarok Vasiliev-ZHE-Old-IV, 575

Levshin-Brukhatyi, Daniel Ivanov-ZHE-Uncl.-IV, 575
Likharev, Kuzma Astafiev-SVI-Old-IV, 553
Miachkov, Fedor Vasiliev-SKN-Old-IV, 573
Miachkov, Ivan Stepanov-ZHE-Old-IV, 572
Mikhailov, Ivan Kostin-ZHE-Old-IV, 584
Molchaninov, Ivan Matveev-SKN-Old-IV, 541–42
Nazimov, Semen Vasiukov-VYS-Old-IV, 532–33
Pervoi, Yakov Savin-RET-Old-IV, 537
Povarov, Stepan Pasynkov-STR-Old-IV, 563
Rostovsky, Prince Ivan Dmitrievich-STR-Old-IV, 559
Rumiantsov, Zhikhor Vasiliev-STR-Old-IV, 561
Rumiantsov, Tikhon Vasiliev-STR-Old-IV, 561
Rumiantsov, Mikifor Vasiliev-STR-Old-IV, 561
Rzhanikov, Bogdan Tretiakov-STR-New-IV, 559–60
Shchekin, Fedor the Sytnik-SKN-New-IV, 544–45
Shchulepnikov, Danielko Ivanov-VYS-Old-IV, 533–34
Shishmarev, Daniel Chubarov-SVI-Old-IV, 556–58
Shmardin, Ignaty Vasiliev-SMOL-Escheated-IV, 570
Tatarinov, Istoma Yakovlev-SMOL-Old-IV, 567–68
Terpigorev, Mikita Andreev-ZHE-Old-IV, 579
Tulupov, Prince Andrew Vasilievich-VYS-Old-IV, 531–32
Turgenev, Ivan Petrov-ZHE-Old-IV, 573–74
Tyrtov, Gerasim Grigoriev-ZHE-Old-IV, 578–79
Vdovin, Kurbat Grigoriev-ZHE-Old-IV, 582
Vdovina, Fedosia (Gregory)-ZHE-Prozhitok-IV, 582
Zasekin, Prince Michael Konstantinov-SMOL-New-IV, 568–70

Appendix H

Shelonskaia Manorial Parcels, 1571

Most Recent Lord-Parish-Former Lord Reference-1500 Parish Representative-Source

Afrosinin, Fedor Yuriev-SHCH-none-Afrosinin:Semen,Andrew and Filia-*NPK*, V, 471

Bartenev, Daniel Mikulin (State Secretary)-LIAD-none-none-*NPK*, V, 529

Blagoi, Posniak Vasiliev-BEL-Blagoi, Vasily Danilov-same-*NPK*, V, 32–34

Bobrov, Stepan Zaleshanin-SHCH-Bobrov, Zaleshan-none-*NPK*, V, 456–57

Boltin, Boris Grigoriev-SHCH-Boltin,Grigory-none-*NPK*, V, 451–52

Buturlin, Bogdan Ivanov-SHCH-none-Buturlin, Ivan Grigoriev-*NPK*, V, 446

Buturlin, Ignaty Vasiliev-SHCH-Buturlin, Vasily-Buturlin, Ivan Grigoriev-*NPK*, V, 459

Buturlin, Nechai Ivanov-SHCH-none-Buturlin, Ivan Grigoriev-*NPK*, V, 445–48

Buturlin, Nikita Timofeev-SHCH-none-Buturlin, Ivan Grigoriev-*NPK*, V, 442–44

Eremeev, Afanasy Andreev-LOS-Eremeev, Andrew-Eremeev, Boris & Ivan-*NPK*, V, 501

Eremeev, Vasily Ivanov-LIAD-Moshkov, Diatl (State Secretary)-none-*NPK*, V, 550

Glotov, Kurbat Vasiliev-DREM-none-Glotov: Andrew Ivanov & Luka-*NPK*, V, 493

Glotov, Vasily Andreev-DREM-none- Glotov: Andrew Ivanov & Luka-*NPK*, 494

Glotov, Kurbat Vasiliev-DREM-none-Glotov: Andrew Ivanov & Luka-*NPK*, 490

Golovin, Bogdan Tretiakov-LIAD-Golovin, Tretiak-none-*NPK*, V, 559

Igolkin, Ostalets-SHCH-Shusherin, Ivan-none-*NPK*, V, 459

- Kharlamov, Andrew Ivanov-LIAD-none-Kharlamov: Palka & Ivan Yushkov-*NPK*, V, 559
- Kharlamov, Filip Andreev-LIAD-none-Kharlamov: Palka & Ivan Yushkov-*NPK*, V, 552
- Kvashnin, Vasily Semenov-SHCH-none-none-*NPK*, V, 451
- Kvashnin, Voin Grigoriev-BEL-none-none-*NPK*, V, 534
- Kvashnin, Ivan-BEL-none-none-*NPK*, V, 534
- Likharev, Boris Stepanov-SAB-none-none-*NPK*, V, 512
- Likharev, Fedor Stepanov-SAB-none-none-*NPK*, V, 514
- Loshakov, Alexis Nikitin-SHCH-Blagoi, Stepan-none-*NPK*, V, 466
- Loshakov, Bogdan-LOS-none-none-*NPK*, V, 496
- Loshakov, Stepan Nikitin-SHCH-none-none-*NPK*, V, 468
- Lugvenev, Andrew Semenov-BYS-none-Lugvenev, Ivan-*NPK*, V, 483
- Lugvenev, Volodimer Ivanov-BYS-none-Lugvenev, Ivan-*NPK*, V, 478
- Narymov, Prince Ivan Mikhailov-LOS-none-none-*NPK*, V, 503
- Ovtsyn, Zhdan Ostafiev-LIAD-none-none-*NPK*, V, 558–59
- Palekhov, Tretiak Aleksandrov-LIAD-none-Palekhov, Gridia-*NPK*, V, 560
- Parsky, Ivan Vesniakov-BEL-none-none-*NPK*, V, 537
- Peshkov, Daniel Gavrilov-BEL-none-none-*NPK*, V, 531
- Pisarev, Ivan Ivanov-BEL-none-none-*NPK*, V, 520
- Pustoshkin, Fedor Vasiliev-SHCH-none-Pustoshkin: Semen, Andrew, Filia-*NPK*, V, 461
- Pustoshkin, Gregory Ivanov-SHCH-none-Pustoshkin: Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 460
- Pustoshkin, Guria Pirovym-SHCH-Pustoshkin, Pirei-Pustoshkin, Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 453
- Pustoshkin, Ivan Andreev-SHCH-Pustoshkin, Andrew-Pustoshkin, Semen et al, *NPK*, V, 458
- Pustoshkin, Levantei Chekhlov-SHCH-none-Pustoshkin, Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 457
- Pustoshkin, Nechai Yakovlev-SHCH-none-Pustoshkin, Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 455
- Pustoshkin, Oksen Fedorov-SHCH-none-Pustoshkin, Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 465
- Pustoshkin, Sotnik Semenov-LOS-none-none-*NPK*, V, 506
- Pustoshkin, Timothy Fedorov-SHCH-Pustoshkin, Fedor-Pustoshkin, Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 465
- Pustoshkin, Zloba Fedorov-SHCH-Pustoshkin, Fedor-Pustoshkin, Semen et al-*NPK*, V, 448
- Ragozin, Osip Meshcherinov-BEL-none-Ragozin: Fedets, Denis-*NPK*, V, 526

- Shusherin, Daniel Fedorov-SHCH-none-none-*NPK*, V, 453
 Shusherin, Vasily Rychkov-SHCH-Shusherin, Rych-none-*NPK*, V, 452
 Simansky, Nikita Danilov-BYS-none-Simansky: Palka, Semen & Michael Vasiliev-*NPK*, V, 475
 Simansky, Braga Ogarkov-BYS-none-Simansky, Palka et al-*NPK*, V, 479
 Simansky, Dementy Kashin-BYS-none-Simansky, Palka et al-*NPK*, V, 482
 Toporkov, Andrew Danilov-SHCH-Toporkov, Daniel-none-*NPK*, V, 462
 Trofimov, Ivanets Selianinov-LIAD-Trofimov, Selianin-Trofimov, Filia Borisov-*NPK*, V, 561
 Tushyn, Ivan Vasiliev-LIAD-Tushyn, Vasily-Tushyn, Ivan Mikhailov-*NPK*, V, 556
 Tushyn, Andrew Vasiliev-LIAD-none-Tushyn, Ivan Mikhailov-*NPK*, V, 557
 Tushyn, Peter Andreev-LIAD-none-Tushyn, Ivan Mikhailov-*NPK*, V, 555
 Tyrtov, Elizar Fedorov-LIAD-Tyrtov, Fedor-Tyrtov, Semen-*NPK*, V, 554
 Tyrtov, Mir Gamov-BYS-none-none-*NPK*, V, 485
 Ushatoi, Prince Nikita Ivanov-SAB-none-none-*NPK*, V, 516
 Volokhov, Zakhary Ivanov-LOS-none-none-*NPK*, V, 499
 Vorobin, Alexander Dementiev-BYS-Vorobin, Dementy-Vorobin, Neporiadnia-*NPK*, V, 487
 Voronin, Mardan Turgenev-LOS-none-Voronin, Semen Aleksandrov-*NPK*, V, 504
 Vysheslavtsov, Vasily Zaleshaninov-LOS-Vsheslavtsov, Zaleshan-none-*NPK*, V, 502
Old Manors-42-67.7%
 Definitely Old-19-45.24%
 (Former, 1500-12-28.57%)
 (Former only-7-16.67%)
 Possibly Old (1500 only)-23-54.76%
New Manors-20-32.3%
 Definitely New (former lord from a different family)-3-15%
 Possibly new (no references to a 1500 representative)-17-85%
Note: “Former” refers to an earlier landlord cited in the 1571 cadaster. “1500” refers to the presence of representatives from the same family as the pomeshchiks of 1571 in the same parish in 1500.

Appendix I

The Shelonskaia Pomesties of 1576

I. Manorial Parcels

Most Recent Pomeshchik-Classification-Parish-Source (*NPK*, V)

Azariev, Ushatoi-PRN-KAR-V, 593

Beloselsky, Prince Posnik Volodimerov-OLD-BELI-V, 630

Belsky, Afanasy Vasilievich-PRN-SMOL-V, 55

Belsky, Bogdan Yakovlev-PRN-MIKI-V, 660

Bibikov, Buslav Fedorov-NEW-MIKI-V, 664

Blazhonkov, Istoma Petrov-PRN-OKP-V, 579

Bobrov, Zaleshanin-PN-KAR-V, 585

Buturlin, Loba-OLD-BOL-V, 607

Choglokov, Istoma-OLD-KAR-V, 600

Egupov, Prince Ivan-NEW-BOL-V, 601

Egupov Cherkasky, Prince Ivan-PRN-BELI-V, 634

Esiukov, Semen Yuriev-OLD-DUBR-V, 670

Evreev, Mosei-PSO-BOL-V, 605

Evreev, Ivan-OLD-KAR-V, 594

Evreev, Ivan-NEW-OKP-V, 576

Kalitin, Alexis-OLD-SMOL-V, 658

Kalitin, Oliabia Osipov-OLD-SMOL-V, 657

Karasov, Boris Ivanov-PRN-DUBR-V, 678

Karaulov, Sumorok-PSO-KAR-V, 590

Karaulov, Druzhin-PSO-KAR-V, 585

Kharlamov, Fedor Levontiev-OLD-DUBR-V, 667

Kharlamov, Vlas-PSO-DUBR-V, 678

Kharlamov, Semen Rusinov-OLD-DUBR-V, 669

Kharlamov, Nikifor Levontiev-OLD-DUBR-V, 668

Khlopov, Ivan-PN-BELI-V, 621

Kniazhnin, Fedor Semenov-PRN-DUBR-V, 674
 Kositsky, Pauk Ivanov-OLD-OPOT-V, 685
 Kositsky, Ilia Borisov-PSO-DUBR-V, 671
 Kositsky, Zhdan-PN-BELI-V, 627
 Lazorev, Porosha-OLD-OKP-V, 582
 Miakoi, Nikifor-PRN-OKP-V, 580
 Nashchokin, Ivan Semenov-PSO-DUBR-V, 676
 Ogarev, Gregory Ivanov-OLD-DEG-V, 638
 Ogarev, Ivan Borisov-OLD-DEG-V, 641
 Ogareva, Matrena (Ivan)-PROZ-DEG-V, 639
 Onikeev, Andrew-PRN-BELI-V, 632
 Palitsyn, Bogdan-NEW-OKP-V, 573
 Palitsyn, Vasily-OLD-DEG-V, 645
 Pianteleev, Alexander-NEW-OKP-V, 580
 Pleshcheev, Vasily-PN-BOL-V, 611
 Pleshcheev, Ivan Ratmanov-OLD-BELI-V, 633
 Pleshcheev, Semeika-OLD-MIKI-V, 662
 Pustoshkin, Semen the Steward-PN-PAZ-V, 619
 Selivanov, Ivan-OLD-BELI-V, 623
 Seslavin, Ivan Grigoriev-OLD-DEG-V, 644
 Shablykin, Mikita Vasiliev-OLD-BELI-V, 625
 Shablykin, Zhdan-OLD-BELI-V, 630
 Shchogolev, Stepan Istomin-PSO-DUBR-V, 669
 Shishkin, Nikita Andreev-OLD-OKP-V, 575
 Shishkin, Maksim-PN-OKP-V, 573
 Simansky, Fedor-PN-DUBR-V, 675
 Tatarinov, Gregory-OLD-SMOL-V, 653
 Terpigorev, Vasily the Steward-PRN-PAZ-V, 618
 Tyrtov, Yury-OLD-DEG-V, 646
 Unkovsky, Maksim-PSO-KAR-V, 592
 Uskoi, Semen Ivanov-OLD-DEG-V, 643
 Uskoi, Zloba Ivanov-OLD-DEG-V, 642
 Zasekin, Prince Vasily Dmitreev-OLD-OKP-V, 575
 Ziuzin, Vasily Grigoriev-PRN-SMOL-V, 650
 Zverev, Fedor-PN-KAR-V, 596

II. Nonmanorial Parcels

Most Recent Pomeschchik-Classification-Parish-Source (*NPK*, V)
Returns from 1576, 1552 and 1500
 Asaev, Vasily-NEW-SMOL-V, 654
 Bachin, Svoiten-OLD-SMOL-V, 655

Iaryshkin, Boris-PN-SMOL-V, 659
Kalitin, Peter-OLD-SMOL-V, 659
Kulikov, Timothy-PN-SMOL-V, 655
Shishkin, Vasily-PN-SMOL-V, 659
Zasekin, Prince Ivan-OLD-SMOL-V, 660
Zasekin, Prince Andrew-OLD-SMOL-V, 659
Returns from 1576, 1539, and 1500
Bobrov, Zhdan-PN-OKP-V, 572
Boltin, Demid-PRN-ROZH-V, 637
Chebotaev, Michael-OLD-OKP-V, 574
Choglokov, Istoma-OLD-OKP-V, 578
Dubrovsky, Khotia-PSO-BOL-V, 600
Dubrovsky, Khotia-PN-BELI-V, 632
Esiukov, Peter-OLD-OKP-V, 572
Evreev, Mosei-PN-BELI-V, 624
Golovin, Cheglok-PRN-ROZH-V, 637
Golovin, Cheglok-PRN-DEG-V, 647
Ignatiev, Andrew-PN-DEG-V, 37
Karpov, Ivan-OLD-PAZ-V, 613
Kartmazov, Semen-OLD-PAZ-V, 617
Kharlamov, Vlas-PN-BELI-V, 630
Kolychev, Venedikt-PN-BELI-V, 626
Korobin, Posnik-PRN-PAZ-V, 618
Korobin, Posnik-PRN-ROZH-V, 637
Korobin, Zhdan-PRN-DEG-V, 647
Kositsky, Peter-NEW-BELI-V, 628
Kositsky, Ilia Borisov-NEW-BELI-V, 629
Kositsky, Ilkin Mikhailov-PN-PAZ-V, 617
Kositsky, Michael-PN-BOL-V, 600
Kostin, Michael-PO-DEG-V, 647
Kostin, Semen-PO-DEG-V, 647
Kvashnin, Likhach-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Kvashnin, Gregory-PO-DEG-V, 647
Kvashnin, Gregory-OLD-BELI-V, 626
Lazorev, Alabysh-OLD-OKP-V, 573
Lazorev, Gregory-OLD-PAZ-V, 617
Lazorev, Gregory Avramov-OLD-OKP-V, 581
Lazorev, Zamiatnia Saltanov-OLD-OKP-V, 581
Lazorev, Zamiatnia-OLD-PAZ-V, 617
Levshin, Ostafi-PN-DEG-V, 647
Levshin, Nenarok-NEW-PAZ-V, 615

Levshin, Ignaty-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Levshin, Ivan-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Miakoi, Nikifor-PRN-OKP-V, 578
Molchaninov, Afanasy-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Moseev, Yakov-PO-DEG-V, 647
Moseev, Mikula-PO-DEG-V, 647
Moseev, Michael-PO-DEG-V, 647
Moseev, Peter-PO-DEG-V, 647
Moseev, Michael-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Nazimov, Vasily Bolshoi-OLD-PAZ-V, 616
Ogarev, Gregory-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Ogarev, Paul-PO-DEG-V, 647
Ogarev, Yakov-PO-DEG-V, 647
Ogarev, Michael-PO-DEG-V, 649
Ogarev, Michael-PO-DEG-V, 647
Ogarev, Ivan Bolshoi-OLD-DEG-V, 639
Ogarev, Daniel Borisov-OLD-DEG-V, 640
Ogarev, Vasily-OLD-DEG-V, 639
Palitsyn, Yakov-OLD-DEG-V, 646
Palitsyn, Peter-PN-ROZH-V, 637
Palitsyn, Michael-PO-DEG-V, 647
Pleshcheev, Barkhat-PO-MIKI-V, 662
Pleshcheev, Stepan-NEW-BELI-V, 626
Pleshcheev, Vasily-PN-BOL-V, 600
Pustoshkin, Ievlia-OLD-PAZ-V, 613
Pustoshkin, Ivan-OLD-PAZ-V, 613
Pustoshkin, Subbota-OLD-PAZ-V, 613
Pustoshkin, Filip Avramov-NEW-PAZ-V, 616
Pustoshkin, Semen-PN-DEG-V, 647
Rezantsova, Maria (Fedor)-PROZ-PAZ-V, 618
Rostovsky, Prince Ivan-PRN-DEG-V, 647
Selivanov, Andrew-OLD-BELI-V, 626
Sertiakin, Varvara (Vasily)-PROZ-ROZH-V, 637
Shablykin, Shestak-OLD-PAZ-V, 617
Shablykin, Yakov-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Shablykin, Piatoi-OLD-PAZ-V, 617
Shcherbinin, Porosha-PO-DEG-V, 647
Shcherbinin, Posnik-PO-DEG-V, 647
Shchogolev, Istoma Ivanov-NEW-OKP-V, 580
Shishkin, Vasily-OLD-OKP-V, 576
Simanskies-PN-ROZH-V, 637

- Snazin, Vasily-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Strechnev, Yury Alferiev-PRN-OKP-V, 578
Sverbeev, Ivan-PRN-BOL-V, 600
Sverbeev, Ivan-PRN-BELI-V, 626
Tatianin, Argun-OLD-PAZ-V, 616
Tatianin, Ivan-OLD-PAZ-V, 614
Tatianin, Dmitry-PSO-PAZ-V, 616
Terpigorev, Fedor-OLD-OKP-V, 580
Terpigorev, Kellar-PSO-OKP-V, 581
Terpigorev, Nikita-OLD-PAZ-V, 614
Terpigorev, Vasily Chetvertkin-OLD-PAZ-V, 615
Turgenev, Ivan-PSO-PAZ-V, 617
Turgenev, Vasily-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Tyrtov, Ivan-PO-DEG-V, 647
Tyrtov, Gregory-PO-PAZ-V, 617
Tyrtov, Fedor-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Umnoi, Vasily-PRN-OKP-V, 581
Unkovsky, Bogdan-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Uskoi, Rium-PO-DEG-V, 647
Valovoi, Nechai-PN-OKP-V, 580
Veliaminov, Vasily-PN-DEG-V, 647
Volnin, Semen-PN-PAZ-V, 618
Volovoi, Domash-PRN-BELI-V, 633
Zamutsky, Ivan-PN-OKP-V, 579
Zasekin, Prince Vasily-PO-ROZH-V, 637
Zasekin, Prince Andrew Mikhailov-PO-OKP-V, 577
Returns from 1576 and 1500
Bachin, Svoitin-PN-OPOT-V, 689
Bekhteev, Mikita-PRN-OPOT-V, 691
Belsky, Afanasy Vasilievich-PRN-OPOT-V, 681
Blazhonkov, Istoma-PRN-DUBR-V, 675
Bobrov, Vzhdan-PN-KAR-V, 599
Bobrov, Zhdan-PN-OPOT-V, 690
Choglokov, Yakov-OLD-KAR-V, 592
Choglokov, Yakov-PSO-KAR-V, 583
Choglokov, Istoma-PSO-KAR-V, 587
Egnutiev, Michael-PN-DUBR-V, 670
Egupov, Prince Ivan-PRN-KAR-V, 596
Esiukov, Ivan-OLD-DUBR-V, 672
Evreev, Moisei-PSO-KAR-V, 596
Evreev, Denis-OLD-KAR-V, 598

Golovacheva, Agraphena (Levontei)-PROZ-OPOT-V, 693
Golovachov, Voin-PRN-OPOT-V, 692
Golovachov, Gregory-PRN-DUBR-V, 674
Golovachov, Filip Alferiev-PRN-DUBR-V, 673
Golovachov, Voin-PRN-DUBR-V, 674
Gribakin, Shiria-PRN-KAR-V, 598
Iusiukov, Boris-OLD-MIKU-V, 665
Karaulov, Gregory Cheremisinov-PSO-KAR-V, 583
Karaulov, Gregory-PSO-KAR-V, 597
Karaulov, Sumorok-PSO-KAR-V, 583
Karaulov, Druzhin-PSO-KAR-V, 587
Karaulov, Druzhin-PSO-KAR-V, 582
Karpov, Luka-PN-OPOT-V, 691
Karpov, Ezdak-PN-OPOT-V, 687
Kartmazov, Timothy-OLD-KAR-V, 600
Kharlamov, Roman-OLD-DUBR-V, 675
Kharlamov, Mikifor-OLD-OPOT-V, 691
Kharlamov, Semen-PSO-OPOT-V, 691
Kharlamov, Roman-PSO-MIKU-V, 665
Kniazhin, Nekliud-PRN-KAR-V, 586
Kositsky, Liapun-OLD-OPOT-V, 687
Kositsky, Pauk-PSO-DUBR-V, 677
Kostrov, Prince Yury-NEW-MIKU-V, 664
Kostrov, Prince Yury-PRN-DUBR-V, 677
Krenev, Mikifor Cheremisinov-PRN-DUBR-V, 670
Lazorev, Zamiatnia-PN-OPOT-V, 691
Lazorev, Gregory-PSO-DUBR-V, 677
Lazorev, Porosha-OLD-DUBR-V, 677
Lodygin, Nikita-PRN-OPOT-V, 693
Miachkov, Fedor-PN-DUBR-V, 673
Nashchokin, Ivan Andreev Vetrennoi-PSO-DUBR-V, 675
Nashchokin, Paul Istomin-PSO-DUBR-V, 677
Nashchokin, Paul-PN-OPOT-V, 690
Nashchokin, Semen Myslakov-PN-OPOT-V, 689
Novokshchenov, Ivan Nikitin-PRN-DUBR-V, 673
Novokshchenov, Nikita-PRN-OPOT-V, 693
Panteleev, Negodai-PRN-KAR-V, 596
Pushkin, Dmitry-OLD-OPOT-V, 689
Pushkin, Mikita Tretiakov-OLD-OPOT-V, 692
Pustoshkin, Semen-OLD-KAR-V, 590
Ragozin, Meshcheria-PN-DUBR-V, 675

Shishkin, Vasily Mikitin-OLD-DUBR-V, 672
Shishmarev, Istoma-PO-OPOT-V, 692
Shusherin, Dmitry-PRN-KAR-V, 590
Snazin, Yakov Mikhailov-PN-OPOT-V, 688
Snazin, Vasily Mikhailov-PN-OPOT-V, 691
Strechnev, Alfery-PRN-KAR-V, 587
Sushilnikov, Vasily Borisov-PRN-DUBR-V, 669
Tsypletev, Gregory-PRN-KAR-V, 584
Tsypletev, Gregory-PRN-KAR-V, 592
Ukriattskaia, Marina (Timothy)-PROZ-KAR-V, 599
Unkovsky, Maksim Aleksandrov-PSO-KAR-V, 683
Vypovsky, Andrew-PRN-OPOT-V, 686

Classification Key:

New

Probably New (PRN)

Possibly New (PN)

Old

Probably Old (PO)

Possibly old (PSO)

Prozhitok (Proz)

Appendix J

Glossary of Russian Terms

altyn. A monetary unit in use after the fourteenth century equal to six dengas or three kopecks. From the Tatar word for six (*alty*).

arenda. A contract to lease immovable property in Imperial Russia. Although not in use before the nineteenth century, S.V. Rozhdestvensky applied the term to leaseholding in appanage Russia, for which he was criticized by V.I. Sergeevich and other juridical historians.

barshchina. Labor dues or corvee on the landlord's manor, usually for two or three days a week.

bochka. A barrel. A liquid measure equal to 40 vedros, 121 gallons or 492 liters.

bolshoi dvor. Literally, "the great homestead" or "great court." The term was used in the Novgorod cadasters to designate the manor that served as the landlord's residence and the administrative center of his lands.

chetvert. Literally, a "quarter." 1. A land measure equal to one half a desiatin or 1.35 acres. 2. A measure of grain equal to a quarter bochka or kad, half of a korobia, eight bushels, 3.5 puds or 126.39 pounds (one pud equals thirty-six American or forty Russian pounds).

chetverik. A grain measure equal to a fourth of a chetvertka, an eighth of a chetvert, a sixteenth of a korobia, or 15.8 pounds.

chetvertka. A grain measure equal to a fourth of a korobia, half a chetvert, 1.75 puds, or 63.19 pounds.

chislennik. A census-taker. The term, which comes from *chislo* ("number"), was first used for the Tatar officials who conducted the censuses of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries to determine taxable property and the number of available recruits.

diak. State secretary. Assisted boyars in running the great departments of state and headed less important departments (*prikazy*).

- dacha. The part of the pomeshchik's claim (*oklad*) actually received.
- dan. A direct tax regularly paid to the Muscovite government derived from the tribute originally paid to the Varangians and later to the Tatars.
- dannaia gramota. A grant charter, usually for land.
- denga. Money. A silver coin representing half a kopeck. 100 Novgorod and 200 Moscow dengas made up a sixteenth century ruble.
- derevnia. In modern Russian, a village. In Muscovite Russia, a hamlet or small rural settlement.
- desiatina. A measure of land equal to two chetverts or 2.7 acres.
- dvor. A farmstead, homestead, court or yard. Used in the sixteenth century cadasters for a peasants' homestead.
- dvorets. 1. Palace. 2. The grand prince's office in charge of the administration of the court and crown lands. Headed by a majordomo (*dvoretskii*) who was usually a boyar in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
- dvorianin. Courtier. The term (pl., *dvoriane*) was used in medieval Novgorod to refer to the agents of the prince. From the late fifteenth to seventeenth centuries the term referred to the higher ranking members of the Muscovite middle service class gentry, who usually were supported by the pomestie and required to perform cavalry service.
- grivna. A monetary unit considered equal to twenty Moscow or ten Novgorod dengas between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the cadasters from early sixteenth century Novgorod the grivna equaled 12.5 Novgorod dengas.
- izdolie. A percentage (usually a fourth or a third) of the crop (rye, wheat, barley or oats) paid by the peasants to their landlord as quitrent (*obrok*).
- kliuchnik. The steward of an ecclesiastical or secular lord's property. The term is derived from "key" (*kliuch*) and literally meant "keeper of the keys."
- koniushii put. The office of the senior equerry or master of the horse.
- kopna. A bale of hay.
- kormlenie. Literally, "feeding." A system of maintenance used in Muscovy between the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries where the lords lieutenant of the towns (*namestniki*) or rural districts (*volosteli*) received a share of court fees and taxes and support from the local populace in lieu of a salary from the treasury.
- korobia. A basket. A measure of grain (rye) equal to seven puds, or 252 pounds. In sixteenth century Novgorod the korobia equaled two chetverts, four chetvertkas, and sixteen chetveriks.
- liudi. People. The term was used in Kiev and Novgorod to refer to the entire free population. In the cadasters the term referred to the personally free peasants who paid dues to the landlord.

- milostniki. A term used in the twelfth century Novgorod Chronicle and the Hypatian and Laurentian redactions of the Primary Chronicle for the palace servants of the prince, including the steward (*kliuchnik*).
- obrok. Quitrent. The dues paid in money or kind to the landlord by the peasants who occupied the estate, whether a votchina or pomestie.
- obzha. A property tax unit in Novgorod equal to ten chetverts in three fields or thirty chetverts in all, fifteen desiatins or a third of a sokha.
- oklad. The amount of land to which the pomeshchik was entitled according to the service norms, which was often less than the amount actually received, the dacha.
- okologorod. The surrounding area administered by a major town (Porkhov or Ivangorod, for example).
- osmina. 1. A measure of land equal to half of a chetvert or a fourth of a desiatin (0.675 acres). 2. A dry measure equal to a half a chetvert, $\frac{1}{4}$ of a chetverik or 105 liters (three bushels).
- piatina. Literally, "a fifth." The term was used as a synonym for province in Novgorod because each of the five provinces was administered by one of the city's five boroughs or "ends" (*kontsy*). The five provinces included Shelonskaia, Vodskaia, Obonezhskaia, Derevskaia, and Bezhetskaia.
- pisets. The state civil servant who compiled the cadasters with the assistance of a clerk (*poddiachie*).
- pistsovaia kniga. The cadastral records of the censuses conducted by the census-takers sent from Moscow between the late fifteenth century and 1630. The books contain the records of the crown lands, pomesties, and unassigned abandoned lands.
- pochinok. New settlements established by the pomeshchik's peasants in the forest. The hamlets were placed in a tax unit after they were self-supporting and capable of providing the landlord with additional income.
- poddiachii. A state civil servant ("undersecretary") who worked in a government bureau or provincial town. Several assisted the pistsy during the censuses.
- pogost. The term was used in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to designate the parish, a subdivision of the district (*uezd*) consisting of the parish seat and surrounding townships (*volosti*).
- pomestie. A military fief granted by the crown to a military servingman (pomeshchik) in return for military service. As long as the landholder and his male descendants served the crown, the pomestie was treated as an allod which descended to the pomeshchik's heirs after his death.
- pomestnyi prikaz. The Muscovite chancery in charge of service landholding. The office maintained the pomestie records, issued pomestie charters and decided litigation.

poselskii. The steward of a large estate belonging to a prince, boyar, or monastery; the manager of a rural district.

posluzhilets. A term used in the Novgorod cadaster of 1500 for the formerly unfree servants of the exiled Novgorod and disgraced Moscow boyars given pomesties in Vodenskaia province.

posp. A specific amount of grain (rye, wheat, barley, and oats) due and payable to the landlord as part of the peasant's obrok.

pridacha. Additions to the pomeshchik's dacha.

pripravochnaia perepis. A revisionary census such as the Shelonskaia census of 1552 conducted to assess the changes in landholding that had occurred after the census of 1539.

prisud. A judicial district. The term was used in Vodenskaia in place of *uezd*.

prozhitok. The part of a pomestie set aside for the maintenance of the landlord's widow and minor children. Sons retained the land upon reaching adulthood. There is no evidence of daughters retaining the land as their property until the second half of the sixteenth century.

pustoshi. Abandoned lands.

razriadnyi prikaz. The Muscovite Military Affairs Chancery that maintained service and appointment records.

ruble. An accounting unit in fifteenth and sixteenth century Muscovy equal to 108 Novgorod or 216 Moscow dengas.

seltso. In the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a settlement larger than a derevnia and smaller than a selo, a small village.

selo. A large settlement with a church; the administrative center of the parish.

shtof. Cup. A liquid measure equal to $\frac{1}{10}$ vedro or 1.3 quarts, 1.23 liters.

sokha. In northern Russia a tax unit used between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries equal to three obzhas (30 chetverts in one field, 90 in three, or 122 acres). Also called the "little sokha" (*malaia sokha*) or soshka to distinguish it from the "big sokha," which was used in the central regions and varied in size on the basis of the productivity of the land and taxpaying ability of the residents.

soshnoe pismo. The sokha register.

svoezemets (zemets). A petty landowner who only had enough land to subsist on and was not liable for military service.

syn boiarskii. Junior boyar. A member of the lesser gentry ("boyar sons," *deti boiarskie*) who, together with the dvoriane, formed the middle service class. The term's origins are unclear; it could have been used for sons of boyars who did not attain their father's rank because they were not appointed to the Boyar Council.

uezd. An administrative district around a major town (Porkhov, e.g.) divided into parishes.

Ulozhenie. A statute. The term was applied to the code of laws drafted by the Assembly of the Land and promulgated by Alexis I in 1649.

vedro. Pail. A liquid measure equal to 3.25 gallons, 12.3 liters, ten shtofs.

verst. A measure of distance equal to 1166 yards and two feet, 0.663 miles, or 1.0668 kilometers.

volost. A rural administrative district forming a subdivision of the parish (*pogost*) in the Novgorod land.

vopche. A term used in the Novgorod cadasters to designate a share of a village, hamlet or estate held in pomestie and treated as a separate administrative unit.

votchina. From votets for “father.” Patrimonial landed estates held in full ownership. They were not subject to military service until Ivan IV’s Service Decree of 1555/56.

vyt. A tax assessment of land ranging between sixty-five and eighty-one acres.

zemli chernye. Literally, “black lands.” The state lands of the far north.

zhalovanie. A grant, favor, mercy, reward, gift or donation.

zhalovannaia gramota. A document granting privileges, rights or immunities, or property. The term was synonymous with the pomestie charter in sixteenth century Muscovy.

Bibliography

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Collections of Documents

- Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi imperii Arkheograficheskoiu ekspeditseiu imp. Akademii nauk.* 4 vols. + index. St Petersburg, 1836, 1858.
- Akty feodal'nogo zemlevladieniia i khoziaistva XIV-XVI vekov.* 3 vols. Moscow: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1951–61.
- Akty iuridicheskie, ili Sobranie form starinnago deloproizvodstva,* izd. Arkheograficheskoi kommissii. 1 vol. + index. St. Petersburg, 1838, 1840.
- Akty, otnosiashchiesia k iuridicheskago bytu drevnei Rossii,* izdannyya Arkheograficheskoi kommissieiu. 3 vols. + index. St. Petersburg, 1857, 1864, 1884, 1901.
- Akty Moskovskago gosudarstva.* Ed. by N.A. Popov. 3 vols. St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Akademiia nauk, 1890–1901.
- Akty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Severo-Vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV-nachala XVI v.* 3 vols. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1952–64.
- Arkhivnyi material. Novootkrytye dokumenty i pomestno-votchinnyykh uchrezhdenii Moskovskago gosudarstva XV–XVII stoletii.* Edited by D. Ya. Samokvasov. 2 vols. Moscow, 1905, 1909.
- Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete. Sbornik.* Moscow, 1845–1918.
- Dopolneniia k aktam istoricheskim, sobrannyya i izdannyya Arkheograficheskoiu kommissieiu.* 12 vols. + index. St. Petersburg, 1846–75.
- Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV–XVI vv.* Edited by L.V. Cherepnin and S.V. Bakhrushin. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1950.

- Materialy po istorii SSSR, II. Dokumenty po istorii XV–XVII vv.* Edited by A. A. Novoselsky, L.V. Cherepnin, and L.N. Pushkarev. Moscow: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1955.
- Medieval Russian Laws.* Edited and translated by George Vernadsky. New York: Norton, 1947.
- Opisanie dokumentov i bumag khraniashchikhsia v Moskovskom arkhive ministerstva iustitsii.* 21 vols. St. Petersburg, 1869–1921.
- Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei.* 31 vols. St.Petersburg-Leningrad, 1846–1968.
- Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka.* 39 vols. St.Petersburg-Leningrad, 1872–1927.
- Razriadnaia kniga 1475–1598 gg.* Edited by V.I. Buganov. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
- Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy XIV-XV vv.* Edited by L.V. Cherepnin. 2 vols. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1948, 1951.
- Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov.* 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1813–94.
- Sobornoe Ulozhenie 1649 goda.* Edited by M.N. Tikhomirov and P.P. Epifanov. Moscow: Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1961.
- A Source Book for Russian History from Early Times to 1917.* Compiled by Sergei Pushkarev and edited by George Vernadsky and Ralph Fisher. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Testaments of the Grand Princes of Moscow.* Edited by R. C. Howes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Zhurnal ministerstva iustitsii.* St. Petersburg, 1894–1916.
- Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia.* St. Petersburg, 1834–1917.

B. Muscovite Cadasters

- Novgorod: Beliaev, I.D. *Pistsovye Novgorodskie knigi 7090 i 7091 gg.* In *Vremennik imperatorskago Moskovskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh*, VI (1850).
- Novgorod: Grekov, Boris D. *Opis' trgovnoi storony v pistsovoi knige po Novgorodu Velikomu XVI veka.* In *Letopis' zaniatii Arkheograficheskoi komissii*, XXIV, no. 4 (1912).
- Novgorod: Maikov, V.V. *Kniga pistsovaia po Novgorodu velikomu kontsa VI v (1583–84 gg.).* In *Letopis' zaniatii Arkheograficheskoi komissii*, XXIV, no. 3 (1912).
- Novgorod: *Pistsovaia kniga Velikogo Novgoroda, 1583–84 gg.* Forward by P.L. Gusev. In *Vestnik arheologii i istorii*, XVII (1906), and XVIII (1909).
- Novgorod: “Vypis' iz pistsovykh knig pis'ma i mery Leontii Aksakov o dvore Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyria v Novgorode, 1582 g.” *Chteniiia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, Bk. 2 (1883).
- Novgorod: Zimin, A.A. “Dva otryvka iz Novgorodskoi pistsovoi knigi kontsa XV v.,” *Istoricheskii Arkhiv*, no. 1 (1959).

- Novgorodskie piatiny: *Novgorodskiiia pistsovyia knigi*. 6 vols. Edited by I. Savviatov, et. al. St. Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaiia kommissia, 1859–1910. Index vol., 1916. Vols. I & II (1859–1862), oldest kniga, c. 1495, of Derevskaiia piatina; III (1868), Votskaiia piatina (1500); IV (1886), Shelonskaiia piatina (1498, 1539, 1552–53); V (1905), Shelonskaiia piatina (1498, 1501, 1551, 1524, 1499, 1505, 1571, 1576); VI (1910) Bezhetskaiia piatina (1501, 1545, 1551, 1564). 5110 cols.
- Novgorodskii uезд: “Vypiska iz pistosvykh knig Dmitriia Kitaeva o volostiakh i derevniakh po Novgorodskomu uезdu,” *Russkaiia istoricheskaiia biblioteka*, XXII (1908).
- Obonezhskaiia piatina: Gnevushev, A.M. *Pistsovaia kniga Obonezhskoi piatina vtoroi Moskovskoi opisi*. In *Kievskoe universitetskoe Izvestie*, nos. 10, 11 (1910).
- Obonezhskaiia piatina: Petrov, K. “Pistsovyie knigi Obonezhskoi piatiny, Zaoonezhskoi poloviny Olonetskogo Rozhdestvenskogo pogosta (posle 1543 g.)” *Olonetskii sbornik*, no. 1 (Petrozavodsk, 1875–76).
- Obonezhskaiia piatina: *Pistsovyie knigi Obonezhskoi piatiny, 1496 i 1563 gg.* In *Materialy po istorii narodov SSSR*, no. 1: *Materialy po istorii Karel'skoi ASSR*. Leningrad: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, Arkheograficheskaiia kommissiia, 1930.
- Obonezhskaiia piatina, Tolvuiskii parish: “Perepisnaia knigi Tovuisкого pogosta, 1671 g.,” *Akty iuridicheskogo byta*, II, no. 139.
- Votskaiia piatina: Gnevushev, A.M. *Otryvok pistsovoi knigi Votskoi piatiny, 2-i polovny 1504–1505 g., sodержashchei v sebe opis' chasti dvorsovykh zemel' etoi piatiny*. Kiev, 1908.
- Votskaiia piatina: Gnevushev, A. M. *Pistsovaia kniga votskoi piatiny 1539 g.* No. I. Novgorod: Izd. Novgorodskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii, 1917.
- Votskaiia piatina: “O sostoianii mestnostei S.-Petersburgskikh v XVI veke.” *Zhurnal ministerstva vnutrennego dela*, Part 20 (1836), no. 6 “Obysknaia kniga.”
- Votskaiia piatina: Obolensky, M. A. *Perepisnaia okladnaia kniga po Novgorodu Votskoi piatiny Karel'skogo gorodka s uездом*. In *Vremennik Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, XI (1851), 1–461, XII (1852), 1–188.
- Votskaiia piatina: *Pistsovaia Kniga Votskoi piatiny pis'ma za 7090 g.* Moscow, 1850.

II. SECONDARY WORKS

- Abramovich, G.V. “K voprosu o stepeni dostovernosti pistsovykh knig XVI v i metodike ee ustanovleniia,” *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy za 1971 g.* Vilnius: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1974.
- Abramovich, G.V. “Pomestnaia politika v period boiarskago pravleniia v Rossii (1538–1543 gg.)” *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 4, (1979).

- Alekseev, Iu. G. *Agrarnaia i sotsial'naia istoriia Severo-vostochnoi Rusi XV–XVI vv: Pereiaslavskii uezd*. Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka, 1966.
- Alekseev, Yu.G. and A.I. Kopanев. "Razvitie pomestnoi sistemy v XVI v." In *Dvorianstvo i krepostnoi stroi Rossii XVI–XVIII vv: Sbornik statei*. Moscow: Nauka, 1975.
- Bernadsky, V.N. *Novgorod i Novgorodskaiia zemlia v XV veke*. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1961.
- Blum, J. *Lord and Peasant in Russia from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Blum, J. "Prices in Russia in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of Economic History*, XVI (1956).
- Bruning, James L. and B.L. Kintz. *Computational Handbook of Statistics*. 2nd. edition. Glenview: Scott Foresman, 1977.
- Budnovits, I.U. *Monastyri na Rusi i bor'ba s nimi krest'ian v XIV–XVI vv (po "zhiliiam sviatykh")*. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
- Buganov, V.I. *Razriadnye knigi*. Moscow: Institut istorii, Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1962.
- Cherepnin, L.V. "Istoricheskie usloviia formirovaniia russkoi narodnosti do kontsa XV v." in *Voprosy formirovaniia russkoi narodnosti i natsii. Sbornik statei*. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1958.
- Cherepnin, L.V. *Russkaia metrologiia*. Moscow: Istoriko-arkhivnyi institut, Glavnoe arkhivnoe upravlenie NKVD SSSR, 1944.
- Coulborn, ed., *Feudalism in History*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1965.
- Danilova, L.V. "Istoricheskie usloviia razvitiia russkoi narodnosti v period obrazovaniia i ukrepleniia tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva v Rossii." In *Voprosy formirovaniia russkoi narodnosti i natsii. Sbornik statei*. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1958.
- Danilova, L.V. "K voprosu o prichinakh utverzhdeniia krepostnichestva v Rossii." In *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii stran vostochnoi Evropy za 1965 god*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1970.
- Danilova, L.V. *Ocherki po istorii zemlevladieniia i khoziaistva v Novgorodskoi zemle v XIV–XV vv*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1955.
- Degtiarev, Ya. "O mobilizatsii pomestnykh zemel' v XVI v" in *Iz istorii feodal'noi Rossii: Stat'i i ocherki k 70-letiu so dnia rozhdeniia prof. V.V. Mavrodina*. Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1978.
- Deny, J. "Timar." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. Vol. 4. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1934.
- D'iachenko, Grigorii. *Polnyi tserkovno-slavianskii slovar'*. Moscow: Moscow Patriarchate, 1993.
- Eaton, Henry. "Cadasters and Censuses of Muscovy," *Slavic Review*, 26 (March, 1967).
- Eaton, Henry. "Early Russian Censuses and the Population of Muscovy, 1550–1650." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois. Urbana, 1970.

- Ekzempliarsky, A.V. *Velikie i udel'nye kniaz'ia severnoi Rusi v tatarskii period, s 1238 po 1505 g. Biograficheskie ocherki*. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1889, 1891.
- Eliashevich, V. B. *Istoriia prava pozemel'noi sobstvennosti v Rossii*. 2 vols. Paris, 1948, 1951.
- Gnevushev, A.M. *Ocherki ekonomicheskoi i sotsial'noi zhizni sel'skogo naselenie novgorodskoi oblasti posle prisoedineniia Novgoroda k Moskve*. Kiev, 1915.
- Gorchakov, M.I. *O zemel'nykh vladeniiakh vserossiiskikh mitropolitov, patriarkhov i sv. sinoda. (988–1738 gg.) Iz opytov izsledovaniia v istorii russkago prava*. St. Petersburg, 1871.
- Gorsky, M.M. "Urozhainost' zernovykh kul'tur v tsentral'noi chaste Russkogo gosudarstva v kontse XVI-nachale XVII v." In *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy*, 1961 g. Riga: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1963.
- Gotie, Yu.V. *Zamoskovnyi krai v XVII v.* Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe izdatel'stvo, 1937.
- Gradovsky, A.D. *Sobranie sochenii*. II. St. Petersburg, 1899.
- Grebelsky, Peter and Alexander Mirvis, ed. *Dom Romanovykh*. 2nd Edition. St. Petersburg: Intersoiuz, 1992.
- Grekov, B. D. *Krestiane na Rusi*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1946.
- Grekov, B. D. "Novgorodskie bobyli v XVI i XVII v." *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia*. January, 1912.
- Hammond, Vincent E. "The History of the Novgorod Pomestie: 1480–1550." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois. Urbana, 1987.
- Harnett, Donald L. and James L. Murphy. *Introductory Statistical Analysis*. 2nd. edition. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1980.
- Hellie, Richard. *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Indova, E.I. *Agrarnyi stroi v Rossii v XVII v. IV-a sovetsko-angliiskaia konferentsiia istorikov, 15–22 sentiabria, 1966 g.* Moscow, 1966.
- Kantorowicz, E.H. "Feudalism in the Byzantine Empire." In R. Coulborn, ed., *Feudalism in History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Karamzin, N.M. *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo*. Kniga II, tom VI. St. Petersburg, 1842.
- Kareev, N. *Pomest'e-gosudarstvo i soslovnaia monarchiia srednikh vekov*. St. Petersburg, 1906.
- Kaufman, A.A. *Novgorodskii pistsovyia knigi v statisticheskoi obrabotka, I: Pogosty i derevni Shelonskoi piatiny po pis'mu 1498–1501 gg.* Petrograd, 1915.
- Kliuchevsky, V.O. *Sochineniia*. 8 vols. II. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1957.
- Kobrin, V. B. "Stanovlenie pomestnoi sistemy," in *Istoricheskie Zapiski*, no. 105 (1980).

- Kochin, G. "Pistsovye knigi v burzhuaznoi istoriografii," *Problemy istochnikovedeniia*, II. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, Istoriko-arkheograficheskii institut, 1936.
- Kopanev, A.I. *Istoriia zemlevladieniia belozerskago kraia*. Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1951.
- Lakier, A.B. *O votchinakh i pomestieskh*. St. Petersburg, 1848.
- Lybyer, A.H. *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.
- Lyon, Bryce. *A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England*. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1960.
- Makovsky, D.P. *Razvitie tovarno-denezhnykh otnoshenii v sel'skom khoziaistve russkogo gosudarstva v XVI veke*. Smolensk: Smolenskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut, 1963.
- Mango, Cyril. *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*. New York: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1980.
- Mankov, A.G. *Tseny i ikh dvizhenie v Russkom gosudarstve XVI v.* Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1951.
- Mazour, Anatole G. *Modern Russian Historiography*. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Mazour, Anatole G. *The Writing of History in the Soviet Union*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1971.
- Miliukov, Pavel. "Feudalizm v Rossii (v severo-vostochnoi Rusi)." In *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*. Edited by F.A. Brokgauz and I.A. Efron. St. Petersburg, 1902.
- Milov, L.V. "Methodologicheskie problemy istochnikovedeniia pistsovykh knig (o kontseptsii S. B. Veselovskogo)." *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 2 (1978).
- Miuller, R.B. "Novgorodskaiia obzha i izdolie (po materialam Zaonezh'ia XV v)." In *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii vostochnoi Evropy 1968 g.* Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1972.
- Nevolin, K.A. *Istoriia rossiiskikh grazhdanskikh zakonov*. II. St. Petersburg, 1851.
- Nevolin, K.A. *O piatinakh i pogostakh novgorodskikh XVI*. St. Petersburg, 1852.
- Nikitsky, A.I. *Istoriia ekonomicheskago byta velikago Novgoroda*. Moscow, 1893.
- Nosov, N.E. "Mnogotomnaia 'Istoriia SSSR'." *Voprosy istorii*, no. 3 (1968).
- Nosov, N.E. *Stanovlenie soslovno-predstavitel'nykh uchrezhdenii v Rossii. Izyskaniia o zemskoi reforme Ivana Groznogo*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1969.
- Ostrogorsky, Georg. "Agrarian Conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages" in *Cambridge Economic History of Europe from the Decline of the Roman Empire*, I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.
- Ostrogorsky, G. "Die Pronoia under den Komnenen." *Zbornik Radova Viznt.Instituta*. XII (1970).
- Pashuto, V. I. "Golodnye gody v drevnei Rusi" in *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy*, 1962 g. Minsk: Akademiia nauk, 1964.

- Pavlov-Silvansky, N. P. *Feodalizm v drevnei Rusi*. Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1923.
- Pavlov-Silvansky, N. P. *Feodalizm v udel'noi Rusi*. St. Petersburg, 1910.
- Pavlov-Silvansky, N. P. *Gosudarevy sluzhilnye liudi*. St. Petersburg, 1898.
- Perelman, I. L. "Novgorodskaiia derevnia XV-XVI vekov." *Istoricheskie zapiski*. 26 (1948).
- Pollock, Sir Frederick and Frederic W. Maitland. *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Polosin, I.I. "Pomestnoe pravo i krest'ianskaia krepost." *Sotsial'no-politicheskaiia istoriia Rossii XVI-nachala XVII v. Sbornik statei*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1963.
- Pokrovsky, M.N. *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*. Moscow: Mysl', 1966.
- Pushkarev, Sergei G. *Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917*. Edited by George Vernadsky and Ralph T. Fisher, Jr. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Rozhdestvensky, S.V. *Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVI veka*. St. Petersburg, 1897.
- Rozhkov, N.A. *Iz russkoi istorii: ocherki i statoi*. St. Petersburg: Akademiia, 1923.
- Rozhkov, N. *Sel'skoe khoziaistvo moskovskoi Rusi v XVI veke*. Moscow, 1899.
- Sakharov, A.M. "Ob evoliutsii feodal'noi sobstvennosti na zemliu v rossiiskom gosudarstve XVI veka." *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 4 (1978).
- Seredonin, S.M. "Kritika i bibliografiia: S. V. Rozhdestvensky, Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie v Moskovskom gosudarstve." *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia*. May, 1897.
- Sergeevich, V.I. *Drevnosti russkago prava*. St. Petersburg, 1908–11.
- Sergeevich, V.I. *Lektsii i izsledovaniia po drevnei istorii russkago prava*. St. Petersburg, 1910.
- Sergeevich, V.I. *Russkaia iuridicheskiiia drevnosti*. 3 vols. St. Petersburg, 1901–1903.
- Sergeevich, V.I. "Peresmotr istorii sluzhilago zemlevladieniia. S. V. Rozhdestvenskii, Sluzhiloe zemlevladienie v Moskovskom gosudarstve." *Severnii vestnik*. November, 1897.
- Shapiro, A.L. et al. *Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii: vtoraiia polovina XV—nachalo XVI v*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1971.
- Shapiro, A.L. et al. *Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii XVI veka: Novgorodskie piatiny*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1974.
- Skrynnikov, R.G. "Ekonomicheskoe razvitie novgorodskogo pomestie v kontse XV i pervoi polovine XVI vv." In *Uchenye zapiski leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta imeni A. I. Gertsena*. Vol. 150. Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut, 1957.

- Szeftel, M. "Aspects of Feudalism in Russian History," in R. Coulborn, ed., *Feudalism in History*. Princeton: Archon Books, 1956.
- Tarakanova-Belkina, S.A. *Boiarskoe i monastyrskoe zemlevladienie v Novgorodskikh piatinakh v domoskovskoi vremia*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei, 1939.
- Tikhomirov, M.N. *Srednevekovaia Moskva v XIV–XV vekakh*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo moskovskogo universiteta, 1957.
- Tikhomirov, M.N. "Uslovnnoe feodal'noe derzhanie na Rusi XII v." In *Sbornik statei—akademiku B.D. Grekovu ko dniu 70-letii: Sbornik statei*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1952, pp. 100–105.
- Vasiliev, A.A. *History of the Byzantine Empire, 324–1453*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952.
- Vernadsky, G. "Feudalism in Russia." *Speculum*. 14. Medieval Academy of America.
- Vernadsky, G. "On Some Parallel Trends in Russian and Turkish History," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*. XXXVI. July, 1945.
- Vernadsky, G. *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Veselovsky, S.B. *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie v severo-vostochnoi Rusi*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1947.
- Veselovsky, S.B. *Selo i derevnia v severo-vostochnoi Rusi XV–XVI vv.* Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi izdatel'stvo, 1936.
- Veselovsky, S.B. *Soshnoe pis'mo. Izsledovanie po istorii kadastra i pososhnago oblozheniia moskovskago gosudarstva*. 2 vols. Moscow, 1915–16.
- Vladimirsky-Budanov, M.F. *Obzor istorii russkago prava*. 6th. edition. St. Petersburg and Kiev, 1909.
- Vorobiev, V.M. and A.Ia. Degtiarev. *Russkoe feodal'noe zemlevladienie ot "smutnogo vremeni" do kanuna petrovskikh reform*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1986.
- Yanin, V.L. *Novgorodskaiia feodal'naia votchina*. Moscow: Nauka, 1981.
- Yanin, V.L. "O metrologicheskikh zakonomernostiakh v razvitii russkikh monetnykh norm XIV–XVII vekov." *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk, 1958.
- Zimin, A.A. "Iz istorii pomestnogo zemlevladieniia na Rusi." *Voprosy istorii*, no. 11 (1959).
- Zimin, A.A. *Reformy Ivana Groznogo. Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii Rossii serediny XVI v.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960.
- Zimin, A.A. "Sostav boiarskoi dумы v XV–XVI vekakh." *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik*. Moscow: Akademiia nauk, 1958.

Index

- Abramovich, G.V., 19, 34n110, 38, 105n59, 201n40
- Alekseev, Yu. G., 13, 15, 31n83, 31n84, 31n85, 38, 63n4. *See also* A.I. Kopanev
- Alexis (Tsar and Grand Prince), 47, 248, 319
- Belsky (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 29n61, 35n123, 47, 50, 53, 55–56, 65n35, 65n36, 68n57, 70–72, 79, 81, 85, 89, 92, 97–98, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 104n58, 134–39, 141–47, 149n1, 150n8, 150n13, 150n23, 150n24, 151n27, 151n35, 152n44, 152n53, 153n58, (Porkhov: Belsky of St. Yury's) 156, 160, 164–69, 171, 173–76, 184n48, 185n53, 186n75, 256, 259, 261, 262, 264, 265, 267, 269n14
- Bereza (Shelonskaia parish), 71n75, 258, 224n45, 235, 277
- Blum, J., 13, 23n3, 31nn78–80, 34n105, 34n115
- Bolchino (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 35n123, 70, 78, 98n15, 101n49, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 104n58, 109–10, 126n12, 127n47, 156, 159–61, 167–68, 172, 174–75, 182n17, 183n31, 185n60, 257, 259–62, 265, 267–68
- Borisko Vorkov, 3, 8–10, 25n16, 28n61, 30n70
- Borotno (Shelonskaia parish), 258
- Buregi (Shelonskaia parish), 39–40, 42–44, 64n18, 64n28, 257
- Bystreevsk (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 133, 136–41, 145–47, 149n1, 149n3, 149n4, 151n35, 153n68, 154n71, 155n88, 257–58
- Cadasters (*pistsovye knigi*), 16–23, 255–58, 317; Aksakov, Leonty (1582), 255; Alabukhin, Zhdan (1585), 255, 256; Beleutov, Ivan (1552–53), 19, 35n121, 125n1, 255; Bezobrasov, Volodimer (1576), 255; Bulgakov, Insh Vasiliev syn (1568–69), 37, 256; Bundov, Gregory (1585), 255; Dmitriev, Samson (1582–84), 21–22, 37n134, 256; Kiselev, Semen (1582–84), 21–22, 37n134, 256; Kitaev, Dmitry (1495–1505), 18, 227n61, 256; Klushin, Semen (1540–41), 19, 35n117, 190–91, 256; Kuzmin, Nikita (Mikita, 1552–53), 19, 255; Kuzmin, Semen (1582–83), 34n104;

- Muraviev, Yanush (1571), 20, 35n122, 132, 147, 149n1, 255;
 Rezanov, Shemet (1540–41), 19, 35n117, 190–91, 219, 256; Shepelev, Posnik (1568–69), 37, 256; Sobakin, Gregory (1539), 18, 46, 65n35, 190, 255; Staryi, Elizar (1582–84), 21–22, 37n134, 255–56; Valuev, Gregory Mikhailovich Meshok (1539–40), 35n117, 36n123, 191, 219n1, 221n16, 223n33, 256; Valuev, Matvei Ivanovich (1495–1505), 18, 39, 67n51, 68n57, 79, 97n10, 100n34, 225n54, 255; Zherebtsov, Alexis (1552–53), 19–20, 35n121, 107, 125n1, 255; Ziuzin, Ivan (1568–69), 256
 Charkovitsk (Shelonskaia parish), 258
 Cherenchitsy (Shelonskaia parish), 40, 47, 50, 52–54, 64n16, 65n35, 68n57, 81, 98n15, 99n28, 102n54, 104n57, 105n58, 250, 257, 259–61, 265, 268, 269n14, 270n16
 Cherepnin, L.V., 12, 23n1, 25n16, 26n32, 29n61, 30nn70–72
 Chertitsk (Shelonskaia parish), 54, 70n75, 73n83, 258
 Chronicles (*letopisi*), 9, 28n55, 28n56, 28n57, 91, 182n17, 317
 Degtiarev, A. Ya., 14–15, 31n86, 32nn87–88, 32nn90–93
 Degzha (Shelonskaia parish), 35n123, 49, 54–55, 58, 65n35, 67n51, 70n75, 71n75, 72n77, 72n83, 77, 81, 84–85, 98n15, 98n18, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 105n58, 113, 156, 158, 160, 168–69, 171, 174–75, 177, 186n76, 256, 258–60, 262–68, 270n22, 270n23
 Dolzhino (Shelonskaia parish), 56, 70n74, 70n75, 99n18, 102n54, 104n57, 105n58, 257, 259, 264, 267
Domesday Book (1087), 34n115, 247.
See also William I
 Dovorets (Shelonskaia parish), 258
 Dremiatsk (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 36n123, 137, 149n1, 150n26, 151n27, 257–58
 Dretno (Shelonskaia parish), 71n75, 258
 Dubrovno (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 35n123, 39–41, 43–44, 54, 63n7, 64n13, 71n75, 82, 97n13, 100n32, 146, 154n88, 156–62, 165–67, 169–70, 172–76, 181n1, 186n75, 187n80, 257
 Efremovo (Shelonskaia parish), 40, 49–51, 53, 64n16, 65n35, 70n74, 72n83, 73n93, 119, 250, 257
 Exaltation of the Cross at Korboselsk (Vodskaia parish), 196, 200n30, 205, 207–8, 211, 213–14, 221n13, 221n16, 221n17, 221n17, 224n39, 225n49, 225n52, 226n56, 275, 280n6, 280n8, 298n4
 Frolovsk (Shelonskaia parish), 258
 Golino (Shelonskaia parish), 257
 Gorodnia (Shelonskaia parish), 65n35, 174, 188
 Gorchakov, M.I., 5, 25n25
 Gradovsky, A.D., 3–5, 25n17, 25n20, 25n24, 29n61
Harvest and Threshing Book (Uzhinnaia i umolotnaia kniga, 1572), 91
 Hellie, Richard, 13, 23n4, 23nn6–7, 31nn81–82, 184n47
 Ilemno (Shelonskaia parish), 109, 115, 126n11, 129n64, 258
 Indova, E.I., 91, 105n62
 Ivan I (grand prince of Moscow), 3, 8–9, 11, 25n16, 27n52, 28n61
 Ivan III (sovereign and grand prince of Russia), 1–3, 6, 11, 12, 16, 18, 24n10, 29n61, 29n63, 30n68, 30n70, 34n112, 58, 66n38, 76, 78, 87,

- 103n56, 116, 153n68, 164, 179–80, 195, 215, 220n4
- Ivan IV (sovereign tsar and grand prince of Russia), 1–2, 14, 19, 27n47, 30n75, 32n98, 82, 148, 164–65, 176, 179–80, 207
- Ivangorod (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 258, 317
- Karachunsk (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 35n123, 58, 72n83, 110–11, 156–58, 160–62, 165–66, 168–70, 172–74, 181n1, 183n31, 186n71, 186n72, 186n77, 257
- Khmer (Shelonskaia parish), 39, 41, 258
- Kliuchevsky, V.O., 8–9, 25n15, 27n45, 27n47, 27n49
- Kobrin, V.B., 15, 32n94, 32nn95–97, 251
- Kolomna (Shelonskaia parish), 36n123, 47, 50, 54, 65n35, 70n75, 84, 89, 97n14, 98n15, 98n18, 99n23, 103n55, 103n57, 104n58, 174, 177, 189n116, 257, 259, 262, 264, 268
- Kolomna-on-the-Volkhov (Vodskaiia parish), 37n134, 120, 130n96, 183n30, 209, 221n12, 222n26, 226n56, 232–33, 238, 243n17, 245n69, 274, 279n1, 298n5
- Kopanev, A.I. *See* Yu. G. Alekseev
- Koporie (Vodskaiia district), 16, 22, 34n106, 34n114, 37n130, 198n1, 237–38, 256
- Korela (Vodskaiia district), 22, 34n114, 35n117, 37n130, 199n17, 256
- Korelsk at Gorodnia (Vodskaiia parish), 191, 197, 201n39
- Kormlenie* ('feeding,' maintenance), 5, 7–8, 26n27, 163, 184n41, 316
- Korostynia (Shelonskaia parish), 40, 111, 119, 126n28, 130n93, 257
- Kositsk (Shelonskaia parish), 151n44, 234, 238, 258
- Kotorsk (Shelonskaia parish), 36n123, 49, 65n35, 67n51, 139, 145, 258
- Kuretsk (Shelonskaia parish), 257
- Kursk (commercial center), 89–90, 92, 103n57, 104n57, 104n58, 227n64
- Ladoga (Vodskaiia district), 16, 21–22, 33, 34n106, 34n114, 35n117, 37n130, 37n134, 208, 210, 229, 256, 273, 279
- Lagoveshchsk (Shelonskaia parish), 258
- Landholding, clerical: cathedral, 3, 5–6; monastic, 3–5, 7, 17, 22, 85, 87, 95, 195, 211, 250, 253, 269n9; Novgorodian archbishop (prelate): 4–6, 85, 157, 204, 223n35, 233, 261, 267
- Landholding, state: crown land (after 1480), 3, 10, 13, 16–17, 22, 34n107, 35n121, 36n123, 60–61, 64n18, 75n107, 78, 86, 95, 96n1, 96n3, 110, 115, 118, 120–22, 125n1, 126n28, 127n38, 129n61, 130n105, 133, 144–45, 147, 149n3, 153n68, 154n72, 154n73, 154n74, 154n78, 154n85, 164, 166, 168–69, 174, 179, 181n1, 183n30, 184n46, 185n58, 192, 195, 198n6, 211, 214, 223n35, 229–30, 236, 238, 241, 242n8, 246n69, 248, 250, 253, 255, 267, 316–17; palace land (before 1480): 8–10, 76
- Leaseholding (*arenda*), 5–7
- Liadtsk (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 36n123, 134–42, 144, 149n1, 150n8, 150n23, 150n24, 151n35, 257–58
- Lopets (Vodskaiia parish), 226n56, 273
- Lorsk (Shelonskaia parish), 258
- Lositsk (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 133–34, 136–41, 145–47, 149n4, 150n18, 151n28, 151n35, 153n68, 154n71, 154n74, 154n78, 155n89, 174, 257–58
- Lubinsk (Shelonskaia parish), 36n123, 257
- Mankov, A.G., 105n59
- Medved (Shelonskaia parish), 67n51, 81, 184n49, 258, 269n13

- Military Chancery (*Razriadnyi prikaz*), 2, 24n7
- Milostniks, 9–10
- Monetary units: *Altyn* (accounting unit), 55, 60–61, 79, 83, 176, 189n120, 315; *Grivna* (silver bar), 42–44, 64n20, 64n21, 176, 316; *Denga* (silver coin), 42–45, 60, 64n20, 82–84, 86–87, 100n38, 102n52, 176, 189n120, 208–9, 221n13, 222n20, 222n21, 298n3, 299, 315–16
- Mustsa (Shelonskaia parish), 19, 98n15, 102n54, 104n57, 256, 259, 262
- Nativity (*Rozhdestvensky*, Shelonskaia parish), 35n123, 54, 57–58, 71n75, 72n77, 73n83, 74n94, 77, 82, 85–86, 98n15, 98n18, 103n54, 104n57, 113–14, 116, 156, 169, 171–72, 174–75, 186n76, 199n24, 201n40, 257, 259, 262, 264, 266–67, 270n22
- Nevolin, K.A., 3, 17, 24n10, 34n110, 38
- Novgorod (Lord Novgorod the Great), 1, 7, 10, 13, 15–17, 19, 29n63, 39, 66n38, 78, 88–95, 102n53, 102n54, 106n66, 115, 156, 176, 178, 180–81, 182n17, 190–91, 193, 195–98, 203, 211, 213–17, 226, 227n64, 230–31, 233, 236, 240, 242n4, 247–49, 253, 273–76, 284–85, 316–17
- Novgorod (Shelonskaia district), 16, 19–20, 36n123, 47, 50, 132–55, 255, 258
- Novgorod (Vodskaia district), 21, 28n56, 33n100, 34n114, 35n117, 37n130, 37n134, 190, 235, 256, 274
- Obluchie (Shelonskaia parish), 19–20, 36n123, 54, 58–59, 71n75, 72n83, 108, 112, 119, 257
- Okolorusie (Shelonskaia parish), 47, 49–50, 53–54, 65n35, 73n83, 99n19, 102n54, 103n57, 104n58, 127n34, 160, 256, 259–60, 265–68
- Opoka (Shelonskaia parish), 35n123, 39–40, 43, 64n13, 71n75, 115, 128n57, 156–58, 160, 170–74, 181n1, 183n22, 257
- Orekhov (Vodskaia district), 16, 22, 33n100, 34n106, 34n114, 35n117, 37n130, 190, 197, 207, 256, 275
- Our Savior's at Gorodnia (Vodskaia parish), 199n24, 207–8
- Paozerie (Shelonskaia parish), 257
- Pavy (Shelonskaia parish), 71n75, 258
- Pazherevitsy (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 35n123, 36n127, 47–49, 55–59, 65n35, 67n50, 70n74, 70n75, 72n83, 73n86, 74n93, 74n94, 77–79, 81, 83, 85–86, 88, 92, 97n11, 99n18, 100n34, 101n44, 101n49, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 110, 156, 160, 163, 167, 171–72, 175, 177–79, 188n106, 189n116, 189n118, 256, 259, 261–64, 266–67, 270n20
- Pomestie Chancery (*Pomestnyi prikaz*), 35n123, 93, 217
- pomestie(s): additions to (*pridachi*), 18, 22, 38–39, 49–50, 53–61, 67n51, 70n74, 70n75, 72n83, 73n86, 73n90, 74n93, 77–79, 82–84, 87, 92, 94, 96, 106n66, 107, 112–16, 119–20, 122, 124–25, 125n4, 127n34, 127n35, 127n45, 128n47, 128n54, 128n58, 129n65, 160, 171, 191–92, 194–98, 199n24, 200n25, 200n29, 200n30, 201n39, 202–6, 208, 217, 219, 219n1, 220n7, 220n8, 220n11, 222n22, 225n48, 228n67, 228n68, 236, 245n48, 246n69, 250–51, 268n2, 268n4, 269n6, 269n14, 271n25, 273–75, 280n4, 281, 284–85, 298, 299n9, 318; charters (*gramoty*) and, 9, 18, 27n52, 38, 317, 319; donations of, 19, 23, 46, 48–49, 190–91, 194–95, 249; economic dislocation and, 31, 143, 149,

- 229–31, 240; exchanges of, 12, 13, 19, 23, 249–251, 253; *Shelonskaia*, 38, 39–46, 46–53, 62, 63n7, 63n8, 64n13, 65n34, 65n35, 65n38, 66n41, 67n51, 67n54, 68n57, 69n59, 69n62, 69n73, 81, 92, 96, 107–13, 115, 117–18, 124, 125n5, 125n8 (1552), 133–36, 141–42, 149n3, 149n4, 150n12269n14, 269n15, 270n21; *Vodskaia*, 190–94, 197, 198n6, 198n12, 203, 206, 210n11, 224n48, 228n66, 280n2, 299n8 (1500–1540); *Decree of 13 August 1647*, 47; fragmentation index and, 6, 92–94, 106, 135–37, 168–70, 191, 215, 217, 284–85; landlords (*pomeshchiki*), number of, 87, 92, 94, 101n51, 216–17; resemblance to tenancy in common, 100n37, resemblance to joint tenancy, 136, 181n3, 206, 210, 212, 216, 218–19, 220n12, 238–39; income (*obrok*) and, 2–3, 5–6, 16–18, 23n6, 31n82, 42–46, 52, 60, 77–78, 82–84, 86–88, 91–95, 100n33, 100n38, 101n52, 106n66, 111, 115, 117, 124–25, 133, 144, 149, 159, 176–77, 194, 208–09, 215–18, 221n13, 222n20, 222n21, 227n62, 227n65, 240, 281, 284, 298, 298n2, 298n3, 299n6, 317; Inheritability and turnover of, 2–13, 22, 62, 76–106, 116–24, 139–44, 148, 157–68, 202–28, 232–36, 240–41, 250–52; linear regression and, 90–94, 106n67, 186n69, 215–18, 227n63, 228n67, 281–99; location of: 2, 38, 41, 44, 46, 53–54, 57, 59, 61, 79, 84, 88–92, 96, 113, 115, 124, 134, 136–37, 144, 157–59, 161, 169, 176, 188n93, 191, 193, 195–98, 202, 206, 207, 227n62, 227n64, 228n67, 236, 250, 255–56, 280n6, 284, 298n1, 299n7; maintenance pomesties (*prozhitki*), 55, 73n86, 77, 118–20, 129n82, 131n112, 132, 154n72, 196, 242n6, 260, 268, 274–75, 301–2, 313, 318; oprichnina and, 13, 21, 135, 138, 145–48, 153, 154n71, 154n72, 154n85, 155n89, 156–60, 162, 164–65, 167–69, 171–80, 182n17, 230–31, 240, 251–52; sales, transactions resembling, 23, 51–52, 61, 111, 250
- Porkhov (commercial center), 20, 41, 50, 54, 59, 89–90, 92, 103n55, 104n57, 104n58, 156, 169, 176–77, 227n64, 317
- Porkhov (Shelonskaia district), 17, 19–20, 32–33, 36, 39, 89, 102n53, 103n57, 145–47, 154n75, 156–89, 251, 255, 318
- Porkhov area (Shelonskaia parish), 16, 21, 35, 36n128, 54, 70n75, 77, 80–81, 89, 98n18, 101n49, 103n54, 103n56, 148, 156–57, 160–63, 167–68, 171–75, 187n80, 256–59, 262, 264–65, 267–68
- Posluzhiltsy* (former unfree Vodskaia servitors), 1, 227n61, 297
- Pribuzhsky (Shelonskaia parish), 258, 267, 270
- Prices in the Novgorod region, level of, 64n19, 91, 218, 298n2, 298n3
- Pronoia* (*topion*, Byzantine fief), 3, 24n10
- Ramyshevo (Shelonskaia parish), 48, 53, 72n77, 81, 85, 98n15, 102n54, 102n57, 105n58, 257, 259, 261–62, 267, 268n1
- Resurrection (Shelonskaia parish), 19, 35n120, 47, 50, 54, 71n75, 73n83, 81, 86, 98n15, 102n54, 104n57, 105n58, 128n58, 166, 175, 211, 257, 259–60, 264–68
- Retno (Shelonskaia parish), 19, 48–49, 52, 65n35, 67n52, 71n75, 85, 89,

- 102n54, 104n57, 108, 110, 112–15, 118, 121, 123, 127n34, 128n58, 129n64, 130n82, 188n97, 256, 259, 265–66
- Rozhdestvensky, S.V., 6–8, 12, 25n21, 25n23, 26nn29–31, 26nn33–35, 26nn37–8, 30nn74–77, 66n38, 76, 96, 100n 43, 201n40, 244n42, 245nn64–65, 315
- Rozhkov, N.A., 13–14, 31n79, 31nn86–87, 32n90
- Ruchaisk (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 41, 54, 73n83, 183n22, 25
- Ruchie (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 35n123, 150n24, 156, 181n4, 258, 279
- Sabelsk (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 36n123, 37n134, 128n57, 136, 140, 145, 149n1, 154n71, 257
- Sergeevich, S.V., 7–9, 26n37, 26nn39–40, 26n44
- Seredonin, S.M., 7, 26n35
- Service Decree (*Ulozhenie o sluzhbe*), 1–2, 14, 23n6, 48, 124, 319
- Shapiro, A.L., 33n99, 33nn100–106, 34nn110–111, 34n115, 35nn116–118, 35n120, 37n133, 63n3, 63n6, 64n19, 64n29, 68n57, 88, 90, 53, 103n56, 105n59, 105n64, 169, 198n2, 213, 222n20, 229, 241n1, 242n3, 298n3
- Shchepetsk (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 110–11, 134–46, 149n1, 151n28, 151n29, 151n35, 151n44, 166, 257
- Shchirsk (Shelonskaia parish), 50, 65n35, 68n58, 258
- Shelonskaia (province), 15–20, 33n99, 33n100, 34n113, 35n116, 36n123, 38–189, 247, 249–54, 255–73, 281–84, 301–13
- Shelonskaia, families of: Afanasiev, 265, 281 (Inka the Clerk); Afrosinin, 138, 142, 143, 144, 303; Aigustov, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 69, 250, 265, 270, 281; Asaev, 175, 180n120, 308; Azariev, 165, 185n52, 307; Bachin, 109–11, 117, 122, 126n19, 126n27, 129n75, 170, 174, 301, 308, 311; Bartenev, 303; Bekhteev, 311; Beloselsky (Princes; Beloselskaia), 58, 70, 74n97, 97n15, 98, 109–10, 126n12, 165–67, 182n20, 184n48, 184n50, 185n59, 261, 268, 281, 294, 307; Bibikov, 11, 29n63, 166, 224n43, 307; Blagoi, 47, 81, 137–40, 145, 151n34, 154n72, 303–304; Blazhonkov, 164–65, 307, 311; Bobrov, 21, 27n46, 36n124, 56, 110–11, 126, 133, 136, 139–40, 150n6, 150n15, 150n24, 151n36, 166, 168–69, 174–75, 185n57, 185n58, 186n74, 303, 307, 309, 311; Boltin, 140, 151n36, 174, 303, 309; Bulgakov, 35n123, 37n130, 47, 49, 67n54, 69n73, 70n74, 99n18, 119–20, 130n87; Buturlins (boyars), 61, 70n74, 72n77, 98n15, 98n18, 101n49, 112–14, 120–23, 127n31, 127n41, 128n38, 131n123, 131n127, 137–39, 142–44, 151n28, 151n35, 159–60, 168, 182n17, 261–62, 281, 301, 303, 307; Bundov, 47, 49–51, 62, 66n39, 69n59, 69n64, 69n73, 265, 269n15, 281; Buzheninov, 47, 49, 51, 59, 68n54, 69n73, 74n103, 265, 281, 301; Chebotaev, 47, 49, 65n37, 66n38, 69n73, 70n75, 75n111, 98n18, 118, 130n85, 161, 171, 183n30, 262, 281, 309; Cheglovkov (Cheglovkova), 53, 56, 70n75, 70n75, 72n83, 73n91, 81, 160, 165, 168, 170–72, 183n25, 184n50, 261, 268, 281; Chetver(t)kin, 58–59, 70n75, 74n100, 74n102, 98n15, 261; Chikhachev, 30n68, 108, 110, 123, 125n8, 188n98, 265, 281, 301; Choglovkov, 158, 307, 309, 311; Dobrynia, 28n56, 265, 281; Dubrovsky, 108–12, 115, 121,

- 125n5, 126n12, 126n14, 127n47, 167, 185n58, 185n63, 265, 281, 301, 309; Dudin, 265, 281; Egnutiev, 174, 311; Egupov (princes), 164–65, 167–68, 173, 184n49, 185n63, 235, 307, 311; Eremeev, 133, 136–144, 150n6, 150n15, 151n35, 152n52, 153n55, 153n68, 303; Erokhov, 47, 49–51, 53, 69n73, 71n76, 71n77, 72n83, 98n15, 99n28, 261, 265, 268n1, 281; Esiukov, 39, 41, 44, 54, 63n8, 65n34, 146, 153n68, 158, 160, 162, 170–71, 174–75, 184n36, 184n37, 187n91, 188n94, 262, 307, 311; Evreev, 48–49, 51–52, 58, 69n73, 74n100, 81, 86, 99n27, 101n46, 101n49, 101n50, 120–21, 131n111, 160–62, 167–68, 170, 172, 175–76, 183n25, 183n31, 188n101, 261, 265–67, 281, 301, 307, 309, 311; Evsiukov (Evsiukova), 55, 73n83, 73n84, 82, 97n13, 166, 171, 262, 268n2, 281; Ezhov, 110–11, 119–20, 126n21, 130n88, 301; Fedkov, 265, 281; Glotov, 59, 69n59, 70n75, 74n103, 84, 98n18, 100n42, 137, 262, 282, 303; Golodnoi, 86, 101n51, 265, 282; Golovachov (Golovachova), 312; Golovin, 151n36, 165, 174, 303, 309; Gribakin, 173, 312; Gridiukin, 120–21, 262, 282, 301; Iaryshkin, 309; Ievlev, 82, 120, 122, 265–66, 279, 282; Ignatiev, 175, 309; Igolkin, 140, 303; Iusiukov, 312; Kalitin, 109–11, 118, 120, 126n20, 130n85, 130n96, 158, 161, 170, 182n14, 183n30, 189n120, 189n121, 301, 307, 309; Karasov, 164–65, 185n51, 307; Karaulov, 157, 161–62, 168–69, 172, 181n2, 183n34, 186n71, 187n77, 307, 312; Karkmazov (Kartmazova), 58, 72n77, 98n15, 262, 268n3, 269n12, 282, 301; Karpov, 55, 312, 70n74, 72n83, 75n111, 98n15, 108, 171, 174, 177, 188n107, 262, 268n4, 282, 309, 312; Kniazhin, 312; Kniazhnin, 164–65, 168, 173, 185n51, 308; Kobylin, 56, 81, 99n23, 262, 282; Kartmazov, 58–59, 72n83, 74n101, 119, 125n2, 130n91, 130n92, 163, 170, 177, 184n40, 262, 295, 301, 309, 312; Kharlamov, 39–43, 46, 63n7, 64n13, 64n15, 65n34, 134–38, 142–44, 150n11, 150n12, 150n13, 152n54, 159–62, 170, 172, 175, 182n21, 183n22, 184n36, 265, 270n16, 282, 304, 307, 309, 312; Khlopov, 57, 74n95, 78, 101n49, 145, 154n71, 154n74, 166, 262, 282, 307; Khludenev, 98n18, 262, 282; Khlusov, 71n75, 98n15, 262, 282; Kiselev, 56; Kolosov, 71n75, 78, 262, 282; Kolychev, 175, 188n96, 309; Korobin, 174, 177–78, 309; Kositsky, 158, 160, 162, 166–67, 169, 184n37, 185n59, 186n75, 188n101, 308–9, 312; Kostin (Kostina), 71n75, 72n77, 84, 98n18, 100n39, 100n40, 100n41, 171, 211, 224n39, 262, 268, 282, 309; Kostrov (princes), 173, 175, 188n98, 312; Krenev, 173, 295, 312; Kriukov, 98n15, 262, 282, 301; Kropotov (Kropotova), 48–49, 52, 66n44, 67n45, 69n73, 107, 108–9, 111–12, 114, 116–18, 121, 125n2, 125n8, 126n10, 127n33, 127n47, 128n53, 129n75, 129n82, 266, 282, 301; Kuleshin, 112, 114, 122, 128n54, 128n57, 301; Kulikov, 174, 309; Kulikovskiy, 142, 153n55; Kurtsov, 110, 114–15, 128n58, 266, 282; Kvashnin, 39–46, 63n11, 64n13, 64n18, 64n26, 65n34, 72n77, 98n15, 98n15, 138, 140, 151n43, 171, 173, 187n90, 262, 266, 270n16, 282, 304, 309 (*see also* Samarin-Kvashnin and Popadin-Kvashnin); Lazorev, 54, 57,

- 80, 97n13, 98n18, 101n49, 110, 122–23, 131n127, 159–60, 164–65, 170–72, 174, 177, 184n49, 187n80, 188n94, 262, 267, 301, 308–9, 312; Levshin, 112–17, 122–23, 127n39, 128n58, 129n65, 129n71, 129n79, 131n119, 171, 175, 177–78, 301–2, 309–10; Likharev, 4, 136, 140, 150n19, 151n43, 266, 282, 302, 304; Lodygin, 138, 145–46, 173, 312; Loshakov, 133, 136, 138, 140, 150n6, 150n15, 151n41, 151n44, 304; Lugvenev, 137–38, 145–47, 153n68, 154n73, 154n85, 304; Meliukov, 98n18, 262, 282; Meshcherinov, 77–78, 96n5, 99n18, 121, 141, 262, 266, 282, 304; Miachkov, 77, 98n15, 121, 174, 260, 262–63, 282, 302, 312; Miakinin (Miakinina), 47, 50–51, 62, 69n60, 69n64, 69n73, 71n75, 72n83, 78, 81, 101n48, 239, 245n67, 262–63, 268n5, 282; Miakoi, 164–65, 174, 187n77, 308, 310; Mikhailov, 117, 302; Molchanov, 86, 101n50, 189n116, 266, 270n17, 282; Molchaninov, 121, 131n111, 302, 310; Mordvinov, 266; Moseev (Moseeva), 55, 70n74, 72n83, 77, 84, 86, 98n15, 138, 171, 263, 266, 268, 269n6, 282, 310; Muranov, 118, 120, 127n29, 129n82, 260, 268; Narymov, 304; Nashchokin, 39, 41, 46, 63n9, 65n34, 138–39, 145–46, 161, 172–74, 187n89, 308, 312; Nazimov, 47, 49, 52, 54–59, 66n40, 68n58, 69n73, 71n75, 72n83, 73n86, 73n90, 73n92, 74n94, 74n96, 74n102, 78–79, 81, 83, 85–86, 92, 98n15, 99n22, 100n34, 100n35, 100n36, 101n44, 101n47, 108–12, 121, 126n9, 126n14, 126n25, 127n31, 134–35, 138, 142, 150n11, 150n12, 150n13, 152n54, 171, 177, 263, 266–67, 269n9, 270n18, 270n21, 282–83, 302, 310; Nekliudov, 86, 266, 278, 283, 288; Novokshchenov, 173, 313; Oboturov, 47, 49, 51, 69n63, 70n73, 175, 188n97, 266, 270n16, 283; Ogarov (Ogarova), 55, 72n83, 74n104, 98n15, 263, 266, 268; Onikeev, 164–65, 185n53, 308; Ovtsyn, 56–57, 73n92, 73n93, 77–79, 96n1, 96n8, 133, 136–38, 150n6, 150n15, 150n24, 163, 179, 184n42, 263, 269n9, 283, 304; Palekhov, 137, 304; Palitsyn, 77, 98n15, 160, 167–68, 171, 175–76, 186n67, 263, 266, 283, 308, 310–11, 314; Panteleev, 173, 236, 312; Parfeniev, 53, 70n74, 98n15, 263, 283; Parsky, 133, 136–37, 141–42, 150n6, 150n24, 152n54, 304; Pervoi, 112–13, 115, 121, 127n34, 129n65, 130n105, 266, 283, 302; Peshkov, 137, 150n24, 304; Piatin, 49, 51, 68n54, 70n74, 99n18, 263, 267, 283; Pisarev, 304; Pleshcheev, 21, 34n104, 36n123, 60, 70n74, 74n105, 97n10, 98n15, 160, 167–68, 171, 173, 175, 182n17, 185n60, 185n62, 186n70, 187n77, 187n90, 263, 267, 283, 308, 310; Popadin-Kvashnin, 260, 268 (*see also* Samarin-Kvashnin and Kvashnin); Porkhovsky, 133–34, 136, 142, 145–46, 149n5, 152n54, 154n71, 154n84; Povarov, 110, 121, 126n21, 302; Pushkin, 114, 128n54, 128n57, 170, 312; Pustoshkin, 57, 70n74, 74n96, 78, 133, 135–36, 138–39, 142–46, 150n7, 150n14, 150n15, 151n29, 151n35, 153n62, 154n78, 161, 163, 167, 170–71, 177–79, 183n31, 184n39, 188n106, 189n117, 263, 267, 270n20, 283, 304, 308, 310, 312; Ragozin, 56, 70n74, 73n93, 98n15, 137, 139, 141, 151n35, 152n53, 163, 174–75, 184n40, 188n94, 263, 283, 304, 312; Rezantsov, 54, 58–59, 74n101,

- 98n15, 177–78, 189n116, 264, 283, 310; Riapolovsky (princes), 99n18, 199n24, 227n61, 264, 283; Rogotin, 267, 283; Rostovsky (princes), 122, 174, 199n24, 224n43, 302; Rumiantsov (Rumiantsova), 96n6, 107, 114–16, 119–22, 127n47, 130n87, 131n113, 146, 153n68, 160, 163, 265, 302; Rzhanikov, 119, 302; Sablin, 60, 267, 283; Samarín-Kvashnin, 56, 70n74, 73n91, 99n18, 264, 283; Selivanov, 55, 71n75, 72n83, 73n85, 98n15, 159–60, 165–66, 171, 185n50, 264, 283, 308, 310; Sertiakin, 310; Seslavin, 308 (*see also* Vseslavin); Shablykin, 57, 71n75, 79–80, 97n11, 98n15, 163, 165–67, 184n39, 188n107, 189n117, 254, 267, 283, 308, 310; Shchekin, 108, 111, 117–19, 126n10, 126n28, 129n80, 130n93, 302; Shcherbinin, 49, 54, 58, 67n51, 70n73, 74n99, 78, 118, 171, 264, 283, 310; Shchogolev, 133, 161, 174–75, 308, 310; Shchulepnikov, 47, 50, 68n58, 70n73, 86, 109, 126n14, 138–39, 154n74, 268, 270n21, 283, 302; Shishkin, 21, 36, 71n75, 72n83, 81, 115, 129n62, 157, 160, 162–53, 167–68, 170–71, 174, 181n3, 264, 283, 308–10, 313; Shishmarev, 108–09, 111–12, 114–15, 120, 125n6, 126n11, 129n64, 171, 302, 313; Shmardin, 302; Shusherin, 140, 143–44, 151n36, 303, 305, 313; Sushilnikov, 173, 313; Simansky (Simanskaia), 136, 141, 146–47, 152n49, 153n68, 154n88, 166, 305, 308; Snazin, 171, 174, 311, 313; Snazin-Mikulín, 99n18, 264, 283; Strechnev, 168, 173–74, 187n92, 311, 313; Sukov, 60, 75n108, 101n49, 175, 267, 284; Sverbeev, 146, 153n68, 174, 311; Tatarinov (Tatarinova), 48, 70n73, 109–13, 115–16, 122–23, 126n19, 126n27, 127n38, 127n45, 128n58, 129n63, 129n65, 131n125, 158, 160, 182n14, 183n28, 268, 302, 308; Tatianin, 21, 36n127, 47–49, 57, 67n50, 70n73, 74n95, 99n18, 101n49, 110, 118, 171–72, 177–78, 264, 284, 311; Terpigorev, 58–59, 71n75, 72n77, 75n111, 78, 81–82, 99n18, 100n31, 100n32, 100n33, 101n49, 121–22, 163, 166, 171–72, 177–78, 184n40, 188n106, 189n117, 189n118, 261, 263–64, 266–67, 269n8, 284, 302, 308, 311; Tonkov, 267, 284; Toporkov, 140, 151n36, 305; Trofimov, 137, 139, 151n35, 305; Tsypletev, 21, 36n125, 168, 173, 313; Tulupov (princes), 99n19, 109, 120, 126n16, 145, 264, 284, 302; Turgenev, 47, 49, 66n41, 70n73, 71n75, 73n83, 81, 86, 109, 113–14, 119, 122, 126n17, 127n40, 128n58, 129n65, 129n71, 130n91, 171–72, 177, 264, 284, 302, 305, 311; Turov, 47–51, 54, 66n41, 69n63, 70n73, 73n83, 75n106, 98n15, 175, 188n97, 264, 266, 270n16, 283–84; Tushyn, 305; Tyrtov, 59, 74n102, 122, 137–39, 145, 160, 171–72, 177; Ukiattskaia, 313; Umnoi, 174, 311; Unkovsky, 57–59, 74n98, 77, 98n15, 112–14, 116, 127n39, 128n56, 162, 168, 183n35, 186n77, 264, 284, 308, 311, 313; Ushatoi (princes), 66n38, 305; Uskoi, 158–60, 171, 182n14, 182n15, 267, 284, 308, 311; Valovoi, 311; Vdovin (Vdovina), 47, 49, 70n73, 122, 125n2, 302; Veliaminov, 4, 19, 175, 234–35, 311; Volnin, 177–78, 311; Volokhov, 55–56, 78, 85, 137, 263, 266–67, 270n20, 305; Volovoi, 174, 311; Vorobin, 18, 34n112, 39–41, 44–46, 64n28, 65n34, 76, 116, 137, 139, 151n35, 224n45, 238, 297, 305; Voronin, 137,

- 305; Voronov, 50, 68n55, 74n104, 267, 270n23; Vseslavin, 49, 57–58, 67n51, 70n74, 74n104, 81, 265, 267, 269n13, 284 (*see also* Seslavin); Vypovsky, 21, 313; Vysheslavtsov (Vysheslavtsova), 133–34, 142, 150n8, 150n10, 152n54, 153n55, 211, 224n42, 268, 305; Zamutsky, 47, 311; Zasekin (princes), 47, 65n37, 66n38, 70n73, 77–78, 96n6, 113, 116, 118–19, 130n86, 160, 170–71, 187n79, 265, 284, 302, 308–9, 311; Ziuzin, 164, 184n46, 184n47, 189n120, 308; Zverev (Zvereva), 81, 86, 99n18, 9, 99n27, 101n49, 101n51, 166, 265, 267, 268, 284, 308
- Shniatinsk (Shelonskaia parish), 51, 58–59, 65n35, 67n44, 86, 101n50, 102n54, 104n57, 105n58, 108, 112–13, 117–21, 127n34, 129n64, 131n111, 168, 189n116, 257, 259, 261, 266
- Slaviatinsk (Shelonskaia parish), 113, 116, 128n58, 129n72, 188n97, 258
- Smolna (Shelonskaia parish), 19, 21, 35n123, 70n75, 109–11, 113, 117–18, 122–23, 126n20, 128n58, 156, 158, 160–61, 164, 170, 174–75, 181n1, 184n48, 188n93, 189n121, 257
- Snezhsk (Shelonskaia parish), 56–57, 74n03, 99n18, 102n54, 104n57, 257, 259–60, 263, 265, 268
- Soltsa-on-the-Volkhov (Vodskaiia parish), 37n134, 192–93, 199n24, 200n35, 211, 213, 223n34, 224n43, 225n50, 225n54, 226n56, 234–35, 238, 245n60, 275, 280n2
- St Andrew's at Gruzinsk (Vodskaiia parish), 37, 130n96, 183n30, 209, 221n12, 222n26, 226n56, 233, 235, 237–38, 243n20, 245n54, 245n69, 274, 298n5, 299n9
- St Anthony's-on-the-Volkhov (Vodskaiia parish), 220, 226n56, 231, 233, 237, 242n7, 243n20, 245n53, 274, 298n5
- St Dmitry's at Gdittsk (Vodskaiia parish), 226n56, 274
- St Egor's at Lopsk (Vodskaiia parish), 193, 195–96, 198n11, 199n24, 200n26, 210, 220n12, 224n43, 226n56, 275, 299n8
- St Egor's at Luzhsk (Vodskaiia parish), 37, 192, 194, 197, 199n24, 204, 211, 213–14, 220n7, 220n12, 224n43, 225n50, 225n54, 226n56, 233, 235–38, 245n48, 274, 298n5
- St Egor's at Terebuzhka (Vodskaiia parish), 195, 220n12, 280n5, 280n7
- St Fedor's at Peski (Vodskaiia parish), 210, 226n56, 273, 276n1
- St Gregory's at Krechnevo (Vodskaiia parish), 37n134, 191–94, 199n13, 201n39, 238, 246n69, 274
- St Ilia's at Keltushi (Vodskaiia parish), 200n30, 211, 214, 220n12, 221n16, 224n39, 226n56, 275, 298n4
- St Ilia's-on-the-Tigoda (Vodskaiia parish), 37n134, 192–97, 198n11, 199n24, 200n35, 201n36, 203, 224n43, 225n54, 226n56, 236, 245n48, 274, 277–79, 279n1, 299n7, 299n8
- St Ilia's-on-the-Volkhov (Vodskaiia parish), 37n134, 193, 198n12, 199n13, 226n56, 233, 238, 245n69, 273, 299n7
- St Ivan's at Kuivasha (Vodskaiia parish), 190, 196, 200n30, 203, 205, 211–13, 221n16, 224n38, 225n52, 226n56, 275, 280n6, 298n4
- St Ivan's at Pereezhsk (Vodskaiia parish), 225n54, 226n56, 235–36, 274
- St Michael and St George's (Shelonskaia parish), 21, 35n123, 156, 164, 171–72, 176, 258

- St Michael's (Shelonskaia parish), 39–41, 43, 54, 60, 63n7, 64n16, 65n35, 70n74, 80, 89, 98n15, 103n54, 103n55, 103n57, 104n58, 160, 257, 259, 262–63
- St Michael's-on-the-Uza (Shelonskaia parish), 35, 156–57, 166–67, 171, 175, 258, 268
- St Michael's-on-the-Volkhov (Vodskaia parish), 37n134, 192–93, 199n12, 199n13, 204, 220n8, 220n9, 223n35, 224n43, 273
- St Nicholas' (Shelonskaia parish), 257–58, 270n22, 270n23
- St Nicholas' at Budkovo (Vodskaia parish), 37n134, 230, 232, 238, 245n60, 245n64
- St Nicholas' at Dudorovo (Vodskaia parish), 193, 195–96, 199n24, 200n25, 200n31, 209, 211–13, 219n1, 221n12, 221n13, 224n43, 225n51, 225n54, 226n56, 275, 276n1, 280n4
- St Nicholas' at Gorodishche (St. Nicholas at Gorodnia; Vodskaia parish), 37n134, 192, 204, 220n6, 226n56, 234, 273
- St Nicholas' at Izhora (Vodskaia parish), 35nn117, 193, 197, 213, 275–76
- St Nicholas' at Peredolsk (Vodskaia parish), 37n134, 239
- St Nicholas's at Pidebsk (Vodskaia parish), 37n134, 183n30, 190, 193, 198n3, 199n17, 201n39, 214, 220n12, 223n35, 226n56, 239, 274, 298n5
- St Nicholas of Vysotsk (Shelonskaia parish), 54, 58, 71n75, 84, 114, 120n64, 129n64,
- St Peter's (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 149, 149n1, 257–58
- St Peter's-on-the-Volkhov (Vodskaia parish), 37n134, 238, 274, 299n7, 299n9
- St Vasily's (Shelonskaia parish), 257
- Staraiia Rusa (Shelonskaia district), 50, 68n57, 90, 92, 103n56, 103n57, 104n57, 104n58, 227n64, 255
- Storozhev, V.N., 13, 30n75, 31n81
- Strupinsk (Shelonskaia parish), 19, 64n18, 110–11, 113–15, 119, 121–11, 127n29, 129n61, 129n82, 257
- Sumersk (Shelonskaia parish), 36n123, 258
- Sutotsk (Shelonskaia parish), 257
- Svinort (Shelonskaia parish), 19, 59, 89, 102n54, 104n57, 108–9, 111, 114–15, 120–21, 127n45, 127n47, 129n64, 257, 259, 265–66
- Tikhomirov, M.N., 9–10, 27n53, 28n57, 31n82, 63n2, 66n38
- Timar* (Ottoman fief), 3, 24n12
- Tursk (Shelonskaia parish), 258
- Uzhin (Shelonskaia parish), 64n18, 257
- Vasily I (grand prince of Moscow), 11
- Vasily II (grand prince of Moscow), 8, 27n48, 66n38
- Vasily III (sovereign and grand prince of Russia), 87, 119, 164, 195
- Veselovsky, S.V., 11–12, 26nn27–28, 27n47, 28n61, 30n69, 30n70, 30n74, 66n38, 200nn31–32
- Vladimirsky-Budanov, M.F., 8, 26nn42–43
- Vodskaia (province), 1, 14–16, 18–19, 21, 32n87, 33n99, 33n100, 34n106, 34n114, 190–247, 256–58, 273–80, 284–99
- Vodskaia, families of: Achkasov, 234, 277, 285; Aminev, 210, 223n30, 223n31, 277, 285; Barykov, 277, 285; Bastanov, 205, 211, 213, 220n10, 224n38, 224n39, 225n49, 225n52, 277, 285, 298n4;

- Bezstuzhev, 211, 219n1; Bolandin, 243n17, 277, 279n1, 286; Bormosov, 203, 212, 224n47, 277, 286; Brusilov, 277, 286; Bukalov, 192–93, 198n6, 198n12, 199n13, 277, 286; Bulgakov, 211, 256, 263, 277, 281, 286, 301; Buturlins (boyars), 199n24, 204, 220n7, 294; Chastov, 192–94, 197, 198n5, 228n66, 277, 280n2, 286; Chebotov, 277, 280n3, 286; Chiurkin (Chiurkina), 191, 195–96, 198n4, 200n25, 200n28, 212, 224n48, 277, 286–87; Chupriakov, 238, 245n57, 277, 287, 299n7; Dubrovin, 212, 224n45, 278, 287; Golovnin, 278, 287; Groznov, 278, 287; Kalitin, 209, 222n26, 223n27, 232–33, 243n12, 278, 287; Karpov, 223n34, 278, 287; Khomutov, 191, 196, 198n4, 199n24, 200n31, 225n48, 278, 280, 287, 288, 295; Khoroshev, 278, 288; Klementiev, 191, 197, 200n31, 224n45, 236–37, 244n47, 244n48, 245n49, 278, 288; Korsakov, 223n34, 288; Kuchetsky, 207–8, 222n19, 222n20, 278, 288; Kushelev, 192–97, 198n5, 199n18, 199n19, 199n24, 200n25, 200n35, 278, 280n2, 280n5, 288–89; Kuzminsky, 211, 213, 224n41, 225n50, 235, 244n37, 278, 289, 295; Lopukhin, 278, 289; Maslenitsky, 278; Meshchersky, 196, 200n30, 278, 280n6, 289, 295; Munzirin, 278, 290; Myshetsky, 216–17, 220n12, 221n16, 278, 290, 295; Nashchokin, 195–96, 200n26, 214, 216–17, 220n12, 232–33, 243n12, 243n17, 243n18, 278, 290, 295, 298n5; Nefedev, 278; Neledinsky, 192, 194, 203, 207–8, 212, 219n2, 222n21, 222n22, 224n47, 235, 279, 280n7, 291, 295–96, 299n6; Novokshchenov, 232–33, 243n23; Okliachev, 196, 200n26, 279, 291; Otiaev, 279, 291; Ovtsyn, 210, 223n29, 223n32, 223n33, 279, 291, 294, 296; Pechenegov, 205, 220n9, 279, 291; Porkhovsky, 223n34; Pushkin, 194, 224n45, 279, 291, 296; Rakhmanov (Rokhmanov), 217, 221n12, 279, 292; Saburov, 33n104, 133, 136, 145–46, 150n18, 154n71, 192, 194, 197, 198n9, 199n24, 201n36, 203–5, 219n3, 220n9, 279, 292, 296; Sekirin, 225n54, 279, 292, 296; Shadrin, 224n45, 279, 292; Shamshov, 279, 280n8, 292; Skobeev, 279, 292; Skudin, 233–34, 279, 292; Solovtsov, 211, 213, 224n36, 224n37, 225n51, 279, 293, 296; Teleshov, 279, 293; Terkov, 196, 200n29, 203, 219n4, 221n16, 279, 293, 296–97; Tetkin, 200n24, 279, 293; Uvarov, 193, 279, 293, 297; Volynsky, 207–8, 222n23, 222n24, 223n34, 279, 293, 297; Voronin, 209, 224n45, 279, 293, 297; Zabelin, 214, 224n42, 279, 294, 297; Zholtukhin, 204–5, 279, 294; Zuev, 279, 294
- votchina(s), 1–2, 13–15, 22–23, 23n2, 28n57, 29n63, 29n67, 30n68, 31n83, 32n90, 32n94, 62n1, 66n38, 67n51, 68n57, 76, 78–80, 82, 85, 97n13, 103n56, 124–25, 148, 180, 191, 195, 235, 248–50, 252–53, 317, 319
- Vyshgorod (Shelonskaia parish), 19–20, 50, 59, 65n35, 68n58, 71n75, 73n86, 85–86, 88, 99n19, 101n44, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 105n58, 108–9, 112, 120–21, 128n57, 257, 259, 263–64, 267, 269, 270n21
- William I (king of England and duke of Normandy), 34n115, 247. See also *Domesday Book*
- Yama (Vodskaia district), 22, 34n114, 35n117, 195, 237, 256

- Yasno (Shelonskaia parish), 20, 58–59, 61, 71n75, 72n77, 72n83, 81–82, 88, 98n15, 99n18, 100n31, 100n32, 100n33, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 104n58, 110, 114–15, 128n58, 163, 166, 172, 177, 188n93, 256, 258–60, 262, 264, 266–68, 269n8
- Zimin, A.A., 11, 24n7, 29n62, 29n65, 32n94, 182n17, 184nn47–48, 185n60, 188n98, 227n61, 244n38, 244n43, 245n64, 248
- Zhedritsy (Shelonskaia parish), 19–20, 61, 72n77, 77–78, 88, 90, 97n14, 98n15, 99n18, 101n49, 103n54, 103n55, 104n57, 105n58, 109, 112–14, 117, 119–23, 127n41, 128n58, 131n127, 172, 178, 257–62, 268, 271n25
- Zvenigorodsky, Prince Vasily (1584), 255

