

MUSKETEER SETTLEMENTS IN RYAZAN AND TULA FORTRESSES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE XVII CENTURY. MODUSOPERANDI

Center of historical tourism "Faces of the past", Moscow

Резюме: *Исследуется стрелецкие слободы с точки зрения организации стрелецкого быта как военного сословия и как колонизаторов южных регионов России, осваивавших плодородные земли и выстраивавших хозяйственную инфраструктуру. Слобода была обособленным пространством в городах-крепостях Рязанского и Украинного разрядов, что позволяло правительству отделить стрельцов, но не оторвать их от посада, сохраняя торговые и экономические связи. Исследуются организация стрелецкой службы в слободах рязанского и тульского регионов, режим посещения и выхода из слободы и контроль за перемещением стрельцов, очередность распределения стрелецких служб и обязанностей, замещение по службе, а так служба стрельцов-половинщиков. Рассматривается вопрос хозяйственной деятельности стрельцов южных крепостей с точки зрения продовольственного снабжения и жалования. Автор привлекает широкую выборку источников делопроизводственного характера, такие как переписка воевод и Разрядного приказа и челобитные, сохранившаяся в РГАДА, а также известные опубликованные источники.*

Ключевые слова: *стрелецкое войско, городские стрельцы, слобода, быт военного сословия*

Abstract: *The article deals with the topic of Russian service-men class of 16-17th centuries and the main form of their placement – special military settlements called slobodas. Russian servicemen – musketeers, cossacks, cannoneers, gatekeepers – were first regular regiments in the Tsardom of Muscovity army. The focus of the study is on the musketeer settlements of Ryazan and Tula region during the reign of Michael I of Russia in the first half of the 17th century. The author studies the issues of organization and functionality of the slobodas, the main features and mechan-*

¹ Горбачев Валентин Игоревич – кандидат исторических наук, руководитель Центра исторического туризма «Лики прошлого», г. Москва.

isms of musketeer's military service and mode of living. Among those questions are the visiting regime, commanders' control, system of duty distribution, rules and regulations to follow, economic activities, provision supply and cash allowance and others. The research is based on a wide range of primary sources of paperwork management nature. They are government ordinances, the commanders' reports to the central offices in Moscow, servicemen's petitions and interrogation reports kept in Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. A number of published primary source such as cadasters are involved as well.

Keywords: *Russian servicemen class, musketeers, military settlements, military service, modus operandi*

In the middle of the 16th century musketeers – or streltsy – became the first attempt for the just emerged Tsardom of Muscovy to create its own regular army to reinforce feudal levy horsemen. Being units of Russian fire-arm infantry they were evoked to close the gap between Russian military forces and modern mercenary armies of Europe with their infantry of the line of musketeers and pike men. Russian streltsy emerged with the main objective to become military force, ready to execute orders as soon as they were submitted, achievement almost impossible for feudal cavalry. To make it possible, the government settled the musketeers in separated villages called slobodas. They were fenced-in areas to keep musketeers assembled and at the same time separated from other city people in the way of a modern military camp. After the Times of Troubles numerous streltsy units became a large

and important part of Russian army. Musketeer garrison were diverse in the peculiarities of their service, supply support and economic activities depending on the region of settlement. The geographical focus of the study is the southern areas of Ryazan and Tula regions. The aim of the article is to study the way musketeer settlements of remote south areas enabled Russian tsars to operate powerful army units ready to military action in everyday regime.

Slobodas became perhaps the only option to let musketeers combine their military service with economic activities. They had the form of fenced-in villages within city walls or commonly outside the fortress. Being isolated they remained a part of city structure which let musketeers have their businesses in city markets[10, p.79].

The inner area of asloboda consisted of individual yards for each

musketeer with his living house, household buildings and support structures and small areas of gardens and vegetable plots. Streltsy lived with their families and close relatives all together as a single musketeer household. Besides individual musketeer domains there were an administration office or sjesjayaizba, a powder magazine and a church within each settlement[3, p.87].

Sloboda was a state settled regime object. Government ordinances sent to musketeer chiefs witness that the settlements organization had their own peculiarities. One of its most important features was the chief's duty to control musketeer movements. Each sergeant should have been aware of the location of every of his musketeers as well as each commander of fifty men should have known where each of his sergeant was and reported to his sotnik (commander of a hundred men). Thus, every musketeer was under control. Their life was regimented and regularized which meant above all every morning and evening inspections with sotniks and commanders in front of sjesjayaizba[14, des. 9B. st.138. p.573; St. 44. p. 265]. After the inspection they went on duties (warding the gates and armories, patrolling the fortress and its outskirts or doing other services) or were free for their economic activities (gardening, trading, crafting, hunting or fishing, etc.). Anyway they were to report

their commanders about any activity outside the settlement. In case of spending a night or more outside sloboda they had to get their chief's permission reporting the exact place and person they were going to as well as the reason of the visi[6, p.74]. Some Order-in-charge office papers can give us a few examples when musketeers left their slobodas and even cities both for official duties and private business. They could have left the settlements for Moscow in case of a trial or for other cities for their trading needs. For instance, in a Pronsk annual estimate of 1647 it is written that about two or three service class people at a time went to Perevles to trade salt[14, des. 9B. st.138. p.82]. Another example is given in the interrogation report of a Michailov musketeer that on the day of Intercession of the Holy Virgin he went to Pereslavl area to the village of Glinishi to a St. John the Evangelist's monastery servant Nazarko Romanov. In each case musketeers were granted permissions for their leaves. The same demand was claimed to every stranger in the slobodas otherwise they were not allowed in the settlement.

Except the movements control, musketeer commanders were to organize shooting trainings on a regular basis. It is remarkable that musketeer had to use their own powder and bullets for the trainings [1, p.560]. Unfortunately,

we have no evidence of how this demand was fulfilled in Ryazan and Tula regions.

The important part of musketeers' mode of living was their economic activities. It's commonly known that *streltsy* had the right to craft and trade their goods in public markets. The government encouraged most of the musketeer enterprises by keeping no taxation regime. The main objective was to let musketeers have their own incomings so they could supply themselves with provisions, suitable clothing and any other needs to maintain their military efficiency. Thus, there was no need for the authorities to take care of the provision. In the southern areas of Ryazan and Tula regions military command went further and replaced musketeer cash allowance with distribution of cropland. The territory was remote from the capital and had rich land resources available for plowing. This way government both cut back on spending and advanced agricultural development of its southern borders. So musketeer of Ryazan and Tula regions were self-supplied with food provision. Order-in-charge office books witness a decline in military efficiency of cropland supplied musketeers compared to those of cash allowance. For example, in 1618 Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny's Cossacks sieged the fortress of Pereslavl Rya-

zansky with its garrison of 200 musketeers of cash allowance and 100 of cropland supplied. As a result of the battle, 187 musketeers of cash allowance managed to survive, whereas in contrast every one of cropland supplied musketeers was killed. In spite of the decline in military efficiency the practice of cropland distribution was kept till the 18th century[9,p.623].

Musketeers had a complicated system of duty distribution within each military settlement. The orders could have been delivered from both central offices - Order-in-charge office or Musketeer office – and town commanders. Musketeer chief who was the head of *sloboda*, sent musketeers to fulfill orders only in turns one by one in strict sequence[6, p.72]. But musketeer petitions witness that the system failed very often which caused conflicts. The situation was complicated with privileges given to some musketeers, for instance, in cases of fire or illness. A good illustrative example of such conflicts is given in a report sent by a Michailov fortress commander in 1648. It was mentioned there that 69 musketeers under commandment of a *sotnik* Makariy Bukowski suffered from a fire in 1647 and as an answer to their petition they had a half a year privilege granted by the Musketeer office so they could restore their households. The privilege finished on Christmas of

1647. Despite that musketeer chief Pavel Bykov tried to send musketeers of a different sotnik for a duty, which made them protest and send their petition [14, des. 9B. St.131. pp.325-326]. This example shows that queue discipline was crucially important for modus operandi in musketeer settlements.

The system of duty distribution within musketeer settlements took into consideration the fact that some services were burdensome while others on the contrary were profitable as some duties were paid. For example, Don expeditions which were the Turkish and Russian ambassador's convoy on the river Don. So the commander of Donkov fortress wrote to Moscow in 1644 that all the service-men had been chosen for the Don expedition in accordance with their queue [14, des. 12. st.180. p.160].

Another important feature, common for Ryazan and Tula musketeer settlements, was the practice of substitution, when one musketeer hired another to fulfill his duty. That was profitable for both. The one who hired got free time to develop his craft or enterprise. Among musketeers there were blacksmiths, farriers, butchers, shoemakers and even silversmiths. Those who were hired usually had no business of their own and the substitution gave them an opportunity to earn some extra money. So the commanders reported that en-

terpriser musketeers take as a substitute those with no crafts [14, des. 9B. st.39. p.210]. And the government officials turned a blind eye to the practice if one musketeer was substituted by another within one military settlement but strictly suppressed the substitution by people outside sloboda. [10,p.90]. The government authorities reasonably believed that the quality of the service would not suffer from musketeers substituting one another, but it would decline significantly when the duty was fulfilled by non-combatant people both from outside the settlements and within. At the same time the strelets commandment involved musketeers' relatives (children, younger brothers) from within military settlements into fulfilling some of the duties together with their adults. For example, in 1644 Donkov commander assembled 8 musketeers and 5 cossacks with 10 of their children, brothers and nephews to Don expedition to meet and convey a Turkish ambassador [14,des.12, st.180, p.158]. So the authorities tried to prepare youngster for future military service.

We can assume that there took place another phenomenon among musketeers of Ryazan and Tula settlements. It can be called half-service when two people served as a single musketeer sharing all the privilege and duties of a single service-man. It was a

common practice among regiment cossacks who had in their official enrollment papers positions of half-service and even third-service [14, des. 9B. st.138. p.340]. But we have only two vague mentions of such half-service concerning musketeers. And they could not give us an idea of how common the phenomenon was. In an interrogation report of 1641 a michailov strelets Fedka Jukov mentioned that he served his musketeer service together with his comrade Iliya Kornaukhov [14, des. 9A. st.46. p.248]. That could mean both that they were musketeers of equal rank and that they were half-servicemen of a single musketeer service. The other mention of the phenomenon is found in documents about constructing of the Pronsk fortress in 1630. The founder of the castle M.F. Durnoy wrote in his petition that he assigned the construction of a detached tower to half-service musketeers [13, p.163]. It is known that in Pronsk there was only one musketeer sloboda, so we can assume if the practice really existed it could have been executed only among musketeers of a single settlement.

Except the named functional details there were some strict regulations and rules musketeers had to follow. They controlled service-men discipline and

leisure. It was strictly forbidden to gamble, to abuse alcohol, to brawl and to demonstrate any type of inappropriate behavior. But we can find examples that in reality many musketeers disobeyed the rules. For example, excessive drinking [14, des. 9B, st.138, pp.573-574] or wall-to-wall fist fighting between Cossacks and musketeers occurred.

To sum it up we can say that musketeer's isolated settlements had its own complex modus operandi including visiting regime, commanders' control, rules and regulations to follow, system of duty distribution. So sloboda was a complicated phenomenon in Russian military history. At first glance it was a system which kept all the combatants together ready to take orders instantly. The placement of service-men in isolated settlements let musketeers become both military and business units. But the supply management peculiarities as well as excessive economic activities didn't let many musketeer units of the south regions kept their military efficiency at a high level. So we can assess the phenomenon of service-men class sloboda as the transition stage between a medieval feudal army and regular soldier army of Peter the Great.

Список литературы:

1. Акты исторические. Т.IV. СПб., 1842.
2. Александров В. А. Стрелецкое население южных городов России в XVII в. // Новое о прошлом нашей страны. М.: Наука. 1967.
3. Александров В.А. Стрелецкое войско на юге Русского государства в XVII в.: дис. ...канд. ист. наук. М., 1947.
4. Беляев И.Д. Разрядная книга 7123 г. // Временник Об-ва истории и древностей Российских при Московском ун-те. 1849. Кн. 1. С.201-311.
5. Глазьев В.Н. Воронежские стрельцы и их роль в экономическом развитии края //История заселения и хозяйственного освоения Воронежского края в эпоху феодализма. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж.ун-та, 1987. С. 23-33.
6. Дополнения к актам историческим. Т.III. СПб., 1848.
7. Загоровский В.П. Общий очерк заселения и хозяйственного освоения южных окраин России в эпоху зрелого феодализма (XVI - начало XVIII вв.) // История заселения и хозяйственного освоения Воронежского края в эпоху феодализма. Воронеж, 1987. С. 2-23.
8. Зенченко М.Ю. Южное российское порубежье в конце XVI – начале XVII в.: Опыт государственного строительства. М., 2008. 221 с.
9. Книги разрядные, по официальным оных спискам. СПб.:Тип. II Отделения Собственной Его Императорского Величества канцелярии. 1855. Т.II. 1398 с.
10. Марголин С.Л. К вопросу об организации и социальном составе стрелецкого войска в XVII в. // Ученые записки МОПИ. Т. 27. 1953.
11. Мизис Ю.А. Население южнорусского города в XVII-XVIII вв. (на примере Тамбова) // Феодализм в России. М., 1985. С.160-164.
12. Писцовые книги Рязанского края XVI и XVII вв. Рязань:Типография М.С.Орловой. 1900. Т.I. Вып. II. 356 с.
13. Разрядная книга 1637–1638 года. М., 1983.
14. Российский государственный архив древних актов. Фонд 210.
15. Рязань. Материалы для истории города XVI—XVIII столетий. М.: Типография М.Г. Волчанинова. 1884. 158 с.
16. Сметный список 139 году // Временник императорского Общества Истории и Древностей Российских. М. : в Университетской типографии. 1849. Кн. 4. 1849. С.16-51.
17. Труды Рязанской ученой архивной комиссии. Т. II. №7. Рязань. 1887.

References:

1. Akty istoricheskie. T.IV. SPb., 1842.
2. Aleksandrov V. A. Streleckoe naselenie yuzhnyh gorodov Rossii v XVII v. // *Novoe o proshlom nashej strany*. M.: Nauka. 1967.
3. Aleksandrov V.A. Streleckoe vojsko na yuge Russkogo gosudarstva v XVII v.: dis. ...kand. ist. nauk. M., 1947.
4. Belyaev I.D. Razryadnaya kniga 7123 g. // *Vremennik Ob-vaistorii i drevnostej Rossijskih pri Moskovskom un-te*. 1849. Kn. 1. S. 201-311.
5. Glaz'ev V.N. Voronezhskie strel'cy i ihrol' v ehkonomicheskom razvitii kraja // *Istoriya zaseleniya i hozyajstvennogo osvoeniya Voronezhskogo kraja v eh-pohu feodalizma*. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh. un-ta, 1987. S. 23-33.
6. Dopolneniya k aktam istoricheskim. T.III. SPb., 1848.
7. Zagorovskij V.P. Obshchij ocherk zaseleniya i hozyajstvennogo osvoeniya yuzhnyh okrain Rossii v eh-pohu zrelogo feodalizma (XVI - nachalo XVIII vv.) // *Istoriya zaseleniya i hozyajstvennogo osvoeniya Voronezhskogo kraja v eh-pohu feodalizma*. Voronezh, 1987. S. 2-23.
8. Zenchenko M.YU. Yuzhnoe rossijskoe porubezh'e v konce XVI – nachale XVII v.: Opyt gosudarstvennogo stroitel'stva. M., 2008. 221 s.
9. Knigi razryadnye, po oficial'nym ony hspiskam. SPb.: Tip. II Otdeleniya Sobstvennoj Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva kancelyarii. 1855. T.II. 1398 c.
10. Margolin S.L. K voprosu ob organizacii i social'nom sostave streleckogo vojska v XVII v. // *Uch. zap. MOPI*. T. 27. 1953.
11. Mizis Yu.A. Naselenie yuzhnorusskogo goroda v XVII-XVIII vv. (napri-mere Tambova) // *Feodalizm v Rossii*. M., 1985. S. 160-164.
12. Piscovyje knigi Ryazanskogo kraja XVI i XVII vv. Ryazan': Tipografiya M.S. Orlovoj. 1900. T. I. Vyp. II. 356 c.
13. Razryadnaya kniga 1637–1638 goda. M., 1983.
14. Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj arhiv drevnih aktov. Fond 210.
15. Ryazan'. Materialy dlya istorii goroda XVI—XVIII stoletij. M.: Tipografiya M.G. Volchaninova. 1884. 158 s.
16. Smetnyj spisok 139 godu // *Vremennik imperatorskogo Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih*. M. : v Universitetskoj tipografii. 1849. Kn. 4. 1849. S. 16-51.
17. Trudy Ryazanskoj uchenoj arhivnoj komissii. T. II. № 7. Ryazan'. 1887.