

**From:** Daniel Waugh <dwaugh@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>

**Author's Subject:** new book: Trepavlov on Sibirskii iurt

**Date Written:** Sat, 20 Jul 2013 13:05:50 -0700

**Date Posted:** Sun, 20 Jul 2013 16:05:50 -0400

<<http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-EarlySlavic&month=1307&week=c&msg=5TMDNnSbanzgc2ep%2bXQ0Nw&user=&pw=>>

V[adim] V[intserovich] Trepavlov. *Sibirskii iurt posle Ermaka: Kuchum i Kuchumovichi v bor'be za revansh*. Moskva: Vostochnaia literatura, 2012. 231 pp. ISBN 978-5-02-036502-5.

Trepavlov has been working for a good many years on the Turkic peoples on Muscovy's eastern frontiers. His previous books include: *Nogai i Bashkirii, XV-XVIII vv. Kniazheskie rody nogaiskogo proiskhozhdeniia* (1997); *Istoriia Nogaiskoi ordy* (2001); "Belyi tsar." *Obraz monarkha i predstavleniia o poddanstve u narodov Rossii XV-XVIII vv.* (2007). His new book addresses a gap in our knowledge of the fate of the Siberian Chingizids.

The author admits that both parts of his title are not exactly accurate, in that the "iurt" in became at best a moving target and the goal of punishing the Muscovites for having deposed Kuchum seems not to have been the primary concern of his heirs. Some of the Siberian Chingizids ended up in Russian captivity and exile in the Russian north, but their fate is not the real concern here. (He refers the reader to A. V. Beliakov's *Chingisidy v Rossii XV-XVII vekov* [2011].) Rather, Trepavlov explores the history of those who remained in Siberia, a somewhat bedraggled remnant that struggled for survival against rival indigenous groups, raided to be able to eat, and found themselves squeezed between an expanding Muscovy and the substantial threat from the Kalmyks. Since the source base here includes a fair amount of previously untapped archival material, there should be quite a bit new for historians of Siberia and the northern fringes of Central Asia, but, as the author admits, the Russian perspective of his source base limits what one can learn the socio-economic history of the "nomads." I, for one, would like to know more about their relations with the "Bukharan" merchants, who crop up here only in passing.

I wonder whether a more nuanced reading of some of the material in the Russian sources, along the lines of what some Western scholars (e.g., Michael Khodarkovsky, Brian Boeck and Matthew Romaniello) have been doing in their examination of Muscovite relations with the steppe peoples, would take us a bit farther than Trepavlov's rather conventional approach that emphasizes conflict and confrontation. He cites Khodarkovsky once or twice, but presumably would not have been able to incorporate some of the newer work which is now essential reading for those who would wish to understand the processes of Muscovite empire building and the response to it by those over whom the Muscovite government was claiming suzerainty. The evidence here certainly reinforces arguments about the unevenness and slow pace of the absorption of ostensibly conquered territories into the "elusive empire" (Romaniello's term).

Among the more curious episodes in this story are the missions sent by Kuchum's heirs to Moscow, in order to obtain permission to visit their

relatives who had been re-settled in Kargopol' and Beloozero. An appendix includes previously unpublished documents relating to these missions in 1639 and 1668-69. The book has a bibliography, a genealogical tree for the descendants of Kuchum, and a general index.