

Elite Service Registry in Muscovy, 1500-1700*

Marshall Poe

Draft: Not for Citation

Thanks to recent studies of Old Russian administration, our understanding of the Muscovite chancellery system has been significantly enhanced. We now know how the system as a whole grew over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries — when particular *priказы* (“chancelleries”) rose and fell, the duties and jurisdictions of each, and the pattern of hierarchy among them.¹ We know much more about the personnel who staffed the system — how many administrators there were, what types, what their respective duties were, and how they were remunerated.² Finally, we are presently getting a much clearer picture of the way in which the system penetrated the countryside, bringing state control, organizing settlement, extracting resources, and mobilizing service groups.³ As a result of these advances, the text-book depiction of Muscovite administration as ignorant, poorly organized, and corrupt must be revised.

In this essay I propose to further the review of the chancellery system by bringing attention to a force that transformed Old Russian administration and indeed had a significant impact on Muscovite society — the explosion of documentation into all aspects of governmental activity, and the growth of what I call “administrative literacy.” Administrative literacy is the ability to use various forms of writing — narratives, lists, indices, files and tables, among others — to manage information in organizations.⁴ The role of administrative literacy in the mobilization of a state’s resources has been little studied.⁵ Some scholars of Muscovy have noted the growing importance of paperwork and

*I would like to thank A. Bulichev, E. Keenan, O. Kosheleva and B. Morozov for their generous assistance. The judicious comments of an anonymous reader at Russian History improved the essay greatly, as did the suggestions of Richard Hellie. Research was facilitated by grants from the Social Science Research Council and the International Research and Exchange Board. A note on translations. All of the Russian terms (for the most part, documentary names) in the text are attested in Muscovite sources. After the first appearance of each term, I provide an English translation in quotation marks. Translations are used thereafter. Attested terms (mostly ranks, such as boiar) are sometimes left in the original Russian throughout. When this is the case, a brief translation is provided without quotation marks at the first usage. A glossary of all terms denoting documentary types is appended to the essay.

¹P. B. Brown, “Muscovite Government Bureaus,” *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 10 (1983) and *idem*, “Early Modern Russian Bureaucracy: the Evolution of the Chancellery System from Ivan III to Peter the Great, 1478-1717,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1978).

²N. F. Demidova, *Sluzhbilaiia biurokratīia v Rossii XVII v. i ee rol’ v formirovanii absolutizma* (Moscow: Nauka, 1987).

³See B. Davies, “Town Governors in the Reign of Ivan IV,” *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 14 (1987): 77-143; *idem*, “The Role of Town Governors in the Defense and Military Colonization of Muscovy’s Southern Frontier: The Case of Kozlov, 1635-1638,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1983); and, V. Kivelson, “Community and the State: The Political Culture of Seventeenth-Century Muscovy and the Provincial Gentry of the Vladimir-Suzdal’ Region,” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1988).

⁴It has long been recognized that there are distinct degrees and even types of literacy. See, for example, C. Marvin, “Literacy,” in *The International Encyclopedia of Communications*, 4 vols. (New York: Oxford UP, 1989), 2: 440-41; J. Goody, *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1977), 31; and, in a medieval context, F. H. Bauml, “Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy,” *Speculum* 55, no. 2 (1980): 237-65. The sort of literacy I wish to mark out here has been termed “pragmatic literacy” by M. Parkes, “The Literacy of the Laity,” in D. Daiches and A. Thorlby, eds., *The Medieval World* (New York: Aldus Books, 1973), 555-77 and “practical literacy” by M. Clancy, *From Memory to Written Record, England, 1066-1307* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1979), 258-66. The implications of these terms are obvious: this is the sort of nuts-and-bolts literacy one uses instrumentally, to “get things done.” However, the sorts of things one does with practical literacy differ among themselves. Therefore I have chosen to narrow our focus by defining a species of practical literacy used by government functionaries — “administrative literacy.”

⁵On the claim that better communications — including record-keeping — facilitate increases social complexity and organizational power, see J. Goody, *Logic of Writing and the Organization of Society* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1987), 91-92 and R.

literacy in the chancelleries⁶, though no one has thought to study it in detail.⁷ And indeed much of what had been said regarding Old Russian record-keeping paints an unduly dim picture of the scribe's craft.⁸ In what follows, I will trace the rise of a particular species of documents which I believe reflects the advance of administrative literacy — Muscovite service registers. These documents were designed to record the status, remuneration, assignments, and whereabouts of servitors high and low. I will first discuss the growth of the *Razriadnyi prikaz* ("Military Service Chancellery"), the institution charged with the maintenance of upper-level service registers. I will show that the Chancellery grew demographically, became more sophisticated institutionally, and engineered a set of documents and procedures to expedite case processing. I will then offer an overview of the articulation of the various upper-level service registers kept in the Military Service Chancellery. I will conclude with some thoughts on the prospects for further study of administrative literacy.

The Growth of the Military Service Chancellery

The origins, and indeed entire history, of the Military Service Chancellery are bound up with service registry. In the late fifteenth century the court began to keep records of military service, and it is from this embryo that the Chancellery grew. In the 1530s, the first institution recognizable as a predecessor of the Military Service Chancellery appears, the "*Razriad*." Some two decades later, probably in conjunction with a reform of military service, the term "*Razriadnaia izba*" — Military Service Office — is attested for the first time, though it no doubt designates an institution which had existed for some time. By the early seventeenth century, the Military Service Chancellery was perhaps the most important and surely one of the largest institutions in the entire state.⁹ The rapid development of the Military Service Chancellery was primarily due to the expansion of the military forces under the Chancellery's control: Muscovite armies

Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality. Studies in the Technology of Communication* (New York: Blackwell, 1977), 18-19. The specific link between information and state power is treated, albeit schematically, in M. Weber, *Economy and Society*, 2 vols. (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1978), 2: 973; H. Innis, *Empire and Communication* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972), *passim*; A. Giddens, *Violence and the Nation-State* (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1985), 41-49; Goody, *Logic of Writing*, chapter 3.

⁶Both R. Hellie and D. Kaiser have noted that the development of Russian law in the early modern period clearly indicates the rising importance of documentation in Russian society. According to Hellie, "late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century Muscovy was making the transition from an oral to documentary society, one in which the possession of properly and accurately executed documents was crucial for many aspects of life." See R. Hellie, *Slavery in Russia, 1450-1725* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1982), 603 and D. Kaiser, *The Growth of the Law in Medieval Russia* (Princeton: Princeton UP), 153-163. Also see, for an earlier period, S. Franklin, "Literacy and Documentation in Early Medieval Russia," *Speculum* 60, no. 1 (1985): 1-38.

⁷The obvious exception here, and one crucial for the present purpose, is the large and rich literature on Muscovite sources. Studies in this vein are, however, normally considered auxiliary to the writing of social, political or other forms of history.

⁸For example, B. Chicherin writes: "In case processing [in the chancelleries] there was neither legally established order, nor general written forms for documents and audits, nor regular periods for the processing of cases or correspondence with superior authorities. Everything was determined by tradition and convenience, legal regulations were few, and those there were defined not a general order, but rather particular cases, especially where the interests of the state were involved." (*Oblastnye uchrezhdeniia Rossii v XVII v.* (Moscow: Tip. A. Senena, 1856), 270.) Kliuchevskii describes the chancelleries as "a mass of institutions, having arisen at various times, without any general plan, according to the dictates and needs of the moment." The system, he writes, "wasted much paper and time, [and] committed not a few administrative errors." (See *Kurs Russkoi istorii*, 5 vols. (Moscow: Gos. sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe izd-vo, 1937), 2: 373.) J. Keep explains the "inefficiency" of Old Russian central administration (in part) with reference to the "lack of proper record-keeping procedures, inadequate knowledge of arithmetic (Arabic numerals were introduced to Russia by Peter I), and the complexities of contemporary orthography and grammar." He also calls Muscovite record-keeping as "cumbersome." (See *Soldiers of the Tsar. Army and Society in Russia, 1462-1874* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985), 31-34.)

⁹For a brief characterization of the history of the Military Service Chancellery, see Brown, "Muscovite Government Bureaus," 323-24.

grew steadily in the period under consideration.¹⁰ Another spur to growth was the widening of the Chancellery's authority to include much of the western and the entire southern frontiers, as well as the operations of several smaller chancelleries in the later seventeenth century.¹¹

The expansion of the administrative competence of the Chancellery led to the growth of its staff and to functional differentiation. At the end of the 1620s there was one *dummyi d'iaki* ("consular state secretaries"), two *prikaznye d'iaki* ("state secretaries"), and forty-five *pod'iachie* ("clerks") employed there.¹² Late in the century we discover one boiar, two counselor state secretaries, four state secretaries, and two hundred and forty-two clerks.¹³ The Military Service Chancellery evolved complex internal organizations to meet increasing administrative demands. First, we see the development of a hierarchical command structure within the largest chancelleries. The Military Service Chancellery and other institutions of its size would be headed by one or two counselor state secretaries, the highest grade of chancellery personnel.¹⁴ They served as the chancellery's *sud'i* ("judges"), the chief executives of the institution. Directly below the counselor state secretaries, we find the state secretaries, functionaries in charge of the day-to-day affairs of the chancellery. Under their command were the foot-soldiers of Muscovite administration, the numerous clerks. This group was in turn divided into three grades, each senior to the next: *starye* ("senior"), *srednie* ("middling") and *molodye* ("junior").¹⁵ Each level within the Military Service Chancellery was compensated according to a highly structured yet responsive pay-scale, and advancement through the ranks was orderly and to a significant degree meritocratic.¹⁶ A second sort of internal evolution concerns the emergence of functional and territorial divisions within the major chancelleries, the *stoly* ("bureaus"). The Military Service Chancellery had as many as twelve bureaus in the seventeenth century.¹⁷ The bureaus were sometimes further broken down into *ponyŭ'ia* ("sections"), as were the larger provincial chancellery offices. The *moskovskii stol* ("Moscow bureau"), to take a particularly pertinent example, had special divisions for each of the major service registers I will speak of below.¹⁸ These internal divisions marked out spheres of

¹⁰See R. Hellie, *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1971), 267ff.

¹¹Brown, "Muscovite Government Bureaus," 323-24.

¹²Demidova, *Službilaia biurokratiia*, 22-24.

¹³S. K. Bogoiavlenskii, *Prikaznye sud'i XVII veka* (Moscow-Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1946), 37 and Demidova, *Službilaia biurokratiia*, 44.

¹⁴There were only three or four *prikazy* as large and complex as the late-seventeenth century Military Service Chancellery. The *Posol'skii* ("Diplomatic") and *Pomest'nyi* ("Service Land") would definitely rank with it.

¹⁵On the various grades of personnel in the chancelleries, see Demidova, *Službilaia biurokratiia*, 147-89; B. Plavsic, "Seventeenth-Century Chanceries and their Staffs," in D. K. Rowney and W. M. Pintner, eds., *Russian Officialdom: the Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the 17th to the 20th Century* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of Carolina UP, 1980), 19-45; and Brown, "Early Modern Russian Bureaucracy."

¹⁶See Demidova, *Službilaia biurokratiia*, 76-79, 86-89, 90-147, and 153-65; Plavsic, "Seventeenth-Century Chanceries," 27; and S. K. Bogoiavlenskii, "Prikaznye d'iaki XVII veka," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 1 (1937): 220-39. Each chancellery and local office set its own pay scales in accordance to its own sources of revenue.

¹⁷They were: *moskovskii* ("Moscow"), *vladimirskii* ("Vladimir"), *novgorodskii* ("Novgorod"), *sevskii* ("Sevsk"), *belgorodskii* ("Belgorod"), *kienskii* ("Kiev"), *kazanskii* ("Kazan"), *smolenskii* ("Smolensk"), *denezhnyi* ("Monetary"), *pomestnyi* ("service land") and *prikaznyi* ("chancellery"). On the desks of the *Razriad*, see: N. Zagoskin, *Stoly razriadnogo prikaza* (Kazan: Tip. Imp. un-ta, 1878); G. Golombievskii, "Stoly razriadnogo prikaza," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvetsheniia* (hereafter "ZhMNP") (1890), no. 6: 1-17; and S. Bogoiavlenskii, "K voprosu o stolakh razriadnogo prikaza," *ZhMNP* (1894), no. 6: 401-403.

¹⁸M. P. Lukichev, "Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskie istochnik," (K.D., MGIAI, 1984), 121. More generally on regional and functional subdivisions within the chancelleries, and the assignment of staffs to them, see Demidova, *Službilaia biurokratiia*, 153-56.

competence within which particular state secretaries and clerks sometimes specialized.¹⁹ And the Military Service Chancellery was not alone in this: the *Pomestnyi* (“Service Land”), *Posol’skii* (“Diplomatic”) and other major chancelleries were similarly divided and sub-divided.²⁰

The secretariat of the Military Service Chancellery, in conjunction with the staffs of other chancelleries, developed a set of standard documents and procedures to handle efficiently the cases with which it dealt.²¹ Let us look at an ideal-typical example of case processing in the seventeenth-century Military Service Chancellery. Our case will be that of a *chelobit’e* (“petition”) for an increase in *oklad* (“entitlement”) submitted to the Moscow bureau of the Military Service Chancellery by a *moskovskii dvorianin* (military servitor on the “Moscow list”).²² The petition itself is of course the first document in the *delo* (“case”).²³ Pay increases were not granted without formal petition in Muscovy, which helps accounts for their volume in chancellery administrative materials.²⁴ It, like all the documents which eventually accompanied it, followed a strict diplomatic form.²⁵ A petition would be written by an experienced hand. Drafting official paper was then, as now, a profession of sorts, requiring skill, training, and knowledge of diplomatics.²⁶ It was

¹⁹Plavsic, “Seventeenth-Century Chanceries,” 25-31 makes the strongest argument for specialization within spheres. Brown, “Early Modern Russian Bureaucracy,” 280-83 points out that though some specialization within institutions and careers may have developed, it had no real legal standing. Shifting and mixed competence were the rule among and within the chancelleries.

²⁰Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 153-54.

²¹On sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Muscovite case processing, see Shmidt and Kniaz’kov, *Dokumenty deloproizvodstva*; M. N. Tikhomirov, “Prikaznoe deloproizvodstvo v XVII v.,” in *idem*, ed., *Rossiiskoe gosudarstvo XV-XVII vekov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1973), 348-83; and K. G. Mitiaev, *Istoriia i organizatsiia deloproizvodstva v SSSR* (Moscow: MGIAI, 1959).

²²This example was constructed from materials found in the archive of the Moscow bureau of the Military Service Chancellery, the nerve center of rank processing for those serving at court (*Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov* (hereafter “RGADA”), *fond* 210, *opis’* 9, *stolbets* 622 (hereafter “st. 622”). Judging by the superscript inscribed on fol. 521 *verso* of the scroll — its seventeenth-century cataloging description, so to speak — it comprised documents to be used in the drafting of a new *boiarskii spisok* (“boiar list,” see below) in 1685/1686. In any case, the scroll is definitely related to rank processing: it consists of 187 petitions, the vast majority of which concerns requests for increased entitlements, from servitors on the *moskovskii spisok* (“Moscow list”) together with a good portion of the ancillary materials used to process the same. Given the financial nature of the collected texts, it seems likely that the superscript indicates either a *boiarskaia kniga* (“boiar book,” which recorded such fiscal data: see below) or simply the group designated by the term “boiarskii spisok.” As Shmidt and Kniaz’kov, *Dokumenty deloproizvodstva*, 28-30, point out, Muscovite documentary names show a certain instability, so any of these interpretations seems possible. On this scroll and the collection of materials for service register drafting, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 127-30.

²³Though the petitions in st. 622 are frequently found without supporting materials, whenever they are present they are in order behind the petition. See, for example, the petition of I. M. Ivashkin which is followed by a *skazka* (“deposition”) and an internal *vypis’* (“report”) (st. 622, fol. 83-85). Thus we are perfectly justified in calling this and similar materials “cases” or “dossiers,” and in fact this is the way Muscovite administrators spoke, using the term *delo*. On this usage, see the *Slovar’ russkogo iazyka XI-XVII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974-), entry for “delo.”

²⁴Keep, *Soldiers*, 35-36.

²⁵On the diplomatics of petitions, see Shmidt and Kniaz’kov, *Dokumenty deloproizvodstva*, 40-41 and H. Dewey and A. Kleimola, “The Petition (*chelobitnaia*) as an Old Russian Literary Genre,” *The Slavic and East European Journal* 14 (1970): 284-301. The style of such documents was, albeit erratically, legislated. See *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* 45 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1830-1884; Tip. otdeleniia Sobstvennoi E. I. V. Kantseliarii) (hereafter “PSZ”), 2: nos. 677, 709, 715, 820, and 964.

²⁶On the profession and its requirements generally, see Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 165-75. There are many hints of professionalization among seventeenth-century administrators. Within the chancelleries schools were formed in the second half of the seventeenth century to train future state scribes: see *ibid.*, 43 for one such school in the Service Land Chancellery. In the provinces training was primarily through apprenticeships (especially of the sons of clerks), though schools of sorts were not unknown: see G. A. Leont’eva, “Organizatsiia prikaznogo deloproizvodstva v Sibiri i professional’naia podgotovka sibirskikh pod’iachikh v XVII v.,” in E. I. Solov’eva, ed., *Razvitiie kul’tury sibirskoi derevni v XVII-nachala XX vv.* (Novosibirsk: Novosibirskii gos. ped. in-ta, 1986), 3-19. Further signs of professionalization are that qualifications and diplomatic standards were legislated (though in an *ad hoc* fashion), and that competency reviews were regularly undertaken. See Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 62.

paid work and was practiced by, in order of expertise, literate service men, priests, *ploshchadnye pod'iachie* (“town-square clerks”) and moonlighting chancellery personnel.²⁷ Moreover, it does not seem unlikely that the mothers, wives, and daughters of members of each of these groups served as scribes as well.

Regardless of who drafted the petition, its most important part consisted of a chronological list of heroic feats, service assignments, and sacrifices suffered for the greater glory of the tsar. It was for these reasons, the petitioner argued, that his entitlement should be increased. Before moving on, it should be noted that such lists were frequently compiled from extracts of “official” service registers, registers which were actively copied and collected by servitors themselves (see below). Petitioners thus buttressed their claims for increased entitlements with references to the government’s own records.

After the petition was received, it was given a preliminary review by a state secretary or senior clerk. If the petition involved no complications, it was passed on for processing; if it contained some special request or complaint — something which could not be dealt with by the Moscow bureau — a *pometa* (“note”) was written on the *verso* to the effect that the case should be processed and submitted to superior authorities for decision. In the latter case, a *dokladnaia vypis'* (“appeal”) would be drafted, issued to the director of the Military Service Chancellery, to the boiar council, or to the tsar himself, and the final decision — *imennoi ukaz* (“edict of the tsar”) or *prigovor* (“order,” usually in the name of the boiars) — would be appended to the case.²⁸ Let us imagine, however, that our petition is of the simpler variety.

The first step in the processing of such a petition was to conduct a review of the petitioner’s record. In the idiom of the chancelleries, the verb used here was *vypisat'* (“to extract,” in this context, “to report”), and the product was a *vypis'* (“report”) or *spravka* (“check”).²⁹ Drafting a report involved going to the service registers kept in the archive of the Moscow bureau and extracting (here, *vypisat'*) the entries which touched on the petitioner’s activities. These items were

²⁷On literacy among the service classes, see C. Stevens, “Belgorod: Notes on Literacy and Language in the Seventeenth-Century Russian Army,” *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 7 (1980): 113-24. Only one document in st. 622 shows any sign of having been written by a serviceman. Fol. 298 is a *posluzhnoi spisok* (“service rescript”: on these, see B. N. Morozov, “Sluzhebnye i rodoslovnye dokumenty v chastnykh arkhivakh XVII v. (k postanovke voprosa),” in V. I. Buganov, ed., *Issledovaniia po istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR dookt'iabrskogo perioda* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1982), 80). These were lists of services solicited from *dvoriane*, here M. I. syn Kobylskoi, by the Moscow bureau. Its primary drafter (there are two hands) wrote in the first person and in a language much too lively for the staid conventions of chancellery practice (e.g., describing a particular campaign in which he served he writes: “kak duraki pobezhali” — “when we ran like idiots”). He also appears to have initialed the document. The list of services has been checked and corrected by another hand, probably that of the responsible clerks. Many of the documents in st. 622 were signed by servicemen or their (male) family members: see fol. 53 *verso* and fol. 234 *verso*. Several of the articles in st. 622 indicate a clerical hand, particularly when a signature was required and the principal was unlettered. It is easy to imagine that many of the petitions in st. 622 were drafted by town-square clerks: all are diplomatically correct and the vast majority are written in an excellent hand. As these artisans did not sign their work, there is nothing but weak circumstantial evidence of this. On the town-square clerks generally, see M. F. Zlotnikov, “Pod'iachie Ivanovskoi ploshchadi. K istorii notariata Moskovskoi rusi,” in *Sbornik statei, posviashchennykh A. S. Lappo-Danilevskomu (Istoricheskoe obozrenie* 21 (1916): 82-130), and Brown, “Early Modern Russian Bureaucracy,” 111-15. It stands to reason that some of our petitions were written by moonlighting chancellery personnel. Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiiia*, 141-46 makes clear that much of their income derived from “private” work. The only indication of this is that fol. 53 *verso* is signed by a *pod'iachii* in place of the principal.

²⁸The “simple” cases almost always involved routine requests for a new entitlement after appointment to a new rank (*povertat' okladom*, “to determine an entitlement”: see, for example, st. 622, fol. 74, a petition from A. I. Bezobrazov), or for a simple raise after the completion of a string of concrete deeds (*spravit' pridachu*, “to figure a raise”: see st. 622, fol. 41, a petition from S. Sobakin). The “complex” cases ordinarily relate to monetary petitions from chancellery personnel — counselor state secretaries, state secretaries, clerks (see st. 622, fol. 376, 6 and 98 respectively) — or requests for relief from service due to old age (fol. 282), sickness (fol. 232), or private business (fol. 28).

²⁹For orders to produce reports, see st. 622, fol. 221-24 and 410-11 (bearing the construction *vypisat' kogo-to*, “to draft a report on someone”), and fol. 234, 487, and 499 (*u vypiski skazal...*, “at the investigation he said...”).

then compiled into chronological lists, comprising the substance of the report itself.³⁰ If a register was damaged, missing, or the relevant information was for some reason missing, this was noted (the Military Service Chancellery and Service Land Chancellery kept lists of damaged registers).³¹ If important information was available from another chancellery, a *pamiat'* (“memo”) was written and sent explaining the matter in full and detailing exactly what was needed.³² The receiving chancellery would then draft a report, write it into a memo and send it back. This second, or foreign memo would then be rewritten into the original report of the home chancellery, here the Moscow bureau of the Military Service Chancellery.³³ If additional information was required, the petitioner, his representative, or a witness for him might be deposed. Such *skazki* (“depositions”) were usually not required in simple entitlement increase requests, but they can occasionally be found. They were always dated and signed, either by the deponent or his representative.³⁴

The final element in the report was a proposal for an entitlement increase. Though the petition itself would not suggest any specific figure, its author might well indicate that he understood himself to be entitled to a raise within a definite range. An expression commonly found in petitions such as ours does just this with a request for an allotment *protiv moei brat'i*, i.e., “to be treated as one’s peers.”³⁵ The entitlement proposal section of the report mirrors this hint of standard pay scales based on the treatment of equals equally. It lists *primery* (“precedents”), drawn from the service registers, of the entitlements of servitors with profiles approximating that of the petitioner.³⁶ These precedents, we might imagine, added an air of equity to this rather delicate procedure. Though it probably wouldn’t be wise to say entitlement determinations were legally grounded in precedent-based pay scales, they were hardly arbitrary. In addition,

³⁰These reports were often headed *v razriade vypisano* (“extracted from [the archive] of the Military Service Chancellery”), particularly the formal reports which accompanied the “complex” cases cited above. “Simple” cases lack this header, but include the list of services extracted from the registers. Sources — boiar books, boiar lists, temporary service lists and various minor personnel lists — are frequently cited for each entry in the list. See the case of E. D. Pashkov, st. 622, fol. 54-56.

³¹For a list of damaged registers from 1696, see RGADA, *fond 1209 (pomestnyi prikaz)*, *opis' 1, chast' 1*, kn. 269. Also see the request from the *sudnye prikazy* (judicial chancelleries) to various towns to send copies of documents lost in a fire (PSZ, 2: no. 965).

³²Muscovite administrative communications were governed by strict diplomatic conventions: writing up the hierarchy required a supplicational form (e.g., a petition or a dispatch); writing down required a decree of some sort (e.g., an edict or a writ of the tsar); writing across required a memo. See Tikhomirov, “Prikaznoe deloproizvodstvo.”

³³The documents in st. 622 contain many orders to send dispatches and memos bearing requests for information: *poslat' pamiat' v chet* (“send a memo to the fiscal bureau”: fol. 29 verso); *otpisat' v pomestnyi prikaz* (“write to the Service Land Chancellery”: fol. 520); *otpisat' v moskovskoi stol k boiarskomu spisku* (“write to the Boiar List [Division] at the Moscow Bureau [of the Military Service Chancellery]”: fol. 73). Many responses to such queries — the memos themselves — are found there as well: from the *prikaz kazanskogo dvortsa* (“The Kazan Court Chancellery”), fol. 17-18; from the *inozemskii prikaz* (“Foreigner’s Prikaz,” dealing with mercenaries), fol. 19-22; from the *streletskii prikaz* (“Musketry Chancellery”), fol. 70-70a; and from the Service Land Chancellery, fol. 425.

³⁴In st. 622, depositions come in two varieties, embedded and separate. In the former case, the actual deposition does not survive, we have only the report of the deposition written into a *vypis'*. See, for example, the imbedded *skazka* taken from A.A. Musin-Pushkin pursuant to his request to be relieved from service (fol. 103-6). This sort of deposition was closely related to the physical *osmotr* (“examination”) of servitors claiming dissabilities. See fol. 106 (*po osmotru v razriade...skazal...*, “at the review in the Military Service Chancellery...he said...”), 233-35 and 252. The separate depositions differ from the embedded ones in that they have a distinct formulary including an oath. See fol. 32, 84 and 204 for examples. The separate depositions would seem to be the product of a swearing ceremony (*privesiti k vere*, “bring to the faith”) mentioned in fol. 344.

³⁵The *protiv* formulation was used in a variety of contexts in st. 622. We find *protiv svoego chinu* (“according to my station”: fol. 120); *protiv moei brat'i* (“as my peers”: fol. 118); and *protiv ottsa moego* (“as my father”: fol. 307) in petitions, as well as orders to figure new salary levels *protiv nykykh takikh* (“as others such as this”: fol. 70 verso) in an edict written on the verso of a petition. On the use of this expression in administrative contexts generally, see Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 118.

³⁶See the precedents listed in the report accompanying state secretary V. Berezin’s petition (fol. 8-9). On the use of precedents to figure rewards, see Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 118.

the system of precedents also served a fiscal function: it prevented clerks from assigning entitlements in excess of available funds.

The capstone of the case was the *ukaz* (“edict”) deciding the fate of the petitioner’s request. If the report part of the case was discarded — and this was frequently the case with simple petitions such as ours — the decree was written on the *verso*.³⁷ If, on the other hand, the entire case was preserved, it was written along the *recto* seams of adjoining leaves to comprise what is called a *skrepa* (“authentication”).³⁸ This device validated the document, ensuring that all the leaves belonged to one case and that nothing could be interpolated. Decrees of either sort had common formularies: “On such-and-such a date the grand prince favored Ivan Ivanovich and ordered that he be granted an entitlement of such-and-such lands and such-and-such moneys.” Sometimes we read, “According to the grand prince’s edict of such-and-such a date...”

After the case was complete, two things remained to be done. One of them, surprisingly, was not to notify the petitioner of the outcome: the sources I examined are silent about how this information was passed. In any case, the new entitlement had to be recorded in the relevant service registers. This is demonstrated by the notes frequently found on the *verso* of requests for entitlement increases, *napisat’ v knigu* (“to be written in the book”).³⁹ Further, we know that the registers were constantly updated, as is evident from the frequent amendments found in them. The final moment in the active life of the case was its storage in the Moscow bureau’s archive. The last note written on the *verso* of a petition such as ours is *vzjat’ v stolp* (“affix [this case] to the scroll”). To which scroll is never explicitly indicated. However, the clerk given the materials must have known, insofar as the bureaus themselves were divided into functionally distinct subsections, e.g., one dealing with incoming petitions from the *moskovskie chiny* (“Moscow ranks”), another dealing with the compilation of new service registers, etc.⁴⁰ Furthermore, the scrolls of the Military Service Chancellery were sorted topically, e.g., materials related to the construction of service lists for a given year were collected in one scroll. Thus *vzjat’ v stolp* meant, in essence, “file this case in the appropriate place.”

All this attention to classification of materials aside, the scroll was not a very efficient storage device in terms of retrieval of materials. In order for a particular case to be found, the entire bundle had to be unrolled and reviewed — obviously a very cumbersome process in a roll containing several hundred petitions. However, this was in all probability rarely if ever done. The important information in the petitions, e.g., the final sum of the entitlement, was extracted and written into easily handled books, some of which we will discuss below.

This example, albeit ideal-typical, demonstrates the elegant simplicity of late Muscovite case processing. The various documents used to expedite this matter — petitions, reports, memos, appeals, dispatches, depositions, entries, edicts, notes, and others — were general instruments, having distinct and recognizable diplomatic form. They were not drafted to suit particular types of cases, but adapted to them. In our own terms they are recognizable as “forms” or “blanks.”

³⁷A typical example is st. 622, fol. 69 *verso*: “On July 15, 1684 the grand prince has shown favor and ordered that a land entitlement of five hundred *cheti* and a monetary entitlement of twenty rubles be apportioned to him.” Following this and in another hand we have the in-house directive “Process [this matter] according to the edict of the grand prince.”

³⁸See st. 622, fol. 398-403.

³⁹See st. 622, fol. 56, 193, and 465 *verso*.

⁴⁰On this functional division, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 121-27 and Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 182.

Indeed, some of them, memos for example, were penned in just this fashion, with the particulars such as dates and names omitted.⁴¹

To conclude, the growth of the Military Service Chancellery, the unfolding of a hierarchy of command within it, and the elaboration of a complex set of diplomatic instruments together indicate a general rise in administrative literacy. This rise was occasioned by increasingly weighty administrative requirements brought on by the pressures of state-building. In a broader perspective we can see that the Military Service Chancellery — and with it, I presume, the entire chancellery system — was under what some anthropologists have termed “scalar” or “communication stress.”⁴² As the size of organizations increases, once ready means of communication and control become overloaded. New, more complex structures must be engineered. Increases in complexity ordinarily move along two dimensions — height, i.e., the number of levels in an organization, and width, i.e., the number of organizationally distinct sub-units in the structure.⁴³ As we have seen, the Military Service Chancellery became taller — more levels of secretaries — and wider — more bureaus. The same is of course true of the entire chancellery system: major chancelleries subordinated a number of minor chancelleries, effectively producing administrative levels⁴⁴, and the total number of chancelleries expanded.⁴⁵ And, as the level of complexity grew, so too did the level of administrative literacy, measured by the number and sophistication of documents and procedures employed to various ends. Let us now look more closely at the advances made in administrative literacy by the Military Service Chancellery’s secretariat in the sphere of service registry.

Muscovite Service Registry

Service registry was extremely important in Muscovy, and probably more so than elsewhere in early modern Europe. This is true for two related reasons. First, the sixteenth-century Muscovite elite was apparently too cash-poor to follow the Western lead and hire modern infantry forces in large numbers. Fiscal restraints (together with other considerations, military and political) forced the elite to maintain a large cavalry army long after such forces had become outmoded.⁴⁶ Second, the Muscovites were quite hesitant to grant military and administrative autonomy to local powers. In the post-feudal West, local authorities could be vested with both military and administrative duties, reducing expenditures. The

⁴¹Frequently we find the dates left out in memos: see st. 622, fol. 2, 10, 19 and many others. In other memos the introductory formulary is in one ink and the detailed body is in another, suggesting pre-preparation: see st. 622, fol. 44 and 273-74.

⁴²On this concept, see: G. A. Johnson, “Information Sources and the Development of Decision-Making Organizations,” in C. L. Redman, ed. et al., *Social Archeology. Beyond Subsistence and Dating* (New York: Academic Press, 1978), 87-112; *idem*, “Organizational Structure and Scalar Stress,” in C. Renfrew, ed. et al., *Theory and Explanation in Archeology* (New York: Academic Press, 1982), 389-421; *idem*, “Decision-Making Organization and Pastoral Nomad Camp Size,” *Human Ecology* 11, no. 2 (1983): 175-99; and R. L. Meyer, “Communications Stress,” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 3 (1972): 289-313.

⁴³This is by no means the only way to measure organizations. On the study of organizational dimensions and the literature concerning it, see W. R. Scott, “Organizational Structure,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 1 (1975): 1-20.

⁴⁴On hierarchy among the chancelleries, see Brown, “Muscovite Government Bureaus,” 283.

⁴⁵In 1550 there were no well-articulated chancelleries; in 1626 there were 44; and in 1698 there were 55, each with a more or less distinct territorial or functional sphere of activity. See Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 23. The number of all-governmental chancelleries remained relatively stable after the 1620s. To get an idea of the range of matters handled by the chancelleries, see Brown, “Muscovite Government Bureaus,” 269-330.

⁴⁶See Helle, *Enserfment, passim*. Militarily, the cavalry was largely sufficient for Muscovy’s defensive needs prior to the beginning of major operations against Western forces in the later sixteenth and especially the seventeenth century.

Muscovites did some of this, but in general they seem to have insisted on centralized control.⁴⁷ Unable to buy an army and unwilling to delegate authority, the elite solved its manpower problems in the sixteenth century by extending a requirement for service to all landholders (and indeed the subject population as a whole). To be sure, the upper service classes were remunerated for their military and administrative labor, but only irregularly in cash. The primary form of compensation for a service class cavalryman was land with bonded peasant labor which he could tax as he might. And there was no question of the granting of political power in exchange for service. Thus the elite mobilized significant military and administrative resources without large fiscal outlays or the division of authority. However, there was a hidden cost to this otherwise efficient technique. Instead of the relatively simple procedure of tracking incoming taxes and out-going expenditures to military enterprisers, or of issuing writs to local lords allowing them to rule or muster forces, the Muscovite chancelleries had to record the rendering of services by the entire service elite. This, as we will presently see, generated an enormous amount of paperwork.

We obviously cannot review the entire panoply of Muscovite service registers, or even all those kept by the Military Service Chancellery, in this forum. Therefore I will treat only those registers recording the activities of the *sluzhbilie ludi po otechestvu* (“servitors by birth”), i.e., those whose status, though not rank, was heritable.⁴⁸ The men (and families) recorded in the lists I will presently detail were the center of the Muscovite political and administrative system, as well as the backbone of the cavalry army. In broad strokes, three groups may be said to have comprised the category of heritable servitors: the upper court elite (the so-called *dumnye chiny*, or “counselor ranks”), the upper service elite (primarily the *moskovskie dvoriane*, but other ranks as well), and, below them, the provincial service class (*dvoriane i deti boiarskie*, privileged cavalymen assigned to service in towns and forts).⁴⁹

Let us begin our catalogue with the *rodoslovnye knigi* (“genealogical books”). These books recorded genealogical information concerning the grand princely and elite service families. They have been much studied.⁵⁰ However, only two have been published.⁵¹ It may seem paradoxical to place documents whose manifest purpose was to record genealogy under the rubric of service registry. The paradox is more apparent than real: as is now well established, the opportunity to serve at court could only be won by accident of birth, at least after the mid-fifteenth century when we see the emergence of the first *rodoslovnye rospisi* (“genealogical registers”). Servitors eager to receive lucrative court assignments

⁴⁷One thinks, for example, of the administrative independence of northern communities after the *zemskii* and *guba* reforms of the mid-sixteenth centuries. A better example might be the autonomy of the Ukrainian Hetmanate after the treaty of Periaslav' in 1654. In both cases, however, final authority remained in Moscow.

⁴⁸They are of course to be distinguished from *sluzhbilie ludi po priboru* (“servitors by selection”), i.e., servitors by contract. On this distinction, see Hellie, *Enserfment*, 21-25 and E. D. Stashevskii, “Sluzhiloie soslovie,” in M. V. Dovnar-Zapolskii, ed., *Russkaia istoriia v ocherkakh i statiakh*, 3 vols. (Moscow: Moskovskoe uchebnoe kn-vo, 1909-12), 2: 1-33.

⁴⁹See Hellie, *Enserfment*, 22-24. These groups correspond to Hellie’s “upper upper-service class,” “lower upper-service class,” and “middle service class.”

⁵⁰Basic works on the genealogical books include: M. E. Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi XVI-XVII vv. kak istoricheskie istochniki* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975); *idem*, “Rodoslovnye knigi serediny XVI veka,” *Trudy Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo istoriko-arkhivnogo instituta* (hereafter *Trudy MGAI*) 16 (1961): 475-80; *idem*, “Redaktsiia rodoslovnykh knig vtoroi poloviny XVI v.,” *Arkhieograficheskie ezhegodniki za 1962* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1963) (Hereafter *AE za...*), 126-33. On the historiography of the genealogical books, see Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 5-12.

⁵¹“Rodoslovnaia kniga, spisok A,” *Vremennik imperatorskogo obschestva istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh* 10 (1851), 131-203; and “Rodoslovnaia kniga sviateishogo gosudaria Filareta Nikiticha patriarkha vseia Rossii,” in *Iubileinyi sbornik S.-Peterburgskogo arkhieologicheskogo instituta, 1613-1913* (St. Petersburg: Synodal'naia tipografiia, 1913), 1-106. Both are Bychkova’s “patriarchal redaction.”

were at pains to demonstrate either that they were the scions of princely families that joined the Muscovite court, or that their commoner ancestors had served the Danilovichi from the beginning.⁵² Insofar as the very presence of a clan in the books demonstrated a history of sacrifice in the favor of the Danilovichi — a history that conferred on them the right to service assignments — they are rightly considered service registers, though not of individuals, but of families.

Though the first service clan genealogical registers do not appear until the 1490s, they have much more distant origins.⁵³ Genealogies are found of course in the Old Testament and in Byzantine chronographs, both of which were widely copied in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries.⁵⁴ The Mongol-Turkic peoples on Muscovy's southern and eastern frontiers took a keen interest in genealogy, and one would imagine that their practices in this regard were not without influence on Muscovite mentalities.⁵⁵ In any case, the first "genealogies" written in East Slavic are found in twelfth-century chronicles, most notably the *Povest' vremennykh let* ("Tale of Bygone Years"). Here we discover genealogies of tribes, cities, and princely families. Naturally these chronicles do not survive in the originals and come down to us in later copies. Similar materials were apparently collected in the appanage principalities and in Novgorod in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. These also survive in chronicle collections. The first grand princely genealogies appeared in Novgorod and Moscow in the first half of the fifteenth century, again in chronicle compilations.⁵⁶ By the 1530s, Muscovite chronicles had come to include many genealogies, usually with a rather obvious polemical intent. We find genealogies of the khans of the Golden Horde, of Moldavian, Lithuanian, and Russian grand princely lines, and of course the stilted account of the Roman origin of Danilovichi rule found in the *Poslanie Spiridona-Savy* ("The Missive of Spiridon-Sava") and the *Skazanie o kniazjakh vladimirskekh* ("The Tale of the Princes of Vladimir"). The message was clear: the Danilovichi's only true peers were imperial lines.⁵⁷

For our purposes, the most significant of these late chronicle entries is one found attached to the *tipograficheskaia letopis'* in the 1490s. Here for the first time we see true genealogical registers of service clans (princely and non-princely). Previous registers had concerned only mythical, biblical, clerical, imperial or, at minimum, Rurikid lines. The inclusion of these service clans signals the formation of a distinct, hereditary affinity of families around the Muscovite grand prince, who were interested in maintaining their integrity and position at court.⁵⁸ In the turbulent decades which followed, both the crown and elite clans seemed to take an active role in furthering the genealogical principle: the minority of Ivan IV saw intense infighting among the elite families and the rise of the *mestnichestvo* (precedence) system, which of course relied

⁵²The development of genealogical exclusivity and its importance as the basic structural principle of Muscovite politics has been thoroughly explored by N. S. Kollmann, *Kinship and Politics: the Making of the Muscovite Political System, 1375-1547* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1987). That genealogy remained an important requirement for elite service in the seventeenth century is demonstrated by R. Crumme, *Aristocrats and Servitors: the Boyar Elite in Russia, 1613-1689* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983).

⁵³The deep cultural roots of the genealogical reflex in Muscovy have never been traced. Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, mentions borrowings, for example, from Byzantine chronographs, but ignores the wider cultural context in which the first genealogies were produced. She focuses on proximate, not distant, origins.

⁵⁴Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 149.

⁵⁵On Muscovite knowledge of the Mongol world, see C. Halperin, "Know thy Enemy: Medieval Russian Familiarity with the Mongols of the Golden Horde," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 30 (1982): 161-75.

⁵⁶Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 145-48.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 148-49.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 149-50.

heavily of genealogical data⁵⁹; the 1540s saw the production of the first “official” genealogical books in the *gosudareva kazna* (“sovereign’s treasury”)⁶⁰; and the 1550s witnessed their transfer to the newly-formed Military Service Chancellery.⁶¹ From then until the 1630s, when official interest in the books lagged, genealogical books were regularly updated in the Military Service Chancellery. One hundred and thirty-one copies have been identified and divided into eight successive redactions. Four of these, comprising the *gosudarev rodoslovet*s (“sovereign’s genealogy”) editorial group, are closely linked to one another. Compiled from the early 1540s to the end of the century, each redaction of the group takes the “chapters,” i.e., clans, of its predecessor and introduces new ones. Chapters expand from forty-four to eighty-one. Clans in each book were introduced in order of importance, beginning, naturally, with the grand princely family.⁶²

The first genealogies of the service clans were no doubt the product of collective memory. The earliest clan genealogies, i.e., those found in the various fifteenth-century chronicle compilations are sometimes called *pamiati* (“memos”), suggesting their origins.⁶³ The method used in the Military Service Chancellery to compile the genealogical books is largely unknown because ancillary administrative materials — the by-product of the process of composition — do not survive. We know that litigants in *mestnichestvo* cases both submitted genealogical rescripts and cited official genealogical books to support their claims. This may indicate that such rescripts were solicited by the court when books were being created or amended.⁶⁴ If we can judge by the call for and receipt of clan genealogies after the “elimination” of *mestnichestvo* in 1682, this was the basic *modus operandi*.⁶⁵

Even after the 1630s “unofficial” interest remained high: redactions produced in Military Service Chancellery from the 1540s to the early seventeenth century were actively amended in private copies by elite families until late in the seventeenth century. It is telling that almost all the copies that come down to us are from the archives of elite clans, and most of these were copied in the second-half of the seventeenth century.⁶⁶ While it may be true that the royal family or some boiar faction at court desired to de-emphasize the role of *rod* (“clan”) in status determination, many of the clans themselves proved much more conservative. Further demonstration of this is provided by the official collection of genealogical registers which immediately followed the destruction of the *mestnichestvo* books: the speed with which the elite clans responded to this call is ample evidence that their archives were full of genealogical records.⁶⁷

⁵⁹See A. M. Kleimola, “Status, Place and Politics: the Rise of Mestnichestvo during the Boiarskoe Pravlenie,” *Forschungen zur Osteuropaischen Geschichte* 27 (1980): 195-214.

⁶⁰On the link between the *boiarskoe pravlenie* (“boiar rule”), the rise of *mestnichestvo*, and the formalization of genealogical records, see Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 124-30.

⁶¹Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 17.

⁶²The manuscript history of the genealogical books has been exhaustively analyzed by Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 114-21.

⁶³*Ibid.*, 21, 114 and 125-29.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, 129.

⁶⁵On the collection of these records from the service families in the 1680s, see *idem*, “Iz istorii sozdaniia rodoslovnykh rospisei kontsa XVII v. i Barkhatnoi knigi,” *Vspomogatel’nye istoricheskie dsiipliny* (hereafter “VID”) 12 (1981): 90-109.

⁶⁶Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*, 17 (“Many manuscripts of the genealogical books preserve entries made by their [private] owners. Practically, we may consider the majority of surviving copies to be private, because none of them has a note that would permit us to relate the manuscript directly to a chancellery.”) By my count (based on information provided in Bychkova, *Rodoslovnye knigi*), six of the 131 surviving copies are of late sixteenth-century origin; the rest were drafted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. On genealogical materials in private archives, see Morozov, “Sluzhebnye i rodoslovnye dokumenty,” *passim*.

⁶⁷See Bychkova, “Iz istorii” and A. B. Kamenskii, “K voprosu rodoslovnykh rospisiakh XVII v.,” VID 21 (1990), 211-25.

Let us move on to the *razriadnye knigi* (“deployment books”). These were official chronological registers of “private,” military, and court activities. They touch on a remarkable range of matters: weddings, receptions, campaigns, various service assignments, councils, *mestnichestvo* cases and others. The deployment books have been intensively studied.⁶⁸ All major redactions have been published.⁶⁹ Somewhat anachronistically, we might term their thematic focus “affairs of state,” but closer to the truth would be *delo gosudarevo*, a Muscovite phrase meaning the “sovereign’s business” (especially military), for the grand prince is the motive force in each entry. And still more accurate (though never found in the sources) would be *delo gosudarevo i ego boiar*, the “sovereign’s and his boiars’ business,” for the principle actors in the books were the grand prince and his men.

The basic building-block of the deployment books was the *razriad* (“deployment register,” a rescript analogous to the genealogical register), a short account of a particular action compiled from one or more primary documents relating to the event, for example, *nakazy* (“instructions”), *rospisi* (“registers”), *otpiski* (“dispatches”), *gramoty* (“writs”), and *mestnichestvo* cases.⁷⁰ Deployment registers were apparently written by scribes during or shortly after the events they describe. They begin to appear about the same time as the first genealogical registers, i.e., in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Like the latter, they were soon entered into books. These were called *sluzhebnye knigi* (“service books”) or *nariady sluzhebnye* (“service registers”) in the first-half of the sixteenth century and *bol’shie knigi* (“grand books”) or *knigi v razriade* (“books in the Military Service Chancellery”) thereafter.⁷¹ From their first appearance there seem to have been a special corp of scribes who drafted the registers and the books that held them, first in the Sovereign’s Treasury and later in the Military Service Chancellery.⁷² It would hardly be an exaggeration to submit that one of the primary reasons for the emergence of the Military Service Chancellery as an independent institution was the necessity of keeping the deployment books.

Though the manuscript history of the deployment books is not terribly complicated, it is probably best to simplify matters by dividing existing copies into two classes — expanded and abbreviated — based on entry form, content, and function. In the expanded texts, first produced in the first half of the sixteenth century or slightly earlier, entries are long

⁶⁸On the deployment books, see: V. I. Buganov, *Razriadnye knigi poslednei chetverti XV-nachala XVII v.* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1962); *idem*, “Sokrashchenaia redaktsiia razriadnykh knig 1550-1636 gg.,” *Problemy istochnikovedeniia* (hereafter “PI”) 9 (1961): 270-79; *idem*, “Opisanie spiskov razriadnykh knig XVII v.,” *AE za 1972* (Moscow, 1974), 276-81; *idem*, “Dvortsovye razriady’ pervoi poloviny XVII veka,” PI 8 (1959): 361-71; *idem*, “Gosudarev razriad’ 1556 g. i reformy 50-kh gg. XVI v.,” *Istoriia SSSR* (1957): no. 5, 220-31; *idem*, “Istochniki razriadnykh knig poslednei chetverti -nachala XVII v.,” PI 6, (1959): 152-19; *idem*, “Razriadnye knigi kak istochnik istorii pogranichnoi oborony Russkogo gosudarstva v kontse XV-pervoi treti XVII v.,” *Istchnikovedenie otechestvennoi istorii, 1979* (Moscow: Nauka, 1980), 200-8; D. N. Al’shits, “Ofitsial’naia razriadnaia kniga moskovskikh gosudarei XVI v.,” PI 4 (1958): 130-51. On the historiography of the deployment books, see Buganov, *Razriadnye knigi*, 7-21.

⁶⁹For a list of deployment books published to 1933, see *Materialy dlia bibliografii po istorii narodov SSSR XVI-XVII vv.* (Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1933), 19 and 189-90. More recent publications are: V. I. Buganov, ed., *Razriadnaia kniga 1475-1605 gg.* 2 vols. (Moscow: Inst. istorii AN SSSR, 1977); *idem*, ed., *Razriadnaia kniga 1475-1598 gg.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966); *idem*, ed., *Razriadnaia kniga 1559-1605 gg.* (Moscow: Inst. istorii AN SSSR, 1974); *idem*, ed., *Razriadnaia kniga 1550-1636 gg.* 2 vols. (Moscow: Inst. istorii AN SSSR, 1975-); *idem*, ed., *Razriadnaia kniga 1637-1638 goda* (Moscow: Inst. istorii AN SSSR, 1983); and *idem*, ed., *Razriadnaia kniga 1598-1638 gg.* (Moscow: Inst. istorii AN SSSR, 1974).

⁷⁰Buganov, *Razriadnye knigi*, 5. One redaction of the deployment books, that “with with the oldest entries,” includes registers dating from 1375 to 1475. These entries were retrospectively constructed in the first half of the sixteenth century from a variety of materials including chronicles, the grand princely wills, and memos. They contain much fanciful material and share little with the “official” registers produced by the grand prince’s scribes after 1475. See *ibid.*, 105-106.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, 109-17 and 240-41.

⁷²Buganov, “Sokrashchenaia redaktsiia,” 109-17.

and stay close to the “original” texts; topically, the entries touch on all significant activities of the court; and, finally, the entries serve a documentary function, simply chronicling the affairs of the elite.⁷³ The abbreviated texts, first drafted in the 1550s and primarily comprising the so-called *gosudarev razriad* (“Sovereign’s register”) group, differ on each of these points. First, suspect entries based on chronicle passages, the grand princely wills, memos, and a healthy dose of status-seeking poetic license are removed: entries begin with 1475, a date which suggests their content could be confirmed by various official documents and deployment registers compiled from them. Furthermore, entries in this group are shorter than those in the expanded group. The editorial process used to construct books of this sort would seem to have entailed taking the relevant passage from the expanded text and editing out extraneous details. Content in the abbreviated group is also different. Though they concern a wide variety of events, military, diplomatic, and administrative activities receive pride of place. This is particularly true in one sub-group variously called *podlinniki* (“originals”) or *knigi razriadnye* (“books of deployments”). These exclusively record assignments to the southern frontier from 1613-1636. In all the copies of this group, *svadebnye rospisi* (“wedding registers”) are separated from military and administrative entries and placed at the head of the book. This weeding out and paring down of entries is consistent with the general purpose of the books in the abbreviated group. They are plainly administrative, designed to be used in adjudicating *mestnichestvo* disputes, and as reference works in quotidian case and rank processing. And, in this capacity, they are frequently cited, for example, in *mestnichestvo* cases.⁷⁴

As with the genealogical books, the elite clans took an active interest in the compilation of the deployment books. The reason is obvious and completely analogous to the case of the genealogical books. Because advancement (preferment) at court was contingent upon service to the Danilovichi measured relative to the service of other individuals and clans — the essence of the *mestnichestvo* system — the elite was compelled to have its every contact with the “radiant eyes” of the tsar recorded. Service records maintained the clan’s position at court, guaranteed regular advancement, and ensured against predatory *mestnichestvo* suits by rival clans. Thus, it is clear that the genealogical and deployment books worked in tandem: the former established the long history of a clan’s service and thus offered living members the opportunity to serve at court, while the latter documented in detail the actual service of individuals in competition with members of other clans. And indeed there is an institutional link: the deployment books, like the genealogical books, were kept first by the Sovereign’s Treasury and then transferred to the Military Service Chancellery in the 1550s. It only remains to add that, as with the genealogical books, the very survival of the deployment books is a consequence of the elite’s interest in them: if we exclude the so-called “originals,” all but seven of the remaining two hundred and thirty-five manuscripts are private copies made by elite clans.

Until the 1550s, the service record-keeping activity of the grand prince’s secretariat was apparently limited to the genealogical and deployment books. However, the first decades of Ivan IV’s reign brought the introduction of a new complex of sophisticated service registers — documents that would be the backbone of Muscovite personnel auditing for the next 150 years. These registers — the *boiarskie knigi* (“boiar books”), *boiarskie spiski* (“boiar lists”), and, later, the *zhiletskie spiski* (“temporary service lists”) — tracked not heritage or service, but rather rank, remuneration, and

⁷³The “expanded texts” include the following redactions delineated by Buganov: the “Expanded Redaction with the Oldest Entries,” the “Abridged Reaction of 1605,” the “Dvortsovye Razriady,” and the “Abridged Expanded Redaction of 1636.”

⁷⁴The “abbreviated text” includes the following redactions from Buganov: the *gosudarev razriad* of 1556, 1584, 1585, 1598, 1604, 1638; the *podlinniki*.

assignment. As against the genealogical and deployment books, they strike the reader as familiar, no-nonsense personnel records — simple lists of names sorted by rank, seniority within rank, and salary allotment. They de-contextualize the identities of those they list, removing all the flesh-and-blood attributes of humanity that frustrate administrative efficiency.

The new service registers may have been a response to the heightened record-keeping requirements entailed by administrative, military, and fiscal reforms of the 1550s. These reforms seem to have been aimed at regularizing service in the cavalry army, and perhaps at commuting taxes to cash to be used in this effort, but none of this is clear.⁷⁵ In any case, the progenitors of the standard seventeenth-century registers appear about the time of the putative reform. They are: the *tysiachnaia kniga* (thousand book) of 1550, the *dvorovaia tetrad'* (court notebook) of 1551-52, and the so-called *boiarskaia kniga* (boiar book) of 1556.⁷⁶ The first two of these were intimately associated with a decision taken in 1550 to settle approximately 1000 of the “best” *deti boiarskie* in the immediate environs of Moscow (67-70 km). The logic behind this project is obscured by lack of sources, and indeed what does shed light on the reform would seem to indicate that it was never carried out.⁷⁷ Nonetheless, the *tysiachnaia kniga* and *dvorovaia tetrad'* are important for our purposes because they seemed to have defined a style of documentation, setting out a complex of elements which would characterize Muscovite personnel registers through Petrine times and beyond.

The first of these elements was demographic closure: all servitors within a definite administrative or social group are included. In the case of the *tysiachnaia kniga*, this would appear to be those serving the sovereign’s court without sufficient lands around Moscow; in the case of the *dvorovaia tetrad'*, the group singled out is plainly the court itself. Naturally, the one is a subset of the other, and indeed we find the majority of *tysiachniki* (“thousand men”) in the *dvorovaia tetrad'*.⁷⁸ The second element is a descriptive title or explanation of contents written on the first folio. The *boiarskaia kniga* begins with the edict that brought it into existence; the *dvorovaia tetrad'* begins, in raised script: “The court notebook, in which are written *boiare* and secretaries, princes and *deti boiarskie* of the court of the Muscovite lands, and consular people.”⁷⁹ A third element is sorted subdivisions with headers — *stat'i* (“grades”) in the parlance of the secretariat. The compilers of the *tysiachnaia kniga* used the data at their disposal to construct a hierarchically sorted list. We may imagine this as information sorted according to criteria of increasing narrowness, like the familiar biological taxonomic system “kingdom, family, order, phylum, genus, species...” Such a classification is logically hierarchical: each

⁷⁵Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 190, argues this, as does N. E. Nosov, *Stanovlenie soslovno-predstavitel'nykh uchrezhdenii v Rossii* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979). There is good reason, however, to suspend judgement. See E. L. Keenan’s long review of Nosov in *Kritika* 7-8 (1970-72), 67-96 and, more recently, Davies, “Town Governors,” 79-100.

⁷⁶All are published: Zimin, ed., *Tysiachnaia kniga*, and “Boiarskaia kniga 1556 g. (soobshchena kniazem M.A. Obolenskim),” in *Arkhiv istoriko-iuridicheskikh svedenii, otnosiaschikhsia do Rossii, izdavaemyi N. Kalachorym* 3, otd. 2 (1861): 25-88. Professor E. Keenan has brought my attention to a text drafted in the 1540s which bears some resemblance to the new court service registers discussed here. It is published: G. F. Karpov, ed. *Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh snoshenii Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Pol'sko-litovskim gosudarstvom, 1533-1560*, in *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva* 59 (1887), 147. So far as I am aware it has never been discussed in the literature related to the service registers. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to work with it.

⁷⁷Zimin, ed., *Tysiachnaia kniga 1550g*, 3-19; A. A. Zimin, *Reformy Ivana Groznogo. Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii Rossii sere diny XVI v.* (Moscow: Izd-vo sotsial'no-ekon. lit-ry, 1960), 366-75.

⁷⁸Zimin, ed., *Tysiachnaia kniga 1550g*, 11.

⁷⁹Ibid., 53-54 and 111 respectively.

“sort” has fewer instances than the last. But Muscovite service lists were hierarchical in an additional sense: the “sorts” and items in them — here servitors — are ranked according to status, sometimes in violation of the logical principle.

Let us examine the *tysiachnaia kniga* in this light. On the highest level, this register is divided into three groups: *dumnye chiny* (“counselor ranks”), *deti boiarskie* serving in Moscow and, finally, *deti boiarskie* serving in or from areas outside the Moscow region (Novgorod, Pskov, Toropets, Rizhe, Luk). At this point, there are no headers: the information is only sorted.⁸⁰ On the next level, however, these groups are divided into ranks with headers: the *dumnye chiny* are separated into *boiare*, *okol'nichie*, *oruzhniche* (“armorers”), and *kazniachei* (“treasurers”); the *deti boiarskie* are divided into three grades according to the amount of land they are to be granted; those serving from outside Moscow are divided into two such grades. These divisions, in turn, are subdivided by a peculiar mix of clan membership and geographical origin. The lowest sort is of course within the lists of names themselves. These are sometimes grouped by family (without headers), but more frequently, e.g., where a servitor is without kin in a given geographical sub-section, the list is sorted by seniority in a given rank.⁸¹ Naturally, the order of appearance of all the sorts we have discussed was determined by position in the status-hierarchy of ranks.

A fourth element is the use of summaries after major sorts. In the *tysiachnaia kniga* these appear after each of the three divisions in the highest sort. We read, for example, after the *dumnye chiny*, “and all the *boiare* and *okolnichie* and guards and treasurers in this grade are twenty-eight persons, and the service land to be given them in two hundred *cheti* allotments amounts to 5600 *cheti*.”⁸² A final and fifth element is the active amendment of information recorded in the service lists. As data in the service registers became obsolete, Muscovite scribes continually updated records by adding notes. The *dvorovaia tetrad'*, for example, was amended in this fashion from the date of its drafting in 1551/52 through the early 1560s. Its numerous notes concern a variety of matters: rank, service assignment, health (including death), and location of land holdings, among others.⁸³ The *tysiachnaia kniga* was also amended, though surviving copies show less editorial activity.⁸⁴

The *boiarskaia kniga* of 1556 was probably produced as a result of the 1555/56 decree “concerning provender rents and service,” the same decree which putatively eliminated provender rents over much of Muscovite territory, commuted it into cash payments to be funneled through the government to servitors, and set up schedules linking service to land holding.⁸⁵ The decree seems to be indirectly mentioned in many of the entries.⁸⁶ Again, none of this is clear. In any case, diplomatically, the *boiarskaia kniga* of 1556 is a hybrid, combining elements of several types of service registers characteristic of seventeenth-century case processing. Like a *smotrennyi spisok* (“muster list”), it offers dates of service, forces provided, and information regarding their disposition (armor, horses, shields, etc.) for specific regions. Indeed, the frequent mention of the Serpukov review of 1556 in the *tysiachnaia kniga* has led some researchers to suggest it is just

⁸⁰See the synoptic table of ranks listed in *ibid.*, 10.

⁸¹Zimin, *Reformy*, 372-3.

⁸²Zimin, ed., *Tysiachnaia kniga 1550g.* 55.

⁸³*Ibid.*, 13-15.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, 42-43.

⁸⁵Nosov, *Stanovlenie*, 367-420; Zimin, *Reformy*, 422-44.

⁸⁶“Boiarskaia kniga 1556 g...,” 28 (*po ulozheniiu* (“according to the code”) and *po novomu okladu* (“according to the new entitlement [schedule?]”) among others).

that, a peculiar *smotrennyi spisok*.⁸⁷ Like a *desiatnia* (“town military muster”), it lists landed assets — *votchina* (“allodium”) and *pomest’e* (“service land”) — for individual servitors. Finally, like an *okladnaia kniga* (“service entitlement registry book”), it records land and monetary entitlements due to servitors. The very confusion of the document suggests its novelty: the state secretaries and clerks of the Military Service Chancellery were grappling as best they could with an unfamiliar situation.⁸⁸

Yet for all its peculiarity, the deep, diplomatic grammar of the *boiarskaia kniga* of 1556 is much like that of the *tysiachnaia kniga* and *dvorovaia tetrad’*. It is a demographically closed document, probably listing those servitors eligible to receive remuneration in the form of *kormlenii otkup* (“commuted provender rent”).⁸⁹ It has a title, is divided into grades with headers, and has been amended.⁹⁰ Where it departs from the order established by the *tysiachnaia kniga* and *dvorovaia tetrad’*, it does so for good reason. For example, since its entries are much longer than those in the *tysiachnaia kniga* and *dvorovaia tetrad’*, only one servitor has been entered on a page; between leaves with entries there are often blank leaves, presumably placed in this fashion to facilitate the addition of new information regarding the preceding figure or to allow for the addition of entirely new entries.

Out of the firmament of the *tysiachnaia kniga*, *dvorovaia tetrad’*, and *boiarskaia kniga* of 1556 emerged a set of documentary practices and diplomatic styles that would some years later coalesce into the boiar lists and boiar books, the dominant court-level service registers of the latter sixteenth and entire seventeenth centuries. The boiar lists have been extensively studied.⁹¹ Many examples have been published.⁹² Approximately ninety-five boiar lists from 1577-1713 have come down to us, though some of these are very poorly preserved.⁹³ Other documents, especially archival descriptions of the Military Service Chancellery, mention boiar lists (which have not survived) as early as 1546/47 and as late as

⁸⁷Nosov, *Stanovlenie*, 387-388 (the *boiarskaia kniga* of 1556 as *kormlennaia kniga*) and 389-92 (as a *smotrennyi spisok* or town military muster). Whatever the *boiarskaia kniga* of 1556 is, it is not a *boiarskaia kniga* in the seventeenth-century sense: on this, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 23-24.

⁸⁸Nosov, *Stanovlenie*, 418-19.

⁸⁹Ibid, 418-19.

⁹⁰On its amendment and use in the Military Service Chancellery, see *ibid.*, 394-95.

⁹¹See A. L. Stanislavskii, “Opyt izucheniia boiarskikh spiskov kontsa XVI - nachala XVII vv.,” *Istoriia SSSR* (1971): no. 4, 97-110; *idem*, “Boiarskie spiski v deloproizvodstve Razriadnogo prikaza,” in V. I. Buganov, ed., *Aktovoe istochnikovedenie. Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 123-152; *idem* and S. P. Mordovina, “Boiarskie spiski kontsa XVI - nachala XVII veka kak istoricheskii istochnik,” *Sovetskie arkhivy* (1973): no. 2, 90-96; A. A. Bulychev, “O boiarskom spiske 7119(1610/11) goda,” *AE za 1986* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1987), 69-74. A. N. Medishevskii, “Boiarskie spiski pervoi chetverti XVII v.,” *AE za 1981 g.* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1982), 158-63; R. V. Ovchinnikov, “Boiarskii spisok 1607 g.,” *Istoricheskii arkhiv* 8 (1953): 71-79. On the historiography of the boiar lists, see Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 123-25.

⁹²Publications of the boiar lists include, P. Ivanov, *Opisanie gosudarstvennogo Razriadnogo arkhiva...* (Moscow: Tip. S. Silvanskogo, 1842), 12-18 (a fragment of the *boiarskii spisok* of 1667-68); N. A. Popov, ed., *Akty Moskovskogo gosudarstva* (hereafter “AMG”) 3 vols. (Moscow: Tip. Imp. AN, 1890), 1: 39-97 (the *boiarskii spisok* of 1577); N. P. Likhachev, “Boiarskii spisok 7119-1611 goda,” *Sbornik arkhologicheskogo instituta* 6 (1898): 92-111; V. N. Storozhev, “Materialy dlia istorii russkogo dvorianstva,” *Cheniia imperatorskogo obschestva istorii i drevnosti Rossiiskikh* 3, otd. 1 (1909) (hereafter “ChOIDR”): 73-142 (the boiar lists of 1610-11 and 1626); A. L. Stanislavskii and S. P. Mordovina, eds., *Boiarskie spiski poslednei chetverti XVI - nachala XVII vv. i rospis’ russkogo voiska 1604 g.* pts. 1 and 2 (Moscow: TSGADA, 1979) (the boiar lists of 1577, 1585-87, 1588-89, 1590-91, 1598-99, 1602-03 and 1606-07).

⁹³ODB, 9: 3-9 lists 60 boiar lists, 1667-1713, all currently held in *fond* 210, *opis’* 2 (*boiarskie spiski*) of RGADA. Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 125-126, has found twenty-two boiar lists, 1624-1631, in the scrolls of the Moscow bureau (RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis’* 9a) and one boiar list, 1652-53, in the *Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka imeni Lenina, otdel rukopisei, fond* 204, no. 28110. Stanislavskii and Mordovina, ed., *Boiarskie spiski poslednei chetverti XVI - nachala XVII vv.*, cite an additional thirteen boiar lists 1577-1611, most of which are in the scrolls of the Moscow bureau. This brings the total to ninety-six. However, Stanislavskii believed that more would be found: see Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 126.

1718.⁹⁴ The vast majority of boiar lists remain today in the archive of the very institution that constructed them, the Moscow bureau of the Military Service Chancellery.⁹⁵ Though the last surviving boiar lists were drafted in 1714, there is some indication that they were used in Military Service Chancellery book-keeping through 1721.⁹⁶

The primary function of the boiar lists over the entire period they were written was to record the rank, service assignment (including location), and physical condition of those who served *po dvorovomu spisku* (“on the court list”) or, later, *po moskovskomu spisku* (“on the Moscow list”).⁹⁷ The normal practice seems to have been to draw up a new list annually in August, directly prior to the Old Russian new year, however there are instances when we find two or even three for one year. Diplomatically, the boiar lists are much like the *tysiachnaia kniga* and *dvoroaia tetrad'*: they concern the court, have descriptive titles, are composed of hierarchically sorted lists with headers, include summary calculations, and were constantly amended over their short life span.⁹⁸

Two main varieties of boiar lists are known to us: *podlinnye* (original) boiar lists and *nalichnye* (roll-call) boiar lists.⁹⁹ Both shared the common stock of organizational devices described above. However, each served a slightly different role in the Military Service Chancellery’s personnel accounting procedures. The *podlinnye* boiar lists (the name is first attested in connection with the boiar lists in 1613 and first found in a title in 1629) related general information about a servitor’s rank, present assignment (including location) and often, physical status (sickness, physical injuries, death).¹⁰⁰ The *nalichnye* boiar lists (first attested use, 1626), on the other hand, were related to a system of rotational service in the capital for personnel holding positions below the consular ranks. Under this system, begun in the mid-sixteenth century, servitors were divided into two halves, each of which was required to be present (*nalitsa*) at court for one half of the year. In addition to these groups, there were those who were excusably away from Moscow on service assignments. Thus, *nalichnye* boiar lists comprised three sorted sub-groups: those at court, those excused from court and not on service assignments, and those serving outside Moscow.¹⁰¹

New boiar lists were compiled from two sources. The most important of these was the boiar list being superseded, i.e., last year’s. Over the course of the document’s active life, hundreds of notes would have been inscribed on it, describing changes in the status of the personnel registered therein. These notes, constituting the second source of information for a new boiar lists, were drawn from everyday administrative paper handled by the scribes of the Moscow bureau — edicts, instructions, registers, petitions, dispatches, and even memos submitted by the servitors themselves — and other service registers — *pokhodnye spiski* (“pilgrimage” or “campaign lists”) and *polkovnye rospisi* (“regimental

⁹⁴On references to as yet unlocated boiar lists, see Stanislavskii and Mordovina, eds., *Boiarskie spiski poslednei chetverti XVI*, 8-9 and Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 135.

⁹⁵Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 127-28 cites evidence which indicates the boiar lists, like other registers, were kept in a special subdivision of the Military Service Chancellery. Also see N. P. Zagoskin, *Stoly razriadnogo prikaza* (Kazan’: Tip. Imp. univ-ta, 1879).

⁹⁶Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 135.

⁹⁷Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 128.

⁹⁸On the periodicity, compilation, amendment, and diplomatics of the boiar lists, see *ibid.*, *passim*.

⁹⁹Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 152-53 has identified a third variant, the *boiarskie zemlianye spiski* (“boiar land lists”), however little is known about them.

¹⁰⁰Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 126-28.

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, 137-39.

registers”). Such materials were actively collected by secretaries assigned to the boiar lists (and boiar books, for that matter) and were placed in specially-labelled scrolls. A new boiar list thus comprised an old one with obsolete information omitted (frequently such information was scratched out) and current information (in the notes) written in. Until the mid-seventeenth century, the boiar lists were written on sheets and placed in scrolls, after this time they were inscribed in books of high quality.¹⁰²

Unlike the genealogical and deployment books, the boiar lists were administrative documents in the fullest sense. Their internal order, though it generally reflected the status hierarchies of the Muscovite court (this order was legislated), occasionally contained irregularities which rendered them useless in *mestnichestvo* cases.¹⁰³ No doubt they were never intended to be used in status-determinative litigation.¹⁰⁴ Neither were they to be used by servitors in petitions: only very occasionally do we find them cited by members of the Moscow ranks seeking new ranks or higher entitlements.

The boiar books were closely related to the boiar lists. Like the latter, they have been long and thoroughly studied.¹⁰⁵ However, only one boiar book has been published to date.¹⁰⁶ Fourteen boiar books come down to use, eleven in book form and three in scrolls, from 1615 to 1691. As with the boiar lists, all surviving copies remain in the repositories of the Moscow bureau of the Military Service Chancellery, the section charged with the maintenance of the boiar books.¹⁰⁷ It is difficult to determine exactly when the boiar books (in their seventeenth-century form) first appeared due to seventeenth-century confusion over the true designation of the term: a number of service registers, among them the *dvorovaia tetrad'*, from the second-half of the sixteenth century are called “boiar books” in seventeenth-century documents.¹⁰⁸ The last *boiarskaia kniga* of which we have evidence was written in 1691, but there is good reason to believe that boiar book-like documents were compiled and used as late as 1715.¹⁰⁹

The boiar books were above all else financial documents. Their object was to record the monetary and land entitlements of servitors on the Moscow list.¹¹⁰ In this sense, they are closely allied to the *koormlennye* (“provender rent

¹⁰²Ibid., 130-36; also see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 136-37.

¹⁰³Regarding legislation of order, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 82-83 and Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 80-81.

¹⁰⁴In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they were used for status determination: the presence of one’s ancestors in the boiar lists came to be viewed as proof of noble background. See *ibid.*, 134 and 151-52.

¹⁰⁵On the long historiography of the boiar books, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 4-11. Recent studies include: M. P. Lukichev, “Obzor boiarskikh knig XVII v.,” *AE za 1979* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1981), 255-66; M. P. Lukichev and M. N. Rogozhin, “Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g. i ee mesto v deloproizvodstve Razriadnogo prikaza,” in V. I. Buganov, ed., *Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g.* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1986), 6-16; M. P. Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v.,” *Sovetskie arkhivy* (1980): no. 5, 50-54; M. P. Lukichev, “Svedeniia o boiarskikh knigakh v arkhivnykh opisiakh XVII - XVIII vv.,” in *Molodye obschchestvennyye Moskvy. Leninskomy iubileiu* (Moscow, 1982), 105-6.

¹⁰⁶The only complete, orthographically accurate publication of a *boiarskaia kniga* to date is Buganov, ed., *Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g.* Ivanov, *Opisanie gosudarstvennogo Razriadnogo arkhiva*, 5-12, reproduces a fragment of the *boiarskie knigi* 1629. AMG 1: 138-47 is the “*stolbets*” version of the boiar books of 1615.

¹⁰⁷Lukichev, “Obzor boiarskikh knig,” 255-266. These include: the boiar books of 1627, 1629, 1636, 1639, 1647, 1657/58, 1667, 1679, 1676, 1686 and 1691, all found in RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis'* 1 “*boiarskie knigi*”; and the *boiarskie knigi* in scrolls from 1615, 1628, and 1630, found in RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis'* 9a “*stolbtsy moskovskogo stola*.” The boiar books were in fact kept in a special section of the Moscow bureau: see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 120-27 and 130.

¹⁰⁸Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 18-19.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., 135.

¹¹⁰Lukichev and Rogozhin, “Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g.,” 6 and 12.

books”) or *okladnye knigi* (“entitlement books”), registers which recorded the same information, but which were kept in the *cheti* (“tax collection chancelleries”), collection and disbursal chancelleries founded in the second half of the sixteenth century, perhaps in connection with the commutation of provender rents.¹¹¹ Thus the boiar books almost never fail to relate the source of those monetary entitlements held *iz cheti* (“from the tax collection chancellery”), i.e., they tell us which of the *cheti* served as the pay masters for a given figure. The entitlements themselves do not reflect actual disbursements.¹¹² In Muscovy, such remuneration was granted only upon petition, and petitions were sent only upon completion of some concrete service or upon the assumption of a new rank. Entitlements are better viewed as remuneration limits, since actual grants and cash payments were significantly lower. And even more than that they were status indicators: in the boiar books and elsewhere, servitors within given ranks were listed in strict order of entitlement level.

The boiar books were used in the Moscow bureau primarily as financial reference books.¹¹³ As servitors petitioned for new ranks or higher entitlements, the boiar books were searched for relevant information. They were a tried and true source of information for the scribes processing petitions, and are often found cited in the reports and appeals they drafted.¹¹⁴ In fact, the petitioners themselves occasionally refer to them, complaining they were erroneously omitted or written in the wrong place.¹¹⁵ Not only did they supply information regarding servitors’ pay levels, but they also supplied the precedents out of which were constructed the suggestion for a new entitlement. Because petitions were constantly being received and pay levels were constantly being adjusted, the boiar books were continually updated. Notes were inscribed in the same way they were in the boiar lists, but from a more limited range of sources: edicts, provender rent books, entitlement books, town military musters, memos, and occasionally boiar lists. Significantly, the boiar books almost always cite the documentary source of the information they record.¹¹⁶ As might be imagined, new boiar books were constructed in a fashion analogous to new boiar lists: the previous book was simply re-written with invalid information excluded and up-to-date notes included.¹¹⁷ Unlike the boiar lists, the boiar books demonstrate no strict periodicity; they seem to have been written anew as needed, approximately once every decade.¹¹⁸ Early boiar books may

¹¹¹On these see Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 11-12 and 123-24. The provender rent books of the Tax Collection Chancelleries are now for the most part located in RGADA, *fond* 137 “*boiarskie i gorodovye knigi*.” They are described in *Knigi Moskovskikh prikazov v fondakh TsGADA. Opis’ 1495-1718 gg.* (Moscow, 1972; TsGADA). This comprises *opisi* 1 and 2; a third *opis’* is now available in typescript in the archive.

¹¹²Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 150-52 (on the actual disbursement of grants); Helle, *Enserfment*, 36-37; Keep, *Soldiers*, 42-43. For a comparison of entitlement levels with actual outlays, see Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratiia*, 94-100.

¹¹³Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 131.

¹¹⁴See, for a published example, PSZ, 2, no. 1243. This is an appeal from 1687. Also see st. 622, fol. 66, 126, 201-203, 245-46, 314 and 333 — all reports pursuant to entitlement calculations.

¹¹⁵For examples, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 97-98 and 132-34; Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 151-52.

¹¹⁶Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 93-110 mentions over a dozen different types of administrative documents cited in the boiar books.

¹¹⁷Lukichev and Rogozhin, “Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g.,” 11-13.

¹¹⁸*Ibid.*, 11; Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 92, 93, and 118-21.

have been written in scrolls, like the boiar lists, however in the seventeenth century they appear in rather lavish bound form.¹¹⁹

Diplomatically, the boiar books are very similar to the boiar lists, i.e., they are hierarchically sorted collections of lists (themselves sorted) of court servitors. The boiar books are, however, somewhat more elaborate. They begin with a long and ornately written title page on which is inscribed a header listing the year and ranks included in order. The personnel lists, each with a raised header and each sorted by rank, may be divided into four sub-groups (three without headers, though grouped): Upper consular ranks, *dvoroye* through non-consular ranks, *moskovskie dvoriane*, and, *vybory* (chosen servitors) and *zhibil'tsy*. The first three are complex, comprising groups of ranks, and naturally these are ordered hierarchically; the final division is without ranks and is divided first by town and then by entitlement level. Servitors within any undivided list, e.g., “*boiare*” in the consular ranks, are listed in strict order of seniority. This order of course corresponds to entitlement levels.¹²⁰ The boiar books do not contain summary statements, but, as we have noted, they were frequently amended over the course of their active lives.¹²¹

As the court grew, new service registers were sometimes created by splitting off sections of older ones. This would seem to have been the case with the temporary service lists and the *podlinnye spiski* (“original lists”) of provincial gentry. The former, comprising separate lists of low-ranking provincial servitors doing temporary duty at court, appear for the first time at the end of the sixteenth century¹²²; the latter, separate registers of *vybornye dvoriane* (chosen military servitors), emerge at the end of the 1620s.¹²³ In both cases these lists were separated from the boiar books and boiar lists. By the end of the sixteenth century, the ranks of the *zhibil'tsy* (temporary Moscow servitors) — primarily the sons of *moskovskie dvoriane* and *vybornye dvoriane*¹²⁴ — had grown so large that a distinct administration with its own registers was required. A *zhibilets* rank was included in the boiar lists and boiar books until the 1630s, when the temporary service lists were finally made independent. The original lists grew out of a decision to end *vybornyi* service in the capital, i.e., remove them from the Moscow list. Like the boiar lists and boiar books these registers are hierarchically-sorted lists with all the diplomatic features outlined above. They were cited extensively in Military Service Chancellery rank processing and occasionally by servitors in petitions. Both the temporary service lists and original lists of provincial gentry survive in large numbers in the archives of the Military Service Chancellery where they were kept, however they have been little studied and, to my knowledge, never published.¹²⁵

¹¹⁹Lukichev. “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 114-15 and 136.

¹²⁰On the correspondence between rank and position in the boiar books, see Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 81-85; and Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokratia*, 86.

¹²¹On the sorts of amendments made to the boiar books, see Lukichev and Rogozhin, “Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g.” 12.

¹²²On the temporary service lists, see: Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 145-47; Lukichev, “Boiarskie knigi XVII v. kak istoricheskii istochnik,” 100-8; and M. P. Lukichev “Okladnye ‘zemlianye’ zhibiletskie spiski pervoi chetverti XVII v.,” in V. I. Buganov, ed., *Issledovaniia po istochnikovedeniuiu istorii SSSR dooktiabr'skogo perioda* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1988), 53-64.

¹²³On the original lists, see Stanislavskii, “Boiarskie spiski,” 148.

¹²⁴A. A. Novosel'skii, “Praviashchie gruppy v sluzhilom ‘gorode’ XVII v.,” *Uchenye zapiski, Institut istorii* 5 (1929): 316-317.

¹²⁵The ODB lists eighty-one books including temporary service lists from 1663-1710 (RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis'* 3 “*zhibiletskie spiski?*”). No doubt many others could be found in the scrolls of the Moscow bureau (*fond* 210, *opis'* 9): the index in ODB indicates over 200 scrolls with lists of *zhibil'tsy*.

Directly below the temporary service lists in the hierarchy of service registers designed to track the servitors by birth were the *smotrennye spiski* (“muster lists”). These lists were an important variation on a Muscovite theme, the *smotr* (“review”). The earliest references in Muscovite sources to review stem from the early sixteenth century.¹²⁶ They were, of course, military inspections undertaken during campaigns or prior to battle.¹²⁷ After the rise of the service registers in the 1550s, they take on a new, and uniquely literate sense: they come to mean “to check visually against a pre-formulated list or description.” Thus we find reviews of personal injury claims described in petitions, of towns and their military status, and, of course, of warriors expected to muster for battle.¹²⁸

The muster lists are precisely these such registers. At the onset of a campaign an edict would be issued in Moscow ordering, among others, servitors by birth in Moscow and in certain towns to appear fully prepared for war by a certain day. From existing registers in the Moscow bureau’s archives — especially boiar lists, temporary service lists, and town military musters — lists of servitors by birth would be constructed. At the muster point on the designated day, a general review would be held. State secretaries and clerks assigned to the force would construct a *smotrennyi* or *razbornyi spisok* (“inquiry list”) by comparing the list written in the Military Service Chancellery with what they discovered in the field. They provide information on the rank, remuneration, equipment, physical condition, and most important, the presence or absence of servitors. In terms of content, they are close to *razbornye desiatni* (“inquiry musters,” see below), on the one hand, and *priездnye knigi* (“arrival books”), on the other.¹²⁹

Because they included both servitors *po moskovskomu* (“on the Moscow list”) and *po gorodovomu spisku* (“on the town list”), the muster lists represent something of a transition between the town and country registers. Nonetheless, they were kept by the Moscow bureau and, like other lists I have discussed, are presently in its archive: eighty-nine books of them containing three hundred and seventy-five lists dating from 1641 to 1709 survive.¹³⁰ Though the muster lists provided important information to status-seeking service families regarding military service, they were not privately copied and held. Naturally, they were used as reference works in the Moscow bureau.¹³¹ It seems likely that they were a

¹²⁶On the first references to various sorts of military reviews (*razbory, rassmotreniia, smotry*), see M. G. Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten (vtoraia polovina XVI v.),” in V. I. Buganov, ed., *Issledovaniia po istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR dooktiabr’skogo perioda. Sbornik statei* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1984), 156-57.

¹²⁷These reviews were of two types. One sort was a general description of troop readiness for a particular region undertaken without reference to a specific campaign. This is how Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten,” 71, note 2 defines *smotr*. The other type, and the one directly related to the muster lists, was bound up with specific campaigns: it was an assessment of troop strength in the field. See ODB 9: 80. The boundary between these two sorts of activities was fluid, as is indicated by the fact that Muscovites used the same set of terms to designate both: *smotry, osmotry, razbory, rassmotreniia*. This has caused some confusion: see Keep, *Soldiers*, 32, where the two are confused.

¹²⁸For various uses, see *Slovar’ russkogo iazyka XI-XVII vv.* entries for *osmotr, smotrennyi, osmotreti*. For *smotr*, see I. I. Sreznevskii, *Materialy dlia slovaria drevne-russkogo iazyka*, 3 vols. (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo inostrannykh i natsional’nykh slovarci, 1958), entry for *smotr*. For *osmotr* as a physical examination conducted upon requests for relief from service, see st. 622, fol. 248 verso, fol. 251, fol. 105a-106 and fol. 235. For *smotr* as a campaign review, see st. 622, fol. 223.

¹²⁹On the course and context of campaign reviews, see A. V. Chernov, *Voorozhennye sily russkogo gosudarstva v XV-XVII vv.* (Moscow: Voennoe izd-vo Ministerstva oborony SSSR, 1954), 98-99; and *idem*, “TsGADA kak istochnik po voennoi istorii russkogo gosudarstva do XVIII v.,” *Trudy MGLAI* 4 (1948): 120 and 137.

¹³⁰ODB, 9: 80-101 (describing RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis’* 5, *smotrennye spiski*). Others are found scattered in *fond* 210, *opis’* 6 “*knigi razriadnykh stolov*” (ODB, 9-10) and in the scrolls of the various bureaus (ODB, 10-18).

¹³¹One is cited, for example, in a report regarding alleged services: “And at the final review of Boiarin Iu. A. Dolgorukov on Nov. 4, 1674 he was recorded as present” (st. 622, fol. 85).

source for the service registers which found their way into deployment books. This has never been demonstrated and indeed, the muster lists have never been the subject of serious investigation; none is published.¹³²

The classic example of a provincial service register in the full-blooded sense is the *desiatnia* (“town military muster”). They included only servitors by birth — *vybornye dvoriane*, *deti boiarskie* and *gorodoye dvoriane* — registered to provincial *goroda* (“towns”).¹³³ Unlike the muster lists, town military musters have a small literature devoted to them.¹³⁴ Many have been published.¹³⁵ As an institution, they seem to have emerged no later than the early sixteenth century. Herberstein, who visited Muscovy in 1517 and 1526, describes a practice reminiscent of the town military muster: “Every two or three years the grand prince has the *deti boiarskie* [*die Sobne der Bojaren*] in individual provinces counted and recorded, so that he may know their number and how many horses and servants each has.”¹³⁶ Sixteen town military musters from the sixteenth century have survived, the oldest being one of Kashira in 1556. Recently, five more sixteenth-century town military musters have been reconstructed from other sources.¹³⁷ In addition, there are references to over ninety sixteenth-century town military musters which have perished, the earliest of these dating from the second decade of the sixteenth century.¹³⁸ Three hundred and eighty town military musters survive from the seventeenth century, the latest from 1676.¹³⁹

Town military musters were all-purpose fiscal military accounts. They served three functions, and three corresponding types are discernible.¹⁴⁰ The first is a *razbornaia desiatnia* (“inquiry musters”). It was constructed on the occasion of a review and catalogued information regarding monetary and land allotments, militarily viable dependents, horses and weapons of a servitor. As I said, they are close to muster lists in content and purpose, however they differ with reference to timing: muster lists were occasioned by war, while the inquiry musters were regular checks of military

¹³²So far as I know, there is no serious source analysis of the muster lists in the voluminous Russian-Soviet literature on source study. Brief discussions are: “Smotrennye spiski,” *Sovetskaiia istoricheskaia entsyklopediia* 16 vols. (Moscow: Izd-vo “Sov. Entsiklopediia,” 1961), 13: 98; “Smotrennye spiski,” ODB 9: 80; Chernov, “TsGADA kak istochnik,” 120-121; and Ogloblin, *Obozrenie istoriko-geograficheskikh materialov*, 174-75. For a published document which appears to be constructed out of muster lists, see AMG 2: no. 443.

¹³³This was both the word designating “town” and the service groups in which military servitors were enrolled. See Keep, *Soldiers*, 30-31.

¹³⁴See Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten”; *idem*, “Istochniki rekonstruktsii desiaten XVI v.,” in V. I. Buganov, ed. et al., *Issledovanie po istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR dooktiabr’skogo perioda. Sbornik statei* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1983); A. N. Zertsalov, “K voprosu o desiatniakh,” ChOISR 1, otd. IV(1891): 13-22; A. A. Novosel’skii, “Raspad zemlevladieniia sluzhilogo “goroda” v XVII v (po desiatniam)” in N. V. Ustiugov, ed., *Russkoe gosudarstvo v XVII veke* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1961), 231-253; M. G. Krotov, “Opyt rekonstruktsii desiaten po Serpukhovu i Taruse 1556 g., po Nizhnemu Novgorodu 1569 g., po Meshchere 1580 g., po Arzamasu 1589 g.,” in V. I. Buganov, ed. et al., *Issledovanie po istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR dooktiabr’skogo perioda. Sbornik statei* (Moscow: In-t istorii AN SSSR, 1985), 69-91; N. V. Kalachov, “Desiatni. Odin iz materialov Razriadnogo prikaza,” *Trudy Imperatorskogo arkeologicheskogo s’ezda* 1 (1876); N. I. Ogloblin “Chto takoe desiatnia?,” ZhMNP no. 11 (1891): 40-64; V. N. Storozhev, “Desiatni kak istochnik dlia izucheniiia istorii russkogo provintsial’nogo dvorianstva XVI i XVII vv.,” *Iuridicheskii vestnik* no. 3 (1890); V. N. Storozhev, “Eshche k voprosu o desiatniakh,” *Iuridicheskii vestnik* no. 7-8 (1891); V. N. Storozhev, “Opis’ desiaten XVI i XVII vekov,” ODB 7: 64-176; V. N. Storozhev, “Predislovie” to *Desiatni XVI veka*, in ODB 8: I-IV.

¹³⁵Dozens of town military musters have been published. For a list to 1933, see *Materialy dlia bibliografii po istorii narodov SSSR XVI-XVII vv.* (Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1933), 19-20 and 191.

¹³⁶S. von Herberstein, *Moscovia, der Hauptstadt...*[1557], ed. by F. Berger (Weimar: Gustav Kiepenheuser Verlag, 1975), 79.

¹³⁷Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten”, 69.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*, 57-58.

¹³⁹ODB, v. 9; 19-79 (describing RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis’* 4, *delo desiaten*).

¹⁴⁰Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten,” 60.

preparedness.¹⁴¹ The second type of town military muster was chiefly financial. It concerned either a review of entitlements in light of services and general entitlement levels (*denezhnoe verstanie*, “monetary determination”), or the actual distribution of funds. By analogy, we can see that these documents functioned much like the boiar books, but for a different class of servitors.¹⁴² Finally, we have those town military musters that concerned the registration of young men ready to join the ranks, *noviki* (“novices”). Monetary and land allotments had to be determined for these boys, and their readiness for combat assessed.¹⁴³ It remains to add that children (two to three years old) were sometimes registered, though obviously no payment was rendered. The government probably used these data to project the availability of manpower into the distant future.¹⁴⁴

Any of these three sorts of town military musters could be combined on any given review, though they are usually found separately. Seventeenth-century evidence indicates they were constructed in the same basic fashion. An edict was issued to the presiding town military governor ordering the review. Later, he and his team of scribes would receive a *nakaž* (“instruction”) detailing which type of town military muster was to be constructed.¹⁴⁵ Finally, he would receive a *moskovskii* or *razriadnyi spisok* (“Moscow” or “Military Service Chancellery list”) if a new town military muster was to be drafted. This document, written in the Military Service Chancellery, was the military governor’s guide: it reproduced all the information in the previous town military muster, plus any relevant amendments that had been submitted to the Military Service Chancellery by the provincial servitors in the form of memos. If no new town military muster was in order, the old one would apparently suffice: new information would simply be written into the existing text. Once at the review, information in the Military Service Chancellery list would be checked, updated, and added to, and a new muster in the form of a scroll would be drafted. Later, a clean copy in the form of a book would be written and sent to the Military Service Chancellery. There, as new data were received, it would be amended like all other service registers, becoming material for a new version.¹⁴⁶ New town military musters were produced for every major town as the situation required. There seems to have been no set schedule.¹⁴⁷

The town military musters shared the basic set of diplomatic-organizational characteristics of the boiar lists, boiar books, temporary service lists and muster lists. Any given town military muster concerned only one town and the servitors by birth in it. The descriptive title which headed the document was in essence the instruction to the military governor.¹⁴⁸ The lists which made up the town military musters were hierarchically sorted in the following order, from most to least inclusive: rank (*rybornye dvoriane*, *deti boiarskie*, *gorodovie deti boiarskie*, sometimes *noviki*), receipt of money from

¹⁴¹Ibid., 60-62. On *razbornye knigi*, a document similar to the *razbornaia desiatnia*, see A. A. Novosil’skii, “Praviashchie grupy v sluzhilom “gorode” XVII v.,” *Uchenye zapiski, Institut istorii* 5 (1929), 319.

¹⁴²Ibid., 60-62.

¹⁴³Ibid., 69.

¹⁴⁴Shmidt and Kniaz’kov, *Dokumenty deloproizvodstva*, 53.

¹⁴⁵For some examples of instructions, see PSZ 2: nos. 744, 745, 840, and 853.

¹⁴⁶Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten,” 66-67; also see Chernov, *Voorozhennye sily*, 126-27 and *idem*, “TsGADA kak istochnik,” 75-77.

¹⁴⁷Krotov, “K istorii sostavleniia desiaten,” 59-60 and 66.

¹⁴⁸See, for example, the instruction at the head of the Pereiaslav’ town military muster of 1590: V. N. Storozhev, ed., *Desiatni XVI veka*, in ODB 8: 59.

the tax collection chancelleries or from the service city, and finally, monetary grades.¹⁴⁹ Town military musters contained limited counts, but no totals. As we have seen, town military musters were widely amended over the course of their active lives.

Town military musters were used as reference and accounting books in the Military Service Chancellery and in the towns. They were frequently cited, for example in the boiar books¹⁵⁰ and, in at least one instance, were alluded to in a *mestnichestvo* case.¹⁵¹ They were, however, official documents and do not seem to have attracted much attention from service clans.

Conclusion

Though I have touched on each of the main service registers administered by the Military Service Chancellery, my catalogue of lists is hardly complete. In addition to these flagship documents, the chancelleries designed and constructed innumerable minor registers. These were written with narrow, specific purposes in mind, or in response to unforeseen events. References to them are numerous in the administrative paperwork of the Military Service Chancellery.¹⁵² In any case, they were numerous, ephemeral, and without the stable, name-giving practice that marked the genealogical books, deployment books, boiar lists, boiar books, temporary service lists, muster lists, and town military musters. No doubt they were important in the creation, manipulation, and maintenance of Military Service Chancellery personnel records, but, alas, we know next to nothing about them.¹⁵³

Even without an exhaustive review of the service registers, we can still draw certain preliminary conclusions. First, the complex of chief registers we have described developed in the 1550s (or perhaps slightly before), probably as a result of military and administrative pressure brought on by the expansion of the court, territorial growth, and war with Western kingdoms. True, we see hints of the complex — particularly as concerns the genealogical and deployment books — as early as the 1480s. But these foreshadowings were nothing but that: it was not until the mid-sixteenth century that the social and institutional setting (particularly the Military Service Chancellery and its Moscow bureau) would solidify around the regular, official production of the key lists. Second, a discrete subset of the registers — the boiar lists, boiar books, temporary service lists, muster lists and town military musters — show a common diplomatic heritage stemming from the prototypical lists of the 1550s. Third, the coverage of the lists expanded. Beginning rather hesitantly in the late fifteenth century, the complex grew in power: more lists, more servitors on them, and more information about each of them. By the mid-seventeenth century, an experienced clerk in the Moscow bureau could quite easily discover where an elite servitor lived, where his estates were, how large they were, how many households/souls were on them, what his land and monetary entitlements were, when and where he had served, in what

¹⁴⁹On the evolution of these divisions in the provincial hereditary service class and their reflection in the town military musters, see Novosil'skii, "Praviashchie gruppy," 315-17.

¹⁵⁰Lukichev and Rogozhin, "Boiarskaia kniga 1627 g.," 11-12.

¹⁵¹Likhachev, *Razriadnye d'iaki XVI v.* (St. Petersburg: V. S. Balashev, 1888), 158.

¹⁵²Examples from st. 622 include: *otpusknye spiski* (fol. 48-49: "discharge lists"), *pod'iacheskie spiski* (fol. 145: "clerk lists"), *posluzhnye spiski* and *knigi* (fol. 198: "service lists" and "books"), *zapisnye knigi polonianikov i ranenyykh* (fol. 560: "logbooks of prisoners and wounded"), as well as many town *spiski*, e.g., the *vladimiskii spisok* (fol. 394: "Vladimir list").

¹⁵³Some idea of the volume and variety of these miscellaneous lists can be gained by reviewing the hundreds of references in the ODB's index entries for *spiski* and *rospisi* in its description of the archive of the Military Service Chancellery (see ODB 9-18).

capacity, with whom, at what rank, the sorts of war material he might have, whether he had been wounded, where, how severely, and his genealogy through the male line.

Finally, and most important, all this may be taken as *prima facie* evidence of a revolution in administrative literacy. The chancelleries became increasingly adept at keeping track of Muscovy's ever-expanding human resources. For example, in the second-half of the seventeenth century, catalogues of materials¹⁵⁴ and personal indices began to be constructed for the service registers.¹⁵⁵ These reference works were obviously designed to facilitate the use of a growing and increasingly complicated documentary complex. Petrine times brought further advances. Western informational graphics were incorporated in pre-existing Muscovite documents. Pagination, enumeration, lines, and tables appeared.¹⁵⁶ The obvious and most pertinent example here is the 1722 *Tabel' o rangakh* (Table of Ranks), which in essence takes information long kept in the upper-level service registers and presents it in a new "Western" fashion.¹⁵⁷ Finally, writing among the Muscovite scribal elite was not limited to the administrative documents of which we have been speaking. Beginning in the first-half of the seventeenth century, we find evidence of these lettered men reading and writing for diversion and enlightenment as well as administration.¹⁵⁸

Naturally, the service classes themselves responded to the increasing importance of paperwork. They became literate in greater numbers¹⁵⁹ and began to keep personal archives,¹⁶⁰ two processes that are only beginning to be understood.

¹⁵⁴Archival descriptions of the Military Service Chancellery became more sophisticated throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Compare the terse, one volume "fire" description of 1626 (RGADA, *fond* 210, *opis'* 6, "knigi moskovskogo stola," no. 19. Published: Likhachev, *Razriadnye d'iaki XVI v., prilozhenie* 4), the still meager mid-century description of 1651-1661 (*fond* 199, *portfel'* 52, *delo* 2. Published: N. P. Likhachev, *Biblioteka i arkhiv Moskovskikh gosudarei v XVI stoletii* (St. Petersburg: Tip. V. S. Balasheva, 1894), *prilozhenie* 4), and the massive, four volume "Bashmakov" description of 1668 (*fond* 210, *opis'* 20, *delo* 221, 222, 223, and 224). On archival description of the Military Service Chancellery, see M. P. Lukichev, "Iz istorii opisaniia arkhiva Razriadnogo prikaza XVII-XVIII v.," unpublished paper (Moscow, 1990); A. A. Gozdavo-Golombievskii, *Istoriia razriadnogo arkhiva* in ODB 5: 1-13. It should be added that the archives of other major chancelleries, e.g., the *pomestnyi* and *posol'skii* ("diplomatic") were just as well described. See S. O. Schmidt, *Rossiiskoe gosudarstvo v seredine XVI stoletia. Tsarskii arkhiv i litsnye letopisi vremeni Ivana Groznogo* (Moscow: Nauka, 1984); V. I. Gal'tsov, "Arkhiv Posol'skogo prikaza vo vtoroi polovine XVI - nachale XVII v.," *AE za 1981* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1982), 134-48; V. I. Gal'tsov, "Arkhiv Posol'skogo prikaza vo vtoroi polovine XVII v.," *Sovetskie arkhivy* no. 5 (1984): 17-24; in general, see V. I. Gal'tsov "Arkhivnye opisi v prikaznom deloproizvodstve XVII veke," in V. M. Istinov, *Istoriografiia i istochnikovedenie arkhivnogo dela v SSSR* (Moscow: MGIAI, 1984), 5-15.

¹⁵⁵The best example of materials probably constructed as reference works is the rather mysterious late-seventeenth century "*Sheremetevskii spisok*." This document, written in the Moscow bureau of the Military Service Chancellery, lists those holding consular ranks for the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries. On it, see A. A. Zimin, "Sostav boiarskoi dumy v XV-XVI v.," *AE za 1957* (Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1956), 41-87; and *idem*, *Formirovanie boiarskoi aristokratii v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XV - pervoi treti XVI v.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 18, note 32. Similar retrospective lists seem to have been produced earlier: see A. L. Stanislavskii's introductory essay to Stanislavskii and Mordovina, eds., *Boiarskie spiski poslednei chetverti XVI v.* Unfortunately, the manuscript of the *Sheremetevskii spisok* does not survive. For a surviving document very much like it, see RGADA, *fond* 181, *opis'* 1, no. 115. In the last two decades of the seventeenth century, many alphabetical lists of court members were compiled, see *fond* 210, *opis'* 2, nos. 34, 40, 45, and 48; *fond* 210, *opis'* 3, no. 47; *fond* 210, *opis'* 5, nos. 82 and 83; *fond* 210, *opis'* 21, nos. 614, 879, 2254, 2255 and 2256. It should be added that even more extensive indexes were constructed for documentary and property registers.

¹⁵⁶I am currently researching this subject. Preliminary indications are that Western graphics began to appear (in *zapisnye knigi*, for example) in the first years of the eighteenth century.

¹⁵⁷On the creation of the *Tabel' o rangakh*, see S. M. Troitskii, "Istoriia razrabotki Tabeli o rangakh," in *idem*, *Russkii absolutizm i dvorianstvo XVIII v.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974), 47-118.

¹⁵⁸On literary activity among the seventeenth-century administrative elite, see: S. I. Nikolaev, "Poeziia i diplomatiia (iz literaturnoi deiatel'nosti Posol'skogo prikaza v 1670-kh gg.)," *Trudy. Institut russkoi literatury. Leningrad. Otdelenie drevnei literatury* 42, (1989): 143-73; E. L. Keenan, *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1971), 84-89.

¹⁵⁹See Stevens, "Belgorod."

¹⁶⁰See Morozov, "Sluzhebnye i rodoslovnye dokumenty."

In any case, the scrolls of the Moscow bureau are filled with evidence of the dramatic flood of paperwork into the everyday lives of servicemen. Throughout their careers they received orders, relations, lists, complaints, edicts, and records of every variety. So too did they write: relations, memos, rescripts (from the very registers we have discussed), petitions, and even letters.¹⁶¹ It is clear that by the second half of the seventeenth century administrative literacy had arrived in Muscovy.

Much more work needs to be done to give us a clear indication of the basic contours and effects of the revolution in administrative literacy. For example, we have said nothing of the deployment of literacy in other areas of state activity crucial for the growth of state power. In addition to service registry, management of in-coming and out-going paper and the recording of tax burdens were two tasks shared by all Muscovite chancelleries.¹⁶² We need to know how the various techniques of literacy were used in these spheres if we are to gain a true picture of the advance of Muscovite administrative power. Furthermore, there are significant social historical issues involved as well. What effect did the “paperization” of administration have on the lives of servitors? It seems probable, for example, that the introduction of lists into the court after the 1550s (at the latest) had a significant impact on patterns of interaction and self-perception among the elite. Status could be read off the list, something impossible (or at least very difficult) prior to the introduction of writing into administration.¹⁶³ And it may even be the case that the intrusion of literacy led to deeper mental alterations. Does someone with the list think in the same way as one who does not?¹⁶⁴ All these issues must be explored if we are to understand fully the growth of administrative literacy in Muscovy.

¹⁶¹Letter (*gramotka*) writing is known to have emerged in Muscovy in the seventeenth century. It is very little studied. A collection of letters is published in S. I. Kotkov, ed. et al., *Gramotki XVII - nachala XVIII veka* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969) and *Rozysknyye dela o Fedore Shaklovitom i ego soobshchikakh* 4 vols. (St. Petersburg: Izd-vo Arkheograficheskoi kommissii, 1884-1893), 3: 102, 114, 179-86, 235, *inter alia*. See N. P. Panipetova, “Iz istorii chastnoi perezpiski na Rusi,” in V. F. Dubrovina, ed., *Izuchenie russkogo iazyka i istochnikovedeniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 127-55.

¹⁶²Each chancellery kept registers of various types to record the flow of paper (e.g., *zapisnye knigi*, “entry books”; *ustavnye knigi*, “regulation books”; *perezpisnye knigi*, “copy books”). In addition, since each chancellery was assigned a set of towns from which it was to draw revenue, fiscal accounts were also kept (e.g., *smetnye spiski*, “accounting lists”).

¹⁶³Scholars in “literacy studies” have made much of the effects of literacy — including of course, record-keeping — on social structure. For general statements, see J. Goody, *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1977), 10, 15-16, and 129; *idem*, *Logic of Writing*, xiii-xiv; and Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality*, 18-19.

¹⁶⁴On literacy’s psychological effects, particularly as they bear on rationality, abstraction, and analytical skills, see W. J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Meuthen, 1982), 8-9 and 78-116; J. Goody and I. Watt, “The Consequences of Literacy,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5 (1962-63), 326-33; Goody, *The Domestication*, 11-12, 43-44, and 49-50; Goody, *Logic of Writing*, 11, 247, 259-260, and 272; R. Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality*, 22. In general, see S. Scribner and M. Cole, *The Psychology of Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1981).

Appendix: Glossary of Documentary Terms

<i>Boiarskaia kniga</i>	boiar book
<i>Boiarskii spisok</i>	boiar list
<i>Boiarskii zemnyi spisok</i>	boiar land list
<i>Bol'shaia kniga</i>	grand book
<i>Chelobit'e</i>	petition
<i>Desiatnia</i>	town military muster
<i>Delo</i>	case
<i>Dokladnaia vypis'</i>	appeal
<i>Dvorovaia tetrad'</i>	court notebook
<i>Gorodovoi spisok</i>	town service list
<i>Gosudarev razriad</i>	sovereign's registers
<i>Gosudarev rodoslovet</i>	sovereign's geneology
<i>Imennoi ukaz</i>	tsar's edict
<i>Kormlennaia kniga</i>	provender rent book
<i>Moskovskii spisok</i>	Moscow service list
<i>Moskovskii/ razriadnyi spisok</i>	Moscow/Military Service Chancellery list
<i>Nakaz</i>	instruction
<i>Nalichnyi boiarskii spisok</i>	roll-call boiar list
<i>Nariad sluzhebnyi</i>	service register
<i>Okladnaia kniga</i>	entitlement books
<i>Otpiska</i>	dispatch
<i>Otpusknoi spisok</i>	discharge list
<i>Pamiat'</i>	memo
<i>Perepisnaia kniga</i>	census book
<i>Pod'iacheskii spisok</i>	clerk list
<i>Podlinnik</i>	original
<i>Podlinnyi boiarskii spisok</i>	original boiar list
<i>Pokhodnyi spisok</i>	pilgrimage/ campaign list
<i>Polkovaia rospis'</i>	regimental register
<i>Pometa</i>	note
<i>Posluzhnoi spisok</i>	service list
<i>Posluzhnaia kniga</i>	service book
<i>Prigovor</i>	order
<i>Primer</i>	precedent
<i>Razriad</i>	deployment register
<i>Razriadnaia kniga</i>	deployment book

<i>Razbornaia desiatnia</i>	inquiry muster
<i>Rodoslovnaia rospis'</i>	geneological list
<i>Rodoslovnaia kniga</i>	geneological book
<i>Skazka</i>	deposition
<i>Skrepa</i>	authentication
<i>Sluzhebnaia kniga</i>	service book
<i>Smetnyi spisok</i>	accounting list
<i>Smotrennyi spisok</i>	muster list
<i>Spravka</i>	reference
<i>Stat'ia</i>	grade
<i>Stolbets</i>	scroll
<i>Svadebnaia rospis'</i>	wedding register
<i>Tysiachnaia kniga</i>	book of the thousand servitors
<i>Ustannaia kniga</i>	regulation book
<i>Vypis'</i>	report [extract]
<i>Zapisnaia kniga</i>	log book
<i>Zapisnaia kniga poloniamikov</i>	logbook of prisoners and wounded
<i>Zhiletskii spisok</i>	temporary service list