DOCUMENT 6 (13–20 OCTOBER 1480)
The šartname (prysjažnyj lyst) sent by Khan Mengli Giray to King Casimir

The original document is missing.

Ruthenian copies:
A. RGADA, fond 389 = Litovskaja metrika, no. 4, fol. 104a–104b [old foliation: 89a–89b].

A.* 18th-century Latin transcription: AGAD, Metryka Litewska, no. 191a, p. 344 [old pagination: 96].
   Published in a) Pułaski, Stosunki Polski z Tatarszczyzną, p. 203; 1 b) Sbornik Muxanova,2 pp. 25–26.

Во имя Божье, втъ Менъдлchgиреѧ, Казимирꙋ королю, брату, в сеи мере присегнуѧ:
Королю, брате мои, мы которое словъ речомъ, братыства и приѧзни повышати, а приѧтелю приѧтелъ, а неприѧтелю неприѧтель будуѧ, а в къ его приѧтелю приѧтелъ, а к неприѧтелю неприѧтель маю быть. Такъѧя в, Менъдлchgиреи царъ, Казимира королѧ, брата моего приѧтелю приѧтелемъ маю быть, а неприѧтелю неприѧтелемъ.
А еще мне, Менъдлchgирею, Казимир король, братъ, коли на своеи присѧже стояти будеть, потомъ в, Менъдлchgиреи царь, Казимира, брата моего людьѧмъ, и землѧмъ его, и водѧмъ, коли бы мело што статисѧ, в и царство покинꙋ, а лиха не дамъ вчинить; втъ мене, а втъ братьи моєе менъшое,8 и втъ сына моего лиха не будеть.
Такожъ мне, Менъдлchgирею, Казимир король, братъ, што втъ брать мои, Ахъггирие царь княѧю Семєя котори подавалъ люди, тье люди мне бы вдъдаль. Ино корол, братъ, коли тье люди мне штъдѧсть, а в, Менъдлchgиреи, коли въ свое присѧге выстѫплю, вт Бога тогда, вд пророка Магъмета, и вт Кургана, и вт книгъ наших вт фрскѣ [sic].

1 Erroneously dated by Pułaski as issued on 15 October 1479.
2 Rendered in the Cyrillic script; cf. note 2 to Document 5.
3 Omitted in Pułaski’s edition.
4 It should probably read вмѣшкѧв; the Cyrillic letter е is uplifted above the word and perhaps has been misplaced. For the Church Slavonic form otkHK/oتركس‘, derived from oтK/oتكس‘ (infinitive: oтKат‘/otrekat'ja), cf. Slovar’ cerkovno-
   slavjanskago i russkago jazyka, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1867), col. 260. I would like to warmly thank Andrij Danylenko for his assistance in solving this puzzle.
In the name of God, from Mengli Giray to King Casimir, [our] brother, I have sworn in the following manner:

Oh king, my brother, we pronounce this word, strengthening brotherhood and friendship, and being a friend to [your] friend and an enemy to [your] enemy; if the king is a friend to my friend and an enemy to [my] enemy, I should [likewise] be a friend to his friend and en enemy to [his] enemy. Also I, Mengli Giray Khan, should be a friend to any friend of my brother, King Casimir, and an enemy to [his] enemy. And if King Casimir, [my] brother, keeps his oath [given] to me, Mengli Giray, then I, Mengli Giray Khan, if anything wrong is to happen to the people of my brother Casimir, his lands, or his waters, I will sooner leave my kingdom than let any harm be committed [to them]; no harm will descend [upon them] from me, my younger brothers, or my son.

Moreover, King Casimir, [my] brother, you should return to me, Mengli Giray, the people whom my father, Hadji Giray Khan, gave to Prince Semen. And if you, king, [my] brother, return these people to me, if I, Mengli Giray,

---

3 This sentence seems to be redundant as it repeats the former statement.
4 Semen Olelkovyč (Pol. Olelkowicz), related to the Jagiellonian dynasty, ruled in Kiev as a prince subordinate to King Casimir in the years 1454–1470; only after his death the autonomy of the principality was abolished in 1471; see his biography by Anna Kruppska in PSB, vol. 23, p. 746. At the beginning of his rule, in 1454 Semen Olelkovyč rebelled against Casimir with the help of Seyyid Ahmed, the grandson of Khan Tokhtamısh and the pretender to the throne of the Golden Horde. The rebellion was crushed with the help of the Crimean khan, Hadji Giray. While Semen was pardoned, Seyyid Ahmed spent the rest of his life in Lithuanian captivity, first in Vilnius and then in Kaunas. Although the members of his Tatar retinue were allowed to settle in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Crimean khans regarded them as their subjects and continually demanded their return. This is how the legend of the “donation” by Hadji Giray to Semen Olelkovyč must have been born. As late as in 1499, Mengli Giray still demanded the return of “his subjects” once “donated” to Prince Semen by his father; see Jan Tyszkiwicz, Tatarzy na Litwie i w Polsce. Studia z dziejów XIII–XVIII w., pp. 132–133 and 161–162; Xoroškevič, Rus’ i Krym, pp. 159–160. In a recent article, Feliks Šabul’do argues that Mengli’s request also had a territorial character and referred to the lands situated to the east from the Vorskla and the lower Dnieper; see idem, “«Semenovy ljudi»: ix territorija i rol’ v političeskix otnošenijax meždu Krymom i Litvoy na isxode XV veka,” in: Ruthenica, vol. 9. Edited by V. Ryčka and O. Toločko (Kiev, 2010): 57–73, esp. pp. 72–73. Yet, the passage in question specifically refers to people (ljudy), and in the steppe culture it was the people rather than the land over whom the khan’s sovereignty could have been extended.