

**SLAVERY AS AN ELEMENT OF THE CULTURE OF CROSS-BORDER DIALOGUE IN THE CAUCASUS ON THE CUSP OF THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES
(BASED ON *THE CIRCASSIAN SLAVE NARRATIVES* BY
A. A. CHERKASOV)**

Artyom Y. PERETYATKO*

Abstract. *This paper explores the significance of non-confrontational phenomena that stemmed from slave ownership in the Caucasus on the cusp of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The author analysed a large body of documents on slavery in the Caucasus, with a primary focus on texts relating to various variants of cross-border cooperation in the region. The study's main information base was formed on the basis of 180 documents from *The Circassian Slave Narratives* by A. A. Cherkasov (all slavery-related documents spanning from 1792 to 1802 retrieved by the historian from the Krasnodar Krai State Archive). The author established that the share of texts relating to the subject is 28%. The author's conclusion is that this way of analysing the issue is full of promise.*

Keywords: *history of the Caucasus, slavery, cross-border dialogue, Russo-Ottoman cooperation, Russo-mountaineer cooperation.*

Introduction

One of the most famous cases of captivity during the Caucasian War is the story of Russian spy F. F. Tornau, who detailed his adventures in the book *Vospominaniya kavkazskogo ofitsera*.¹ Captured in 1835 for ransom, Tornau discovers that at first most of the mountaineers are inclined to be kind to him, treating him like “a guest from a distant land,” rather than a captive.² The situation changes only after it becomes clear that they will receive no ransom for him. Besides, there were two failed attempts to escape on his part. They stop being kind to him and chain him up. To his complaints, they respond by allegedly saying that “a [brave] man ought to serve his captivity in chains.”³ Up until his third attempt to escape, which he undertook in 1838 and which was successful, Tornau had been aided by Aslan-Koz, the daughter of Abadzekh official Daur-Alim-Girey, while his actual escape was made possible through the efforts of Nogai prince Tembulat Karamurzin.⁴ Tornau describes his life in captivity in the book *Vospominaniya kavkazskogo ofitsera*,

* Cherkas Global University (International Network Center for Fundamental and Applied Research), Washington, USA; Volgograd State University, Russian Federation; e-mail: ArtPeretatko@yandex.ru.

¹ Tornau 2008.

² Dzidzariya 1976, p. 55–58.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 60–61.

⁴ *Ibid.*

which to this day continues to be of interest to researchers as an important historical source.⁵ In essence, despite the harsh treatment that Tornau received at the hands of the mountaineers, it would be hardly correct to regard the story of his captivity as downright confrontational and solely as a story of a Russian officer trying to survive the hardships of captivity.

A case that is less famous but is quite interesting in its own way is the story of peasant woman Anna Solopova. She runs away in the 1830s from her husband, a travelling officer's valet, to Mozdok.⁶ After being detained for not having proper ID on her, Solopova eventually runs away from the town in 1836 with another man, an Armenian named Zakhar G. Arakelov, with whom she has already started a love affair by then.⁷ Sadly, all the while, the young woman's lover has been planning to sell her into slavery. For quite a long time (they have been living among "peaceful mountaineers" for several months), Solopova has not had any issue with the way she is treated.⁸ The woman becomes alarmed only when she is taken deeper into the mountains. She is scared to the extent that she pleads to be killed rather than be sold into slavery.⁹ Fortunately, she manages to run away from the mountaineers as well, which she does quite swiftly.¹⁰ Of interest is the fact that, as suggested by Sergei L. Dudarev, Solopova's is not the only case where a Russian woman ran away to the mountaineers of her own accord, for amorous reasons.¹¹ Thus, while the stories of Tornau and Solopova have little in common typologically, both bizarrely combine confrontation between Russian captives and the locals with peaceful interaction, which may extend as far as love affairs, between them.

Prominent researcher of the seventeenth and eighteenth century southern Russian borderland Dmitrii V. Sen', who has drawn attention to the need for the conceptual re-evaluation of slavery in the northern Black Sea region, has suggested that the latter be regarded even as an element of the "culture of cross-border dialogue in a climate of forced neighbourship."¹² Here is how the scholar explains his reasoning:

A future deal [i.e., an act of redeeming the enslaved through paying ransom] involved the bringing together of a large circle of participants, including intermediaries. Its success would depend on the fulfilment of several conditions (e.g., having a command of the language; availability of

⁵ Trapsh 2015.

⁶ Dudarev 2016, p. 15.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid., p. 16.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 17.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Sen' 2020, p. 172.

information on the enslaved; knowledge of prices for captives; knowledge of slave trade routes; etc.).¹³

Sen' has examined a whole range of cases of captive redemption, and has come to the conclusion that on the cusp of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there was in place in the Russo-Crimean-Ottoman borderland "a system that 'pulled' into the space of redemption operations multiple people, who would bicker, trade and, of course, describe their part in the process in their own way."¹⁴

However, there has yet to be conducted a comprehensive study into slavery in the Caucasus in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as an element of the culture of cross-border dialogue specifically. That being said, some attempts at this kind of research *have* been made. Prominent researcher N. N. Velikaya concludes in one of her articles that it was a time when Orthodox Christians and Moslems shared "a peaceful, if forced, co-existence" within one region, when "Russian speech could be heard in just about any mountain aul."¹⁵ The scholar is convinced that during the Caucasian War "the Slavic and mountain peoples became much closer to each other."¹⁶

The purpose of this short paper is to provide an insight into how slavery facilitated the development of non-confrontational relations between various political, religious and national forces on the eve of the Caucasian War. Understandably, for the majority of slaves, even those who did not remain long in captivity, the experience was hard and traumatic. However, the system of slavery, as opposed to slave ownership, as it also included the organisation of slave escapes, was a much more complex and controversial phenomenon, one that definitely merits further investigation along those lines.

Materials and methods

So far, research into slavery in the northern Black Sea region and in the Caucasus has been based mainly on the analysis of particular documents. Few materials on the subject have survived to this day, so researchers get to focus primarily on particular cases of slavery known to them that they regard as typical. Consequently, what tends to be a common form of scholarly narrative is detailed descriptions of certain events or incidents.¹⁷ The problem is that this kind of approach, although researchers are largely compelled to utilise it,

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 184.

¹⁵ Velikaya 2013, p. 88.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁷ Dudarev 1994; Urushadze 2017; Klychnikov 2020.

tends to leave room for subjectivism on the part of authors and for subsequent criticism. In this context, of particular interest are the views of well-known archaeologist Valentin A. Dergachev, which, while being focused primarily on methodological issues in archaeology, do seem to do a good job of describing the situation in contemporary historical science as a whole. Dergachev contrasts research conducted by “hard-and-fast rules” – which implies setting clear-cut objectives, selecting the largest possible number of sources that “adequately match the set objectives,” and resolving the set objectives based on the entire range of the selected sources – with “literary” research, where the person starts not by setting the objectives but by voicing a few a-priori speculations that seem correct to them without any analysis of the entire source base and then “freely cites” only some of the materials, those that appear to confirm those speculations.¹⁸ Eventually, Dergachev arrives at the conclusion that in research conducted by “hard-and-fast rules” they tend to “follow the material” and “build a conclusion based on the consistency of the actual materials,” whereas in the case of “literary” research they tend to “sort of gradually and unnoticeably match to their ideas those of the materials that appear to work for them.”¹⁹ According to the archaeologist, how “this is done is no secret: they tend to ascribe it to a lack of sources and the complexity of the situation when they wish to be silent about one thing but give saliency to another (something that works).”²⁰

Consequently, it would be interesting to explore slavery as an element of the culture of cross-border dialogue not through the example of particular cases but based on an extensive source base on the system of slavery in particular parts of the Caucasus. The author became fully convinced of this after reading A. A. Cherkasov’s collection of documents *The Circassian Slave Narratives*.²¹ Cherkasov attempted to identify all documents “directly associated with slave ownership in Circassia” that are stored in the Krasnodar Krai State Archive.²² While Cherkasov personally admits that most of the materials in the book are incomplete (the numerical irregularities across the years being testimony to not all cases having been found), he has published as many as 1,200 documents on the subject, which cover 2,878 slaves in Circassia.²³ What is of even greater significance for the present study is that Cherkasov published all documents he had found, i.e., we are dealing here with a sound body of authentic sources that was not distorted by the

¹⁸ Dergachev 2007, p. 25–26.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Cherkasov 2020.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 1416.

²³ *Ibid.*

historian's selection processes.²⁴ Thus, having armed himself with a volume of information that was sufficient to conduct the study, the author proceeded to trace, on the basis of those sources, how frequently slavery served as an element of the culture of cross-border dialogue in the region in the past.

Once again, “follow the material” is what the author sought to do in this study. Note that in the course of the study it was understood that there were too many documents to discuss in a single work, with the frequency of the subject getting touched upon varying significantly from decade to decade too. Therefore, it was decided to limit it to the period 1792–1802, which, on the one hand, is covered in *The Circassian Slave Narratives* pretty well (180 documents), and, on the other, is dominated by a clearly specific form of cross-border dialogue, which subsequently became almost non-existent. In analysing the documents from said decade, the author sought to locate in them the various forms of non-confrontational interaction between the Russians, the mountaineers and the Turks, and then check how often one could encounter other similar cases in the book. If a specific form of interaction were encountered often, the author listed general information on it by way of tables – otherwise, the cases were to be touched upon in descriptive form exclusively. Understandably, factors such as an incomplete source base and the impossibility of exploring every single case of non-confrontational interaction available in such an extensive body of documents do not let one regard the conclusions drawn by the study as final. Nevertheless, they do suffice to get an idea of the significance of slavery for the culture of cross-border dialogue in the Caucasus on the cusp of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Discussions

Attempts at having dialogue with the Ottoman leadership

Curiously, *The Circassian Slave Narratives* even begins with a document calling for cross-border dialogue. The Russo-Turkish War of 1787–1791 and the transfer of the Black Sea Host to the Kuban region created a whole new situation in the region, which found itself divided between the zones of influence of Russia and Turkey. Apparently, initially the official authorities of both empires hoped that the opposite side would combat, to the best of its ability, the slave trade among each side's subjects. Therefore, when in 1792 a cornet named Semen Beskrovny fled Circassian slavery, the army authorities opted to resolve the issue as much through official channels as possible, accusing the mountaineers of “having the temerity to act in violation of the peace treaty between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Porte” and proposing to turn to the local Ottoman administration for official

²⁴ Ibid.

investigation.²⁵ As early as the following year, 1793, it became clear that it was not a one-off occurrence. The Anapa pasha complained that the Black Sea Cossacks attacked a group of five Nekrasovites who were fishing in the Kuban River, killing one and capturing the other four.²⁶ The vice-governor of Taurida Governorate, in turn, demanded from the Anapa pasha that they release an enslaved Black Sea Cossack.²⁷

In the summer of 1793, an ensign named Grigorii Lozinsky arrived in Anapa as a negotiating representative of the Russian side. It appears that, while both the Turks and the Russians pinned special hope on the dialogue they had started, both considered the possibility of swindling each other. The Anapa pasha, Tyuse Mustafa, received the negotiator quite warmly, presenting him with a fur-lined coat as a gift and giving the Cossacks who accompanied him some money – but he did not promise them anything specific. For instance, the pasha alluded to the possibility of some of the captures having been made back at the time of official armed hostilities, suggesting that “during the war, as we both know, your men captured ours and our men captured yours, so there is really nothing I can do here to help you.”²⁸ With that said, the pasha requested the release of 14 Greeks who had fled the Turks and crossed over to the Russians.²⁹ Lozinsky, in turn, was playing a double game – under the pretext of a slave release mission, he actually intended to look around the Turkish fortress.³⁰

It is to be noted that the documents on the negotiations with the Anapa pasha are much more detailed than most of the concise texts in *The Circassian Slave Narratives*. The Russian officers made written notes of the verbal exchange with the pasha. The pasha, in turn, personally wrote to the Black Sea Host authorities in an effort to get them to release some boy “captured in Khatakak.”³¹ Later on, during his next meeting with Lozinsky, pasha Mustafa said that it was a minor bey captured by the Russians and that unless and until the boy was released there was to be no satisfying in full measure of the demands put forth by the Russians.³² One has to give the pasha credit – he even released to the Russians two of the captives and at first even agreed to pay compensation for the third one. However, a dispute broke out between the two parties over the size of the compensation to be paid. Mustafa, also,

²⁵ Ibid., p. 1435.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 1438–1439.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 1441.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., p. 1443.

³² Ibid., p. 1444.

refused to pay the cornet Beskrovny the amount the latter demanded for the belongings stolen during his capture.³³

Thus, despite all the issues surrounding it, the emergent dialogue was not fruitless – the Turks released the two Russian captives without a ransom being paid, and the Russians released to the pasha the four captive Nekrasovites.³⁴ However, the continuation of the dialogue was impeded by a conflict around individual issues and issues associated with those who had deserted of their own accord. The same G. Lozinsky was hopeful that the pasha would release those soldiers and Cossacks who had fled to Anapa and converted to Islam. However, the pasha would not make any concessions, as the Russians themselves had persistently ignored his requests for the release of the Armenians and Greeks who had fled to the Russians for protection.³⁵ Yet the local authorities had little to no room to manoeuvre in that situation, for under Catherine II the Russian Empire was seeking to work with runaways from the Turkish dominion. In 1796, Black Sea ataman Zakharii A. Chepega even received from the government a special top-secret directive, which was so eloquent that it is worth citing a portion of it herein:

Considering the tough lot of members of some of the ethnic groups residing in the Circassian dominion, such as the Abazins, Nogais and Tatars, it is quite likely that many of them, in an effort to avoid Turkish raids and looting and break free from the harrowing ordeal, will seek to flee to our side with their families and belongings, with a view to joining persons of the same ethnicity currently living a quiet life in the Taurida region. Thus, having informed Your Excellency of this, I most humbly ask you to direct the officials and Cossacks in charge of the cordons along the border to receive the afore-mentioned groups of people willing to cross over to our side in as benevolent a manner as possible and bring them over to you without any mistreatment.³⁶

The situation started to improve only after the accession to the throne of Paul I, who was convinced that a policy of that kind gravely violated the peace treaty with Turkey.³⁷ In February 1797, the officers in charge of the cordons along the border were directed to act as follows:

In an effort to preserve good relations with the Turks, bar from crossing over to our side any Circassians, Tatars, Armenians or members of any other ethnic group who are heading over here from the Transkuban region as subjects of the Ottoman Porte with the aim of settling in the Russian state.³⁸

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 1438–1439.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 1444.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 1458.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 1463.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 1467.

The paucity of surviving documents makes it difficult to trace in detail the activity of Russian representatives in Anapa in that complicated climate. However, it did probably continue later on, although they no longer pinned special hope on it as they had done before, with it mostly being now only about the release of at least some of the captives through official channels. Apparently, only out-of-the-ordinary cases were documented. The next mention of the theme in question is dated 1797, with G. Lozinsky still being in Anapa. In fact, he does a good job of explaining another reason the Turks would not observe the terms of the peace treaty with Russia. It appears that after the new Anapa pasha, Asman, permitted the release to the Russians of a Russian subject named Petr Pogrebnoy, who had spent 15 years in slavery, the latter's master, Navruz Ovlu, became furious at that and assaulted the Russian representatives.³⁹ In the end, the pasha did help the Russians get their horses back from Ovlu, but he did not punish the man in any way, with the latter continuing to express his discontent and threatening to “avenge it by committing robbery.”⁴⁰ It is no wonder that, with this kind of attitude on the part of the mountaineers toward the release of Russian captives, the primary matter that had brought Lozinsky to Anapa (which is not mentioned in the document) would not be resolved, leaving the Russian leadership with no choice other than to “exercise patience.”⁴¹

Still, the complicated and controversial dialogue with the Anapa pashas, which began and continued largely based on the need to free people from captivity, started to avail the Russian Empire considerably, both expectedly and unexpectedly, following the decision not to receive Turkish subjects into Russian allegiance. The new Anapa governor, Osman Pasha, returned to the Russians 135 head of stolen cattle, as well as stolen rifles and belongings, and in 1798 the Ottoman Empire officially paid Russia 20,312 piasters worth of compensation for its past raids.⁴² That same year, in February, Osman even informed the Russian leadership of a major imminent raid by the Circassians!⁴³

Curiously, the aforementioned pasha is also mentioned in the classic *Istoriya Kubanskogo kazach'ego voiska* by Fedor A. Shcherbina, which describes the excellent relations between the Turkish official and Kuban ataman Fedor Ya. Bursak. Here is an excerpt from it: “His letters to Bursak, abounding in bombastic pleasantries, as was common in the East at the time, were imbued

³⁹ Ibid., p. 1473.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., p. 1477.

⁴³ Ibid.

with well-wishing.”⁴⁴ Note that, as testified in the book, Bursak received from Osman Pasha some assistance in the area of combating slavery too. For instance, the ataman asked the Anapa governor to free from mountaineer captivity a group of Russian deserters and a female relative of his.⁴⁵ Evidently, this kind of interaction was actually not unique: the Black Sea atamans and Taurida authorities had sought to develop it since 1792, but up until 1798 the progress was much slower – mainly on account of Russia’s position. That being said, the interaction between the two empires reached the point where in May 1798 Osman Pasha formed a special unit based on the Turkish side of the border that was to help combat “predatory activities” on either side of the border jointly with Russian cordons.⁴⁶

The problem is that a dialogue of this kind required some sort of sacrifice and moral concessions on the part of the Russian leadership. In the summer of that same year, the Turks put forth a demand to release a runaway slave, the first officially documented demand of that kind in five years. The story goes that some slave, along with his wife and four children, fled to the Russians, and they were even accepted by the Russian side, after he made himself out to be a subject of the Russian Empire that had been captured by the Circassians.⁴⁷ However, when Osman Pasha provided a description of the family, it became clear who the runaways were, so it was decided to release them back to the Anapa governor.⁴⁸ Later on, between November and December 1798, the Russian leadership had to put up with the fact that another raid involving the capture of people came from the dominion of Prince Muradin, whom Osman Pasha had been positioning as a highly reliable ally of the Porte.⁴⁹ Albeit the Cossacks even captured one of the mountaineers, who confirmed Muradin’s guilt, Osman Pasha declared that the prince had not been aware of the deeds of his subjects, asking the opposing side to forgive him and promising that an investigation would be conducted in his dominion, based on which all those found guilty would be punished and all those captured would be released.⁵⁰ The start of a new relationship between the Russian and Ottoman leaderships can be well illustrated by the following case of their interaction. When in the fall of 1799 another Russian negotiator, esaul Nikir Gadzhanov, arrived in Anapa with the aim of discussing the release of a herd of horses carried off by a group of “Transkuban predators,” he would not receive the horses back, but the

⁴⁴ Shcherbina 1913, p. 152–153.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁴⁶ Cherkasov 2020, p. 1481–1482.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1483.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 1484.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 1491.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1492.

Turkish leadership would instantly release to him three captives who had been captured by some Abazins who were totally unrelated to the story.⁵¹

Once again, partial blame for the problems in dealing with the Anapa pasha is to be pointed at the Russian leadership. In 1800, the negotiations with the Turks were again led by G. Lozinsky (the issue of this particular officer being repeatedly enlisted to negotiate with the Ottomans may merit separate investigation). At first, the pasha agreed to pay a new sum of compensation for the mountaineers' raids, specifically those committed after 1797. However, he would receive a note listing the following highly suspicious rounded figures on the losses incurred by the Russians: "horses – 500, cattle – 300, Cossacks killed – 35, those captured – 50, and those wounded – 25; total damages (exclusive of the people) – 25,000 rubles."⁵² As a result, to substantiate the figures, Lozinsky had to consult the official documentation. The official records revealed that the actual losses were as follows: "horses – 362 and cattle – 230; total damages – 18,220 rubles and 30 kopecks; Cossacks killed – 32, those captured – 54, and those wounded – 19."⁵³ It turns out that ataman F. Ya. Bursak had simply ordered the addition of some more cattle retrospectively into the records submitted to the Ottomans in order to receive as much as possible from them.⁵⁴

Essentially, there is a sense that by that time the sides had obtained a good insight into each other, with the illusory hope for close cooperation being replaced with an understanding of the official leadership's potential being limited in the specific conditions of the Caucasus, of both sides playing behind-the-scenes games and, most importantly, of even limited dialogue being highly useful for the release of captives. For instance, that same year, 1800, the Anapa pasha also reminded Bursak, which he did without any claims in a well-meaning letter containing proposals regarding future cooperation, that the latter had promised to release back to the Ottomans 22 captives but had thus far only released three.⁵⁵ Note that in that letter the pasha suggested that the Circassians had "a hundred times more" issues with the Russians.⁵⁶ On the other hand, Lozinsky, too, regularly reported to Bursak that Ottoman officials were doing a poor job of releasing Russian captives – yet not because they did not want to release them but because they "had no power" over many of the mountaineers and were compelled to act exclusively "out of consideration for the wishes of the Russians and fear of the Russian

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1494–1495.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 1499.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1502.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1500.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

army.”⁵⁷ Influential mountaineers in the region oftentimes played a game of their own. For instance, when the authorities officially swapped a Circassian nobleman for a Russian woman with children, her master simply left the house, and, as a result, the Turks found it impossible to take them away with no participation from the master.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, it is as a consequence of this kind of exceptional cases that there emerged another special form of cross-border cooperation in the region – at some point Osman Pasha’s subordinates resolved to engage in the search for Russian captives in association with Lozinsky, with the latter acting as a witness to their actions before the leadership.⁵⁹ Eventually, Osman Pasha and Bursak politely exchanged requests for the speeding up of the captive release process, which, unlike their predecessors, they did without showing any clear displeasure over each other’s sluggishness in the matter.⁶⁰

The situation worsened again in the early nineteenth century, but the documents do not let one trace the course of the process. In any case, in 1802 Alexander I demanded that the system of the release of Russian captives by the Anapa pasha be restored. The emperor demanded that on his “behalf the Anapa pasha be approached with a demand of satisfaction – by way of both the release of captive people and the meting out of harsh punishment to those guilty of perfidy and crime.”⁶¹ Although we do not know the response to that of the Anapa pasha, Ali, based on information from captives who fled Anapa, he was clearly frightened, and eventually resolved to refrain from protecting the Circassians should a Russian expedition be launched against them.⁶²

Thus, the period 1792–1802 was dominated by the following form of cross-border cooperation stemming from slavery in the Caucasus – interaction between the Russian and Turkish leaderships. The author tried to furnish all major themes on the topic that are reflected in *The Circassian Slave Narratives*. It is evidenced in them that this cooperation largely depended on external factors – in some years, it was very active, and in others it was not documented in archive sources at all. What is more, certain documents reflect not so much the sides’ actual cross-border dialogue as their intention and failure to have one. Nevertheless, even such intentions and failed attempts may merit attention. Table 1 displays the number and share of texts on Russo-Turkish cooperation in the region in *The Circassian Slave Narratives* for the period 1792–1802.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 1502.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 1503.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 1505.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 1508.

⁶² Ibid., p. 1509.

Table 1. Number and share of texts on Russo-Turkish cooperation in the region for the period 1792–1802.⁶³

Year	Total documents	Documents on Russo-Turkish cooperation	Share of documents on Russo-Turkish cooperation ⁶⁴
1792	1	1	100%
1793	18	6	33%
1794	1	0	-
1795	15	0	-
1796	34	2 ⁶⁵	6%
1797	32	4	13%
1798	41	6	15%
1799	1	0	-
1800	30	11	37%
1801	1	0	-
1802	6	2	33%
Total	180	32	18%
Average ⁶⁶	28	5	18%

It is worth stating that of all the forms of non-confrontational interaction dealing with slavery it is themes of Russo-Ottoman dialogue that found the largest reflection in the texts analysed. An average of 18% of the texts for each year were devoted to attempts to establish a dialogue with the Anapa pasha in particular and the Turkish administration as a whole. This, of course, does not signify that this form of cross-border interaction was the most significant in the period under review, for official diplomatic negotiations may simply have been reflected best in official documentation. Nevertheless, it can be stated with confidence that the Russian and Ottoman administrations sought to interact on the issue of the mutual release of captives in the Caucasus throughout the period 1792–1802, with a focus not on one-off dealings with each other but on systematic collaboration in the area. With that said, even though relatively successful this relationship was only brief – from 1797 to 1800. The rest of the time, while such relations did

⁶³ Ibid., p. 1435–1510.

⁶⁴ Rounded off to the nearest whole number.

⁶⁵ Technically, for this year there are three documents dealing with Russo-Turkish relations. However, the author did not factor in the above-mentioned directive that runaways from the Turkish side of the border be secretly accepted, considering it as one directed against the Russo-Ottoman dialogue.

⁶⁶ Exclusive of the years from which fewer than 10 documents have survived.

exist, the interest to continue them was expressed only by one of the Russian emperors personally.

Captive redemption

The most conventional slavery-related form of cross-border dialogue, as well as the one covered best in historiography, was captive redemption. As may be recalled, D. V. Sen' notes its significance in the context in question in the southern Russian borderland back in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries:

A future deal involved the bringing together of a large circle of participants, including intermediaries. Its success would depend on the fulfilment of several conditions (e.g., having a command of the language; availability of information on the enslaved; knowledge of prices for captives; knowledge of slave trade routes, etc.).⁶⁷

In the afore-mentioned classic work by F. A. Shcherbina, a significant portion of the chapter "Captives" is devoted to Russian captives being redeemed from and fleeing Circassian slavery. Of particular interest are the following lines:

It would be wearisome to describe on a year-by-year basis deals between the Circassians and the Cossacks relating to the ransom and exchange of captives, but suffice it to say that, alongside a long list of Cossacks killed and wounded by the Circassians, these deals are among the Caucasian War's most characteristic features.⁶⁸

Note, however, that, systematically speaking, Shcherbina furnishes only information for 1807, when there were 17 deals completed and 30 people redeemed (the scholar then switches to a "literary" manner of telling, focusing in detail on only some of the cases).⁶⁹

In the preface to *The Circassian Slave Narratives*, Cherkasov tries to provide more complete statistics on the redemption of Russian captives from the Circassians in the period 1792–1860. The data provided by Cherkasov agree with those from Shcherbina quite well: for 1807, he speaks of 29 redeemed captives (it is to be remembered that Cherkasov relied on materials from the Krasnodar Krai State Archive exclusively, while Shcherbina invoked the capital archives as well).⁷⁰ Overall, Cherkasov confirms the conclusions drawn by Shcherbina: indeed, captive redemption was a crucial component of the relationship between the Russians and the mountaineers. Among the 1,008 Russians established by Cherkasov to have broken free from Circassian

⁶⁷ Sen' 2020, p. 172.

⁶⁸ Shcherbina 1913, p. 530.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Cherkasov 2020, p. 1427.

captivity in all the different ways, there are 638 captives who were redeemed.⁷¹ Yet it is switching from “literary” to “hard-and-fast rules” research that enabled Cherkasov to complement, and in some places even correct, the assertions of the classic of Kuban historiography. The thing is that chronologically the cases of redemption recorded in said body of documents are distributed quite unevenly and, for the overwhelming part, are from the period 1803–1834.⁷² This by no means is associated with an unrepresentative sample of documents: there are certain “gaps,” which may be associated with lost texts, between the peak years too; but outside of the period under review almost no cases of redemption were captured (the afore-mentioned 32-year period accounting for over 550 redemptions, the remaining 37 years doing so for just around 50).⁷³

Thus, for the period under review, 1792–1802, the body of documents under examination contains only some cases of the redemption of Russian captives. It may be associated with the fact that at that time the Russian leadership sought to free people held captive by the mountaineers free of charge, through the agency of the Turkish leadership. Note that at the time the post of Anapa Pasha was held by Osman this policy was quite successful. Before we proceed to the more major conclusions, it may be worth examining each known case separately.

The redemption theme first appears in the body of documents under examination in 1797. Firstly, the document dated 23 May captures the presence in one of the quarantines of three Armenian priests, “whom Transkuban residents redeemed from the Armenians.”⁷⁴ Thus, we have here a one-off act of redemption carried out without the knowledge of the official authorities and captured in their documentation for technical reasons exclusively. Secondly, as early as 3 May that same year, officer Prokop Umanets informed his superiors that a Cossack named Mikola Slepukha was in Abazin captivity and that there was not enough time to free him through official channels, for the mountaineers were going to sell him into captivity “in a distant land” lest a ransom be paid promptly to redeem him.⁷⁵ Curiously, it even follows from the actual document that there was no official mechanism for redeeming captives in place at the time, for Umanets would leave the resolution of this issue up to the will of his superiors.⁷⁶ Considering that Slepukha’s redemption or escape is not recorded in the documents, it

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1427–1429.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 1427.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1468.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

may be assumed that he remained in mountaineer captivity. Finally, thirdly, on 13 June a Cossack named Efrem Titarevsky approached ataman Timofei T. Kotlyarevsky with a request to redeem from the mountaineers his cousin sister, Varvara Zholob, and her minor child.⁷⁷ However, this petition, too, was left without consideration. Interestingly, Zholob was that very same relative of F. Ya. Bursak's whose liberation without a ransom, through official channels, is what the Black Sea ataman would later be asking Osman Pasha for.⁷⁸

The first case of a person being officially redeemed with the participation of the authorities is recorded as occurring on 14 February 1798: through the agency of some Armenian, with funds from the Yekaterinodar exchange court, they redeemed from captivity a jaeger named Tinait Sontkulov.⁷⁹ On 25 November of that same year, a Nakhichevan burgher named Madiroyav Toyulyubakyan went straight to the Yekaterinodar exchange court with two Russian captives redeemed by him – apparently, in hopes of receiving a cash reward for them. However, it is not clear from the document whether or not he actually received one.⁸⁰ Thus, it appears that the Russian leadership tended to actually be drawn into the redemption process, with the initiative in this respect tending to come from the locals – not only the mountaineers, who would hope to get a ransom, but also the Armenians, who would act as intermediaries most of the time. Then again, as evidenced from even the handful of surviving cases, the Russian leadership would get involved in the captive redemption process in a variety of ways. At the beginning of the following year, 1799, “in a bid to accommodate the persistent requests of coastal Circassian princes,” the Black Sea Host leadership agreed to release several mountaineers captured during a raid, but, taking advantage of the situation, refused to release their horses and belongings until the opposite side, also, released a Cossack captured during the raid (and eventually, the Cossack *was* released).⁸¹ There are no more cases of redemption for said period in the body of materials under examination. Cherkasov does mention one case of redemption dated 1800, but Akilina Kalashnikova, to whom he appears to be referring in this case based on his list of those freed from Circassian captivity, was, according to the document, released by way of negotiations with Osman Pasha.⁸²

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 1469.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 1502–1504.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 1476.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 1491.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 1494.

⁸² Ibid., p. 1427, 1503, 1938.

Each of the afore-examined themes is described in one document – thus, in *The Circassian Slave Narratives* there are a total of six texts on redemption from slavery for the period 1792–1802: three in 1797, two in 1798 and one in 1799. Note that in two of the cases the documents are petitions for redemption that were not satisfied. In one of the cases, they actively tried to free a kidnapped woman from captivity through Osman Pasha. Thus, in a sense, the supposition that in the period 1792–1802 the Russian leadership preferred freeing captives through official negotiations with the Turks to ransoming them appears to be substantiated. In fact, in three of the six known cases of an attempt to redeem a captive the driving force behind the negotiations was the Armenians, while the Russians showed initiative in one case only – when they made it a condition of the release of a group of mountaineers that they release a captive Cossack, at that. Consequently, it can be stated with confidence that at an official level in the period under review captive redemption was not a significant element of the culture of cross-border dialogue yet. Yet it *was* practiced at a grassroots level, and there were people who acted as intermediaries in such efforts. However, it is, unfortunately, difficult to make credible statements about the scale of unofficial redemption activity at the time solely based on the source base adopted for this study.

Cooperation with the mountaineers in slave release

This variant of cross-border dialogue largely unified and further developed the two preceding it. On the one hand, the Russian leadership was interested in having direct dialogue with mountaineer rulers concerning the release of people held captive by their subjects – without having to involve the Anapa pasha. On the other hand, due to the absence of a system of mass redemption of Russian captives and in a climate of permanent tensions in dealing with the Ottoman Porte, the Russian leadership, obviously, was compelled to look for some other ways of freeing Russian subjects from mountaineer captivity. As may be recalled, members of the actual Turkish leadership were suggesting that captives be freed not so much by way of their authority as “out of consideration for the wishes of the Russians and fear of the Russian army.” Yet what was keeping the Russians away from actually taking advantage of the “out of consideration for the wishes of the Russians and fear of the Russian army” principle?

In this context, it is back in 1795, just when there was a cooling in Russo-Turkish relations, that the Russian leadership made the first attempt to have direct dialogue about the release of slaves by a mountaineer ruler on the opposite side of the border without the agency of the Turks, which is captured in *The Circassian Slave Narratives*. It appears that the afore-mentioned prince Muradin, whom Osman Pasha recommended as a reliable person but

from whose territory there took place raids on Russian lands, was playing a game of his own and was actually prepared to offer his full support to any of the empires could that avail him. So, in June 1795, during his meeting with a representative of the Black Sea Host, Muradin promised to let the Cossacks cut wood freely on his lands in exchange for letting two of his men officially engage in hunting in the Kuban region.⁸³ During that meeting, Muradin did his best to come across as loyal to the Russians. Muradin declared that the Anapa pasha, no matter what direction Russo-Turkish relations would eventually develop in, would not be in a position to rescind the agreement that was being entered into and that he himself would “continue to reap the benefits of dealing with Russia, rather than Turkey.”⁸⁴ The prince also promised to release everyone held captive by his men.⁸⁵ However, on achieving his objective (his men were given permission to hunt in Russian territory⁸⁶), Muradin would actually do nothing to prevent raids – even though it had been directed that it be done so by Osman Pasha himself.

In April 1796, the Russians were approached by another mountaineer potentate, “Mr Kalga Sultan Selimgerey.” While, as a consequence of those who wrote them being illiterate, the two documents on this are not fully intelligible, it looks like he released one Cossack from among those captured shortly before and requested that a group of officials be sent to search for the cattle carried off on the Russian side of the border.⁸⁷ It is not possible to learn from the documents about the motives behind the decision of someone who was a mountaineer potentate to release to the Russians a captive and some cattle without asking them for a ransom – and that was amid growing tensions between Russia and Turkey. Nevertheless, the two cases covered in the documents (the case of Prince Muradin and that of Kalga-Sultan Selim-Girey) let one state with a high degree of probability that between 1795 and 1796, seeing that having dialogue through the Anapa pasha was a hopeless undertaking, the Russian leadership and neighbouring mountaineer princes attempted to build the relationship independently.

During the period of improving relations with the Ottoman Empire, the release of slaves by mountaineer princes directly became an important complement to that through Osman Pasha. For instance, in July 1798, a certain Circassian mirza, whose identity remains unknown, brought to the border two runaway Nogai slaves who wished to become Russian subjects.⁸⁸

⁸³ Ibid., p. 1449.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 1455–1456.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 1483.

Yet it is in the area of freeing Russian slaves that the mountaineers provided assistance most often. For instance, that same July “a Circassian named Yedin and two of his companions” brought to the Yekaterinodar exchange court two runaway Russian captives.⁸⁹ Note that the last case once again reflects the existence of a special culture of slavery with local inhabitants of the Caucasus: the Circassians deliberately brought Russian captives to Yekaterinodar specifically, as opposed to the cordons, in hopes of collecting a reward for helping the captives escape (and, admittedly, that did work).⁹⁰ There also continued to be singular cases of cooperation with mountaineer princes. For instance, in December 1798, another “Transkuban potentate,” Sultan Magmet Kirey, released back to the Russians a Cossack captive without putting forward any conditions.⁹¹ Essentially, one comes across the same theme in the last document for said period dealing with the release of Russians by the mountaineers: in January 1800, the Circassians captured a Cossack, but literally 10 days later released him without, once again, asking for anything in return.⁹²

Thus, the body of documents under examination contains even more texts on cooperation between the Russians and the mountaineers dealing with the releasing of a captive free of charge than with the doing so by ransom (eight against six). While the difference is minor, it must be understood that a certain number of requests for the ransom of the captives were turned down, while all cases on cooperation between the Russians and the mountaineers concluded either with the setting free of the slaves for free or, at least, with some contribution being made to the development of long-term, if not always successful, collaboration between the Russian leadership and Prince Muradin. Across the years, the documents are distributed as follows: 1 in 1795, 2 in 1796, 4 in 1798 and 1 in 1800. It is worth stating that, while this form of cross-border dialogue is present in the documents quite inconsiderably, all the documented cases of it were successful and quite diverse, from agreements between Russian officials and mountaineer princes to aid provided by ordinary mountaineers to runaway slaves for money.

Other

Finally, *The Circassian Slave Narratives* also provides from the period 1792–1802 a few cases of non-confrontational cross-border interaction that are of a different nature. Those are singular phenomena that have no typological analogues. As much as these events are interesting, it is their singularity that

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 1484.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid., p. 1494.

hinders the proper analysis thereof. The thing is that similar events may not have occurred altogether, or may simply not have been officially documented. Therefore, it will be worth limiting this account to just citing them and providing the year such an event occurred and the number of texts covering such an event.

1) In 1793, a Cossack named Egor Shuvaev fled to the Russians. Interrogation revealed that he was captured by the Circassians, then sold to the Nekrasovite Cossacks, and then, after several years' service to them, "was freed by them – but on condition that he would stay with them for good."⁹³ Thus, this case is an example of a Russian captive being freed by his own masters, who wished to maintain contact with him after his becoming a free person; however, Shuvaev opted to run away at the earliest opportunity. The only document on this theme is dated 1793.

2) Another person who fled slavery, a Cossack named L. M. Zemlyanukhin, confessed during interrogation that, while in captivity, he "was forced to marry a Circassian subject."⁹⁴ The marriage did not, however, last long, with the Cossack leaving his wife on the Turkish side during his escape.⁹⁵ The only document covering this theme is dated 1795.

3) There is one case that clearly stands out, as it is not about a Russian person enslaved by the mountaineers but the other way around. A sotnik named Karp Alenakov took some Circassians up on their offer to pay their debt to him in kind – with six Circassians as slaves, whom he then decided to send deep into Russia (perhaps, so that they would be unable to escape to the mountains).⁹⁶ The only document on this theme is dated 1796. Note that it contains a request that the captives be transported to Crimea.⁹⁷

4) The last of the themes of interest in this context is even more original. In 1800, Paul I personally directed that information be disseminated among the Circassians that any mountaineer captured during a raid would become a hostage in Russian captivity and that the Russians would "do to him everything that they will dare to do to any of our subjects." In this case, a form of cross-border dialogue is, of course, not the taking of hostages but the dissemination among the mountaineers of information about them at the behest of the Russian emperor.⁹⁸ There is just one document covering this theme.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 1437.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 1450.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 1459.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 1498.

Thus, it can be stated with confidence that slavery-related cross-border interaction in the Caucasus in the period 1792–1802 was not limited to the three major focus areas discussed above. It took on a variety of forms: former slaves living with their former masters, mixed marriages, captives being handed over across the border and even information about the hostages being disseminated among the mountaineers. Although it is not possible at this time to establish with certainty how common these forms of cross-border dialogue were in the region back then, it *can* be stated with confidence that the dialogue was there, was substantial in scale and was distinguished by diversity.

Conclusions

The research reported in this paper involved working with a wide selection of documents relating to slavery in Circassia in the period 1792–1802. That being said, the author did not put this selection together artificially – it comprises all documents on similar subject matter stored in the Krasnodar Krai State Archive. Considering the documents' large number (180), there is reason to believe that the findings that arise from this study are relatively credible, despite the fact that the materials from some of the years have not survived to the present day. Another consideration to take into account is that there is a possibility that certain aspects of the slavery-related cross-border dialogue received little to no coverage in official documentation. Nevertheless, the author believes that there is a solid foundation for the ability to assess the significance of slavery to cooperation between the Russians, the Turks and the mountaineers in the Caucasus in the period under review. Table 2 will illustrate this best.

Table 2. Number and share of texts on different variants of cross-border cooperation in *The Circassian Slave Narratives* for the period 1792–1802⁹⁹

Year	Total documents	Documents relating to the subject ¹⁰⁰	Share of documents relating to the subject ¹⁰¹
1792	1	1+0+0+0=1	100%
1793	18	6+0+0+1=7	39%
1794	1	0+0+0+0=0	-
1795	15	0+0+1+1=2	13%
1796	34	2+0+2+1=5	15%

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 1435–1510.

¹⁰⁰ Provided in the following format: number of documents on Russo-Turkish cooperation + number of documents on attempts to redeem a captive + number of documents on cooperation with the mountaineers in slave release + other = amount.

¹⁰¹ Rounded off to the nearest whole number.

1797	32	$4+3+0+0=7$	22%
1798	41	$6+2+4+0=12$	29%
1799	1	$0+1+0+0=1$	100%
1800	30	$11+0+1+1=13$	43%
1801	1	$0+0+0+0=0$	-
1802	6	$2+0+0+0=2$	33%
Total	180	50	28%
Average ¹⁰²	28	8	29%

Thus, while texts on non-confrontational relations dealing with slavery in the region are not the largest group in the above-mentioned body of documents, they do account for over a quarter of the total – nearly 28%. What is of even greater significance in this study is that chronologically these texts are distributed almost across all the years, constituting (for the years from which no less than 10 documents have survived) 13 to 43% of the total. In four of the cases (1792, 1794, 1799 and 1801), there is only one document that has survived from an entire year, and in two of those cases the document deals, in one form or another, with cross-border dialogue specifically. Based on the afore-said, it may be concluded that D. V. Sen’ was totally right in suggesting that slavery in the southern Russian borderland be viewed as a significant element of the “culture of cross-border dialogue in a climate of forced neighbourship.” What is more, this approach is also well applicable for a period later than the period explored by the historian. That being said, the use of a conventional approach to slavery, also, appears to be possible (after all, 72% of the documents examined by the author appear to deal with confrontational themes, predominantly, the kidnapping of captives). It may be stated that slavery both divided the people on either side of the border, by provoking mutual raids and enmity, and united them, by urging them to look for ways to redeem their subjects from captivity.

At the same time, of considerable interest is also the analysis of the share of documents dealing with various aspects of the cross-border dialogue related to slavery in the region. The study revealed that the period 1792–1802 is absolutely dominated by texts dealing with interaction with the Ottoman leadership (32 out of 50). Apparently, it is this form of cooperation that was regarded as most promising at an official level at the time. The situation changed with the passage of time. The year 1803 marked the start of the active process of redeeming captives through official channels – perhaps due to it being impossible to have them freed through the Anapa pasha (in the first year alone, 115 people were redeemed from captivity).¹⁰³ However, there are

¹⁰² Exclusive of the years from which fewer than 10 documents have survived.

¹⁰³ Cherkasov 2020, p. 1427.

very few redemption-related documents available for the period under review, and it is evidenced in them that the Russian leadership normally got involved with redemption-related matters at the instance of the locals. Note that requests for redemption were turned down more than once, and in one case the matter was resolved through no other than the agency of the Ottoman leadership. Documents on cooperation with the mountaineers in slave release even outnumbered those on redemption. Finally, there are documents covering a marriage between a slave and a female mountain dweller, a sale of enslaved mountaineers to a Cossack, etc., but these are rare.

To conclude, the author is hopeful that this short study has once again confirmed that a shift from “literary research” to research conducted by “hard-and-fast rules” can, indeed, help organise historical material and identify the more significant historical themes. *The Circassian Slave Narratives*, where the documentary base is in place already and is accompanied with sound auxiliary research apparatus (e.g., a list of mentioned individuals, a list of slaves who fled Circassia, etc.), is a specific source that makes it possible to undertake this kind of research into slavery in the Caucasus in the late eighteenth century and the nineteenth century. After all, only a shift from examining particular documents to analysing bodies of documents can provide an answer to the question of which aspects of slavery in the Caucasus were most significant in different periods. Understandably, in some cases the historian has no choice other than to adopt a “narrative” manner, just because of the special nature of the material, with very little material having survived to the present day overall. It is also hard to identify all documents dealing with a particular theme even in a small provincial archive. However, considering that work on building a body of related documents has already been carried out by A. A. Cherkasov and we now have *The Circassian Slave Narratives*, the use of this source for “hard-and-fast rules” research into topics and periods other than examined in the present work may be regarded as quite promising.

Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Cherkasov 2020 – Aleksandr A. Cherkasov, *The Circassian Slave Narratives (A Documentary Collection)*, in *Bylye Gody*, 57–1, 2020, 3–1 (special issue), p. 1415–2266.
- Dergachev 2007 – Valentin A. Dergachev, *O skipetrakh, o loshadyakh, o voine. Etyudy v zashchitu migratsionnoi kontseptsii M. Gimbutas*, Saint Petersburg, 2007.
- Dudarev 1994 – Sergei L. Dudarev, *Epizod u Prochnookopa: eshche raz o beghykh i plennykh russkikh soldatakh i kazakakh u gortsev v XIX v.*, in

- Prochnookopskii istoriko-kul'turnyi mnogougol'nik. Materialy konferentsii (sentyabr' 1994 g.)*, Armavir, 1994, p. 13–15.
- Dudarev 2016 – Sergei L. Dudarev, *Pokhozhdeniya krest'yanki Anny Solopovoi (lyubovnaya intrizhka, zavershivshayasya plenom u gortsev)*, in *Kant*, 4, 2016, p. 14–18.
- Dzidzariya 1976 – Georgii A. Dzidzariya, *F. F. Tornau i ego kavkazskie materialy XIX veka*, Moscow, 1976.
- Klychnikov 2020 – Yurii Y. Klychnikov, *North Caucasian “Hotbed” of the Slave Trade (Trade of Captives): To the Problem Statement*, in *STP*, 5, 2020, p. 4–18.
- Sen' 2020 – Dmitrii V. Sen', *Russko-krymsko-osmanskoe pogranch'e: prostranstvo, yavleniya, lyudi (konets XVII–XVIII v.)*, Rostov-on-Don, 2020.
- Shcherbina 1913 – Fedor A. Shcherbina, *Istoriya Kubanskogo kazach'ego voiska*, vol. II, Ekaterinodar, 1913.
- Tornau 2008 – Fedor F. Tornau, *Vospominaniya kavkazskogo ofitsera*, Moscow, 2008.
- Trapsh 2015 – Nikolai A. Trapsh, *Abkhaziya pervoi poloviny XIX stoletiya v voenno-etnograficheskom narrative F. F. Tornau*, in *Kavkazskii sbornik*, 9, 2015, p. 250–262.
- Urushadze 2017 – Amiran T. Urushadze, *V plenu u gortsev: iz istorii uchastiya donskikh kazakov v Kavkazskoi voine*, in *NPNP*, 2, 2017, p. 208–214.
- Velikaya 2013 – Natal'ya N. Velikaya, *Plennye slavyane v gorakh Severo-Zapadnogo Kavkaza*, in *WSNC*, 7, 2013, p. 84–91.

LISTA ABREVIERILOR

- Abgadiyat** – Abgadiyat. Brill. Writing and Scripts Center (Bibliotheca Alexandrina).
- ACD** – Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis. University of Debrecen.
- Acmeology** – Acmeology. Mezhdunarodnoy akademii akmeologicheskikh nauk, Rossiyskoy akademii obrazovaniya, kafedry akmeologii i psikhologii professional'noy deyatel'nosti Akademii pri Prezidente RF (RANKhiGS), Tsentra akmeologicheskikh issledovaniy. Moscova.
- ActaAC** – Acta Archaeologica Carpathica. Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences. Cracovia.
- ActaMN** – Acta Musei Napocensis. Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
- ActaMP** – Acta Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
- AD** – Archaeological Dialogues. Cambridge.
- AÉ** – Archaeologiai Értesítő a Magyar régészeti, művészettörténeti és éremtani társulat tudományos folyóirata. Budapest.
- AI** – Amazonia Investiga. Editorial Primate. Colombia.
- AIIAI/AIIX** – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași (din 1990 Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași). Iași.
- AIIGB** – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „George Barițiu”. Series Historica. Institutul de Istorie „George Barițiu” Cluj-Napoca.
- AKÖG** – Archiv für Kunde österreichischen Geschichts-Quellen. Wien.
- Alt Schaessburg** – Alt Schaessburg. Muzeul de Istorie Sighișoara.
- AnAcad** – Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice. Academia Română. București.
- AnB** – Analele Banatului (serie nouă). Muzeul Național al Banatului. Timișoara.
- Angustia** – Angustia. Muzeul Carpaților Răsăriteni. Sfântu Gheorghe.
- Antinomies** – Institute of Philosophy and Law Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Ekaterinburg.
- Antiquity** – Antiquity. Durham University.
- Apulum** – Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii. Alba Iulia.

Lista abrevierilor

- ArchKözl** – Archaeologiai Közlemények. Pesten.
- ArchMéd** – Archéologie médiévale. Centre de Recherches Archéologiques Médiévales. Caen.
- ArhMold** – Arheologia Moldovei. Institutul de Arheologie Iași.
- Arkheologiya** – Arkheologiya. Kiev.
- Arrabona** – Arrabona. Xántus János Múzeum. Győr.
- AS** – Annals of Science. Taylor & Francis. Abingdon-on-Thames (UK).
- Astra Sabesiensis** – Astra Sabesiensis. Despărțământul Astra „Vasile Moga” Sebeș.
- ASUI** – Analele Științifice ale Universității „Al. I. Cuza” din Iași. Istorie. Iași.
- ATF** – Acta Terrae Fogarasiensis. Muzeul Țării Făgărașului „Valer Literat”. Făgăraș.
- AUASH** – Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
- AUASP** – Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
- AUB** – Analele Universității București. Istorie. Universitatea București.
- AUVT** – Annales d’Université Valahia Târgoviște, Section d’Archeologie et d’Histoire. Târgoviște.
- AVSL** – Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Sibiu.
- BAM** – Bibliotheca Archaeologica Moldaviae. Iași.
- Banatica** – Banatica. Muzeul Banatului Montan. Reșița.
- BAR** – British Archaeological Reports (International Series). Oxford.
- BarbSz** – Barbarikumi Szemle. University of Szeged.
- BB** – Bibliotheca Brukenthal. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
- BCȘS** – Buletinul Cercurilor Științifice Studentești. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
- BerRGK** – Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Frankfurt am Main.
- BiblThrac** – Biblioteca Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
- BICS** – Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Institute of Classical Studies. The University of London’s School of Advanced Study. London.
- BI-PSA** – Biblioteca Istro-Pontică, Seria Arheologie. Tulcea.
- BMA** – Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii Alba Iulia.

BMN	– Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis. Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
BMRBC	– Buletinul Muzeului Regional al Basarabiei din Chișinău.
BMS	– Bibliotheca Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
Boabe de grâu	– Boabe de grâu. Revistă de cultură. București.
BS	– Bibliotheca Septemcastrensis. Institutul pentru Cercetarea Patrimoniului Cultural Transilvănean în Context European. Sibiu.
BSNR	– Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române. Societatea Numismatică Română. București.
BULR	– Boston University Law Review. Boston University School of Law. Boston (Massachusetts).
Brukenthal	– Brukenthal. Acta Musei. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
Byzantion	– Byzantion. Revue Internationale des Études Byzantines. Peeters Publishers. Louvain.
ByzF	– Byzantinische Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik. Amsterdam.
Bylye Gody	– Bylye Gody. Cherkas Global University Press. Washington.
BYULR	– Brigham Young University Law Review. J. Reuben Clark Law School. Provo (Utah).
CACS	– Central Asia and the Caucasus Studies. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Islamic Republic of Iran. Tehran.
CAF/FHA	– Cahiers d'Archéologie Fribourgeoise. Freiburger Hefte für Archäologie. Zürich.
CAH	– Communicationes archaeologicae Hungariae. Budapest.
Caietele ARA	– Caietele Ara. Asociația „Arhitectură. Restaurare. Arheologie”. București.
Caietele CIVA	– Asociația Cercul de Istorie Veche și Arheologie, Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
Calitatea vieții	– Calitatea vieții. Institutul de Cercetare a Calității Vieții. București.
CASS	– Canadian-American Slavic Studies. Brill. Leiden.
CCA	– Cronica cercetărilor arheologice. cIMEC. București.
CCDJ	– Cultură și civilizație la Dunărea de Jos. Călărași.
CEJC	– Central European Journal of Geosciences.
CH	– Construction History. The Construction History Society. Ascot (UK).
CI	– Cercetări istorice. Muzeul de Istorie a Moldovei. Iași.
Concept	– Concept. Universitatea Națională de Artă Teatrală și Cinematografică „I. L. Caragiale” din București (UNATC). București.

Lista abrevierilor

- CR** – Caietele restaurării. Asociația Art Conservation Support. București.
- Crisia** – Crisia. Muzeul Țării Crișurilor. Oradea.
- CSMÉ** – A Csíki Székely Múzeum Évkönyvei. Muzeul Secuiesc al Ciucului. Miercurea Ciuc.
- CSP** – Canadian Slavonic Papers. Taylor & Francis. Abingdon-on-Thames (UK).
- Dacia** – Dacia. Recherches et découvertes archéologiques en Roumanie. București, I (1924)-XII (1948). Nouvelle série: Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. București.
- DLJ** – Duke Law Journal. Duke University School of Law. Durham (North Carolina).
- DLR** – Denver Law Review. University of Denver Sturm College of Law. Denver (Colorado).
- Dolgozatok** – Dolgozatok az Erdély Nemzeti Múzeum Érem – és Régiségtárából. Kolosvár (Cluj).
- DOP** – Dumbarton Oaks Papers. Dumbarton Oaks. Trustees for Harvard University.
- Drobeta** – Drobeta. Seria Etnografie. Muzeul Regiunii Porților de Fier. Drobeta-Turnu Severin.
- DSȘ** – Dări de Seamă ale Ședințelor. Comitetul Geologic. Institutul Geologic. București.
- EMúz** – Erdélyi Múzeum. Erdélyi Múzeum az Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület. Kolozsvár (Cluj).
- EphNap** – Ephemeris Napocensis. Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei Cluj-Napoca.
- Eurasia Antiqua** – Eurasia Antiqua. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Eurasien-Abteilung. Berlin.
- FK** – Földtani Közlöny. Budapest.
- FK** – Földrajzi Közlemények. Magyar Földrajzi Társaság.
- FolArch** – Folia Archaeologica. Magyar Történeti Múzeum. Budapest.
- FVL** – Forschungen zur Volks -und Landeskunde, Sibiu.
- GAS** – Geophysical Research Abstract. European Geosciences Union (EGU).
- Gemina** – Gemina. Revista Muzeului Bănățean din Timișoara.
- Geoarchaeology** – Geoarchaeology. An International Journal.
- GRBS** – Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies. Duke University. Durham.
- Harvard LR** – Harvard Law Review. Harvard Law School. Cambridge (Massachusetts).
- HC** – Historia Constitucional. Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales de Madrid, adscrito al Ministerio español de la Presidencia, y el Seminario de Historia

- Constitucional “Martínez Marina” de la Universidad de Oviedo.
- Hierasus** – Hierasus. Muzeul Județean Botoșani.
- Historica** – Historica. Centrul de Istorie, Filologie și Etnografie din Craiova.
- HK** – Hadtörténelmi Közlemények (Évnegyedes folyóirat a magyar hadi történetírás fejlesztésére). Quarterly of Military History. Budapest.
- HLR** – Houston Law Review. University of Houston Law Center. Houston (Texas).
- HR** – Historical Research. Institute of Historical Research. University of London.
- HT** – The History Teacher. Society for History Education. Long Beach (California).
- IAA** – Istoriko-arkheologičeskij al’manakh. Armavir, Krasnodar. Moscova.
- Ialomița** – Ialomița. Studii și cercetări de arheologie, istorie, etnografie și muzeologie. Muzeul Județean Slobozia.
- IGC** – International Geological Congress. Prague.
- Istros** – Istros. Muzeul Brăilei. Brăila.
- JAHA** – Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology. Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei. Universitatea Tehnică Cluj-Napoca.
- JAMÉ** – A Jóna András Múzeum Évkönyve. Nyíregyháza.
- JAS** – Journal of Archaeological Science. Elsevier.
- J. Biogeogr.** – Journal of Biogeography. Edited by Michael N. Dawson.
- JIA** – The Journal of Indian Art. W. Griggs & Sons. London.
- JKKCC** – Jahrbuch der Kaiserl. Königl. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale. Wien.
- JLSt** – Journal of Lithic Studies. Edinburgh.
- JSFU** – Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. Siberian Federal University. Krasnoyarsk.
- JWP** – Journal of World Prehistory. Kluwer Academic.
- Kavkazskii sbornik** – Kavkazskii sbornik. MGIMO MID Rossii. Moscova.
- Közlemények** – Közlemények az Erdély Nemzeti Múzeum Érem és Régiségtárából. Kolosvár (Cluj).
- Kratkie** – Kratkie soobshčeniya Instituta arkheologii. Institute of Archaeology Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscova.
- LCP** – Law and Contemporary Problems. Duke University School of Law. Durham (North Carolina).
- LȘ** – Lucrări științifice. Institutul de Învățământ Superior Oradea.

Lista abrevierilor

- Marisia** – Marisia. Studii și Materiale. Muzeul Județean Mureș. Târgu Mureș.
- Marmatia** – Marmatia. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Arheologie Baia Mare.
- Materialy** – Materialy po arkheologii, istorii i etnografii Tavrii. Tavria.
- MCA** – Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice (serie nouă). Academia Română. Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”. București.
- MemEthno** – Memoria Ethnologica. Centrul Județean Pentru Conservarea și Promovarea Culturii Tradiționale Liviu Borlan Maramureș. Baia Mare.
- Mittheilungen** – Mittheilungen der K.K. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale. Wien.
- MJSS** – Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Rome.
- MLJ** – Mississippi Law Journal. The University of Mississippi School of Law. Oxford (Mississippi).
- MLR** – Michigan Law Review. University of Michigan Law School. Ann Arbor (Michigan).
- MN** – Munții Noștri. București.
- MT** – Mediaevalia Transilvanica. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare.
- MTA** – Multimedia Tools and Applications. Springer.
- MuzNaț** – Muzeul Național de Istorie a României. București.
- NAV** – Nizhnevolzhskij arkheologicheskij vestnik [The Lower Volga Archaeological Bulletin]. Volgograd State University.
- Nemvs** – Nemvs. Alba Iulia.
- NLO** – Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. Moscova.
- NPNP** – Novoe proshloe / The New Past. Southern Federal University. Rostov-on-Don.
- NULR** – Northwestern University Law Review. Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law. Chicago (Illinois).
- NumKözl** – Numizmatikai Közlöny. Budapesta.
- OC** – Orientalia Christiana. Roma.
- ONV** – Omskiy nauchnyy vestnik. Omsk.
- OSR** – Obshchestvo. Sreda. Razvitie (Terra Humana). Tsentr nauchno-informatsionnykh tekhnologii Asterion. Sankt-Petersburg.
- ÖZBH** – Österreichische Zeitschrift für Berg- und Hüttenwesen. Wien.
- PA** – Patrimonium Apulense. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură, Culte și Patrimoniul Cultural Național Alba. Alba Iulia.
- Palynology** – Palynology. The Palynological Society.
- PL** – Ural State Pedagogical University. Ekaterinburg.

Pontica	– Pontica. Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie. Constanța.
PR	– The Polish Review. Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America. New York.
Probleme economice	– Probleme economice. Organ al Comitetului Superior Economic. București.
PZ	– Prähistorische Zeitschrift. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie. Berlin.
QR	– Quaestio Rossica. Ural Federal University. Ekaterinburg.
Quat.Int	– Quaternary International. The Journal of International Union for Quaternary Research. Elsevier.
RA	– Revista Arhivelor. Arhivele Naționale ale României. București.
RB	– Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Județean Bistrița-Năsăud. Bistrița.
Realitatea ilustrată	– Realitatea ilustrată (sau Lucrurile așa cum le vedem cu ochii). Cluj (1927-1928), ulterior București.
RECEO	– Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest. Institut des Sciences Humaines et Sociales. Paris.
REF	– Revista de etnografie și folclor. București.
RESEE	– Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes. Academia Română. București.
RevArh	– Revista Arheologică. Centrul de Arheologie al Institutului Patrimoniului Cultural al Academiei de Științe a Moldovei. Chișinău.
Revue du Nord	– Revue du Nord. Archéologie. Revue d'Histoire et d'Archéologie des Universités du Nord de la France. Lille.
RHSEE/RESEE	– Revue historique du sud-est européen. Academia Română. București, Paris (din 1963 Revue des études sud-est européennes).
RI	– Revista de Istorie (din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
RJMD	– Romanian Journal of Mineral Deposits. București.
RM	– Revista Muzeelor. București.
RMI	– Revista Monumentelor Istorice. Institutul Național al Patrimoniului. București.
RN	– Revue Numismatique. Société française de numismatique.
RossArk	– Rossijskaya Arkheologiya. Institute of Archaeology, Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscova.
Rossiya i ATR	– Rossiya i ATR. Institut istorii, arkheologii i etnologii narodov Dal'nego Vostoka vo Vladivostoke.

- RR** – Dal'nevostochnoye otdeleniye Rossiyskoy akademii nauk. Vladivostok.
RREI – The Russian Review. University of Kansas. Lawrence.
RRH – Revue Roumaine d'Études Internationales. Academia Română. București.
RRHA – Revue Roumaine d'Histoire. Academia Română. București.
Rusin – Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art. Série Beaux-Arts. Academia Română. București.
SA – Obshchestvennoy assotsiatsiyey „Rus” (Kishinev). Tomskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. Tomsk.
SAI – Sovetskaya Arkheologiya. Moscova.
SAO – Studii și articole de istorie. Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice din România. București.
Sargetia – Studia et Acta Orientalia. Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice din RPR. București.
SCIATMC – Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane. Deva.
SCIV(A) – Studii și Cercetări de Istoria Artei. Teatru, Muzică, Cinematografie. Institutul de Istoria Artei „G. Oprescu”. București.
SCN – Studii și cercetări de istoria veche (din 1974, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie). București.
SCȘMI – Studii și cercetări de numismatică. Institutul de Arheologie București.
SGEM – Sesiunea de Comunicări Științifice ale Muzeelor de Istorie. București.
SlovArch – SGEM. International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference. Conference Proceedings. Sofia, Albena.
SMANS – Slovenská Archeológia. Archeologický ústav SAV. Nitra.
SMIM – Southampton Monographs in Archaeology, new series. Southampton.
SN – Studii și materiale de istorie medie. Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga” al Academiei Române. București.
SoveEtno – Schäßburger Nachrichten. HOG Informationsblatt für Schäßburger in aller Welt. Heilbronn.
SP – Sovetslaya Etnografiya (1931-1991) (vezi și Etnograficheskoe Obozrenie). N. N. Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscova.
SP – Studii de Preistorie. Asociația Română de Arheologie. București.

StComCaransebeș	– Studii și Comunicări de Istorie și Etnografie (continuă cu Tibiscum. Studii și Comunicări de Etnografie - Istorie), Caransebeș.
StComSibiu	– Studii și Comunicări. Arheologie-Istorie. Muzeul Brukenthal. Sibiu.
StComSM	– Studii și comunicări. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare.
STP	– Slavery: Theory and Practice. Cherkas Global University Press. Washington.
Stratum plus	– Stratum plus. Archaeology and Cultural Anthropology. Chișinău.
Studii	– Studii. Revistă de istorie (din 1974 Revista de istorie și din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
Studime Historike	– Studime Historike. Universiteti Shtetëror i Tiranës. Instituti i Historisë dhe i Gjuhësisë. Tiranë.
SUBBB	– Studia Universitatis „Babeș-Bolyai”, Series Biologia. Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
SUBBG	– Studia Universitatis „Babeș-Bolyai”, Series Geologia. Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
SUCSH	– Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” Sibiu.
SV	– Sotsiologiya vlasti. Rossiyskaya akademiya narodnogo khozyaystva i gosudarstvennoy sluzhby pri Prezidente Rossiyskoy Federatsii. Moscova.
Terra Sebus	– Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
TESG	– Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie. Royal Dutch Geographical Society. Utrecht.
The Celator	– The Celator: Journal of Ancient and Medieval Coinage. Lancaster (Pennsylvania).
Thraco-Dacica	– Thraco-Dacica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
Tibiscum	– Tibiscum. Studii și Comunicări de Etnografie și Istorie. Muzeul Regimentului Grăniceresc din Caransebeș.
TLR	– Tulsa Law Review. The University of Tulsa College of Law. Tulsa (Oklahoma).
TxLR	– Texas Law Review. University of Texas at Austin School of Law. Austin (Texas).
Transilvania	– Transilvania. Centrul Cultural Interetnic Transilvania. Sibiu.
TV	– Tyuremnyy vestnik. Izdanie Glavnogo tyuremnogo upravleniya. Sankt-Petersburg.
Tyragetia International	– Tyragetia International, serie nouă. Muzeul Național de Arheologie și Istorie a Moldovei. Chișinău.
Țara Bârsei	– Țara Bârsei. Muzeul „Casa Mureșenilor” Brașov.

Lista abrevierilor

- UCLR** – The University of Chicago Law Review. The Law School of the University of Chicago. (Illinois).
- UCLALR** – UCLA Law Review. UCLA School of Law and the Regents of the University of California. Los Angeles (California).
- UPA** – Universitätsforschungen zur Prähistorischen Archäologie. Berlin.
- VDB-MB** – Veröffentlichungen aus dem Deutschen Bergbau-Museum Bochum. Bochum.
- Vestnik instituta** – Vestnik instituta: prestuplenie, nakazanie, ispravlenie. Vologodskii institut prava i ekonomiki Federal'noi sluzhby ispolneniya nakazanii. Vologda.
- Vestnik SPb** – Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta kul'tury. Sankt-Peterburgskiy gosudarstvennyy institut kul'tury. Sankt-Petersburg.
- Vestnik Tomskogo** – Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Istoriya. Tomskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. Tomsk.
- VHA** – Vegetation History and Archaeobotany. The Journal of Quaternary Plant Ecology, Palaeoclimate and Ancient Agriculture. Official Organ of the International Work Group for Palaeoethnobotany.
- VKZ** – Vserossiiskii kriminologicheskii zhurnal/Russian Journal of Criminology. Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education Baikal State University. Irkutsk.
- VLR** – Vermont Law Review. Vermont Law School. South Royalton (Vermont).
- WASJ** – World Applied Sciences Journal, (Education, Law, Economics, Language and Communication). International Digital Organization for Scientific Information. Pakistan.
- WLJ** – Washburn Law Journal. Washburn University School of Law. Topeka (Kansas).
- WLR** – Washington Law Review. University of Washington School of Law. Seattle (Washington).
- WMLR** – William & Mary Law Review. William & Mary Law School. Williamsburg (Virginia).
- WNELRW** – Western New England Law Review. Western New England University. School of Law Springfield (Massachusetts).
- WSNC** – World of the Slavs of the North Caucasus. Krasnodarskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. Krasnodar.
- YLJ** – The Yale Law Journal. Yale Law School. Danvers (Massachusetts).
- Ziridava** – Ziridava. Studia Archaeologica. Muzeul Județean Arad.

ZMY

– Zhurnal ministerstva yustitsii. Tipografiya pravitel'stvuyushchego senata. Sankt-Petersburg.

Zographe

– Zographe. Revue d'art Médiévale. Institute d'histoire de l'art. Faculté de Philosophie. Belgrad.