


FTAХР/ МРНТИ / IRSTI 03.81.37

ӘӨЖ /УДК/ UDC 930.2

<https://www.doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2025.85.2.030>

Sholakhov M.G. \*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Doctoral student in History, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,  
Kazakhstan, Astana, e-mail: muri777@mail.ru*

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE GOLDEN HORDE ON RUS' IN GERMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

### Abstract

The influence of the Golden Horde (Ulus of Jochi, Ulug Ulus) on Rus' is one of the key topics in German historiography. These studies analyze the impact of the Mongol invasion on the political structure, economic development, and cultural exchange of Rus'. German historians emphasize the role of the Golden Horde in establishing the system of vassalage in Rus', as well as introducing tax systems and administrative governance methods. Moreover, the influence of Mongol military strategies and technologies on Rus' military practices is also explored. In German historiography, this period is viewed as a time when Rus' strengthened its role as a cultural bridge between Europe and Asia. Researchers also highlight the importance of Mongol dominance in reshaping Rus' position in international relations, especially in relation to neighboring states. This influence extended beyond just politics and economy, also affecting the development of the Russian legal system and social structures. Thus, German historiography provides a comprehensive analysis of the Golden Horde's impact on Rus', offering a fresh perspective on its place in historical processes, especially in the context of East-West interactions.

**Keywords:** Golden Horde, historiography, German historiography, Rus, Ulus Jochi, Rus, Ulug Ulus, Influence on Rus

**Acknowledgments.** *The work was carried out with the financial support of the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (IRN No. BR 21882308) within the framework of program-targeted funding “Evolution of political institutions and structures in the history of Kazakhstan (XIX–XXI centuries)”.*

М.Г. Шолахов \*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Тарих ғылымдарының докторанты, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті  
Қазақстан, Астана, e-mail: muri777@mail.ru*

## ЖОШЫ ҰЛЫСЫНЫҢ РУСЬКЕ ӘСЕРІ НЕМІС ТАРИХНАМАСЫНДА

### Аңдатпа

Алтын Орда (Жошы Ұлысы, Ұлық Ұлыс) ықпалы Руське неміс тарихнамасындағы негізгі тақырыптардың бірі болып табылады. Бұл зерттеулер монғол шапқыншылығының Русьтің саяси құрылымына, экономикалық дамуына және мәдени алмасуына әсерін талдайды. Неміс тарихшылары Алтын Орданың Русьте вассалдық жүйені орнатудағы рөлін, сондай-ақ салық жүйелері мен әкімшілік басқару әдістерін енгізудегі маңыздылығын атап көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар, монғол әскери стратегиялары мен технологияларының Русьтің әскери тәжірибесіне әсері де қарастырылады. Неміс тарихнамасында бұл кезең Русьтің Еуропа мен Азия арасындағы мәдени көпір ретіндегі рөлін нығайтқан уақыт ретінде қарастырылады. Зерттеушілер сондай-ақ монғол билігінің Русьтің халықаралық қатынастардағы орнын өзгертуіндегі маңыздылығын, әсіресе көрші мемлекеттермен байланыс контекстінде атап өтіп, неміс тарихнамасына баға бермек. Бұл ықпал тек саясат пен экономикаға ғана емес, сондай-ақ Ресейдің құқықтық және әлеуметтік құрылымының дамуына да әсер етті. Осылайша, неміс тарихнамасы Алтын Орданың Руське

ықпалын жан-жақты талдай отырып, оның тарихи процестердегі орнын, әсіресе Шығыс пен Батыс арасындағы өзара әрекеттесу контекстінде жаңа көзқарас ұсынады. Бұл зерттеулер Русьтің мәдени, саяси және әлеуметтік дамуына әсер еткен маңызды тарихи Жошы Ұлысын терең түсінуге мүмкіндік береді

**Кілт сөздер:** Алтын Орда, тарихнама, неміс тарихнамасы, Русь, Жошы Ұлысы, Ұлық Ұлыс, Руське әсер

**Алғыс білдіру.** Бұл мақала Қазақстан Республикасының Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігінің Ғылым комитетінің қаржылық қолдауымен «XIII-XV ғасырларда Жошы ұлысының этнополициялық және әлеуметтік-экономикалық тарихын зерттеу» бағдарламалық мақсатты қаржыландыру аясында дайындалып, жарияланды (ИРН BR24992878).

Шолахов М.Г. \*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Докторант исторических наук, Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, Казахстан, Астана, e-mail: muri777@mail.ru

## ВЛИЯНИЕ УЛУСА ДЖУЧИ НА РУСЬ В НЕМЕЦКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ

### Аннотация

Влияние Золотой Орды (Улуса Джучи, Улуг Улус) на Русь является одной из ключевых тем в немецкой историографии. Эти исследования анализируют воздействие монгольского нашествия на политическую структуру, экономическое развитие и культурный обмен Руси. Немецкие историки подчеркивают роль Золотой Орды в установлении системы вассалитета в Руси, а также внедрении налоговых систем и методов административного управления. Кроме того, рассматривается влияние монгольских военных стратегий и технологий на военные практики Руси. В немецкой историографии этот период рассматривается как время, когда Русь укрепила свою роль в качестве культурного моста между Европой и Азией. Исследователи также подчеркивают важность монгольского господства в изменении позиции Руси в международных отношениях, особенно в контексте соседних государств. Это влияние распространялось не только на политику и экономику, но также затронуло развитие российского правового и социального устройства. Таким образом, немецкая историография предоставляет всесторонний анализ воздействия Золотой Орды на Русь, предлагая новый взгляд на ее место в исторических процессах, особенно в контексте взаимодействия Востока и Запада.

**Ключевые слова:** Золотая Орда, историография, немецкая историография, Русь, Улус Джучи, Улуг Улус, Влияние на Русь

**Благодарность.** Статья подготовлена и опубликована при финансовой содействии Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан в рамках программно-целевого финансирования BR24992878 Изучение этнополитической и социально-экономической истории Улуса Джучи в XIII-XV веках.

### Introduction.

The influence of the Ulus of Jochi (Golden Horde) on Rus' is one of the significant topics in historical science, attracting the attention of both domestic and foreign researchers. German historiography occupies a special place in this context, offering various approaches to analyzing this period since the earliest studies of the Mongol invasion and its consequences for Eastern Europe. German historians focus on the political, economic, and social changes that occurred in Rus' under Mongol rule.

The influence of the Ulus of Jochi on Rus' is considered a key factor that shaped the subsequent development of its political structure, administrative system, and international relations. The importance

of this topic lies in its ability to shed light not only on internal changes in Rus' but also on the role it played within the broader Eurasian context, where the interests of various cultures and civilizations intersected. Introducing this subject allows for a deeper understanding of how Mongol rule impacted the formation of Russian statehood and its international standing.

It is worth noting that the term "Mongol-Tatars" is a generalized designation for all the peoples of the Ulug Ulus. This term encompasses not only the ruling Mongol elite, the Chinggisids, and ordinary Mongol tribes but also Turkic-speaking tribes, among which Finno-Ugric, Kipchak, and Bulgar elements can be identified.

German historiography has developed different perspectives on the extent and nature of the Golden Horde's influence on Rus'. Some historians argued that the Horde's impact was minimal, limited to economic and political aspects. Others emphasized that the Tatar-Mongol yoke had a significant effect on the formation of Russian statehood, administrative systems, and culture. A notable contribution to this subject was made by German historians such as Berthold Spuler, whose works remain relevant today.

The aim of this study is to analyze German historiography regarding the influence of the Ulus of Jochi on Rus', identify key approaches and interpretations, and evaluate their significance for contemporary historical knowledge.

### **Materials and Methods.**

The historical-comparative method is used to compare historical processes that took place in Rus' and the Golden Horde, allowing for the identification of common and distinct features in their political, social, and economic development. The historical-genetic method is applied to examine the evolution of political and social structures in Rus', considering the influence of Mongol rule. The method of contextual analysis is employed to interpret primary sources within the framework of their time, place, and circumstances, helping to reveal the specific nature of interactions between Rus' and the Golden Horde. The analysis of historical literature involves the evaluation and examination of works by German historians to identify shifts in approaches and interpretations over time. Additionally, discourse analysis is employed to explore the language, narratives, and rhetorical strategies used in German historiography regarding the influence of the Ulus of Jochi on Rus'. This approach enables a deeper understanding of how historical narratives have evolved and how they reflect broader intellectual and ideological trends. By integrating these methods, the study provides a comprehensive assessment of how German historiography perceives the impact of the Ulus of Jochi on Rus' and its significance for the region's further development. These methodological approaches also facilitate a critical analysis of sources, taking into account their historical context and potential biases, thereby ensuring a more nuanced and balanced interpretation of the subject.

### **Discussion of Results.**

A significant contribution to the study of German historiography has been made by Marat Gatin. Tatar scholars have actively sought to explore German historiography, and Gatin has published several notable articles, including: "The Influence of the Tatars on Rus'-Russia in German Historiography" [1], "The Fall of the Kazan Khanate in the Interpretation of German Historians" [2], "German Historiography on the Battle of Kalka" [3], "Issues of the History of the Ulus of Jochi and the Late Golden Horde States of Eastern Europe in German Historiography of the 19th–20th Centuries" [4],

"The Relationship Between Rus' and the Golden Horde in the Second Half of the 14th Century in the Interpretations of German Historians" [5]. Gatin also authored a significant work on German sources concerning Ulugh Muhammad, the Khan of the Kazan Khanate [6]. These contributions underline the importance of German historiographical perspectives and their role in advancing the study of the Golden Horde's influence on Rus'.

Marat Gatin also studied the phenomenon of the Cossacks as a legacy of the Ulus of Jochi in his article [7]. He referenced the German scholar Andreas Kappeler, who noted that the term "Cossack" (qazaq) has Turkic origins, meaning a free warrior, adventurer, brigand, or guard. The earliest mentions of Cossacks in Genoese, Russian, and Polish sources from the mid-15th century associate them with the Tatars. These individuals were engaged in military service or looting. In the Muscovite state, small groups of Muslim Cossacks were employed as border guards, diplomatic couriers, and auxiliary troops [8].

However, there is currently no definitive genetic evidence confirming the Turkic origin of the Cossacks or their possession of Turkic genes, apart from the linguistic analysis of the word "Cossack" and its connection to the Ulus of Jochi on Rus'. It is more likely that the Cossacks were populations imitating the nomadic lifestyle of the Turkic and Mongol peoples, with minimal Turkic genetic components. This perspective is supported by the research of Balanovsky, who observed that the second major migration linked to the Mongol conquest of medieval Russian principalities left no significant genetic traces. This conclusion is corroborated by analyses of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA), Y-chromosomes, and anthropology. For instance, the combined frequency of East Eurasian mtDNA haplogroups in Russian populations is less than 2%, a figure consistent with those of Western European peoples [9]. The cossacks used material culture of the Mongols and Turks, beside it was more suitable for their way of life.

However, in German historiography, a fourth direction can be identified — objective, which considers both the positive and negative consequences of the influence of the Ulus of Jochi on Rus, reasonably assessing which side predominates. This approach was exemplified by historian Berthold Spuler. However, his objectivity was hindered by unreliable sources, such as the fabrications of Václav Hanka about the Battle of Olomouc [10, 21 p.]. Spuler's mistake lies in the assertion, based on Hanka's words, that Batu wanted to marry the Georgian queen Rusudan [10, 57 p.]. Spuler refers to Hanka, claiming that Rusudan allegedly refused this marriage and committed suicide by drinking poison [11]. L.V. Vorotyntsev made a similar remark regarding this hypothesis, noting that Batu's marriage proposal to Rusudan seems unfounded [12, 293 p.]. Attempts by European historians to present the Mongols as excessive lovers of foreign women seem highly unfounded. Such methods were used by historians to make the reader dislike the Mongols more, thus strengthening the negative attitude towards the Ulus of Jochi. Ibn al-Asir also claims that the Georgian queen Rusudan was a woman of excessively immoral behavior and had an affair with her husband, Giyas ad-Din [13, 244-245 p.].

Spuler emphasized that the Ulus of Jochi had an impact on the diplomatic relations of Rus. The art of diplomacy of the Moscow princes and their accuracy in paying tribute contributed (along with the weakening of the khan's power) to their influence in Rus significantly increasing, which went beyond what the khans desired. [10:337 p.] Spuler emphasized: The cultural heritage of the Tatars of the Golden Horde and their domestic system had minimal impact on the surrounding peoples; the traditions that passed to the Russians (except for military art) were primarily of Turkic-Islamic character [10, 440 p.].

Von Rimsha imprudently attempted to link the Soviet Union with the continuation of the Ulus of Jochi and provided an example of their imitation of the Ulus of Jochi [14, 112 p.]. The historian did not consider that the Mongols did not have a racial xenophobic ideology, unlike the European states of that time. Moreover, the founder of theoretical communism was the German-speaking Karl Marx, who had no relation to the Ulus of Jochi.

European historians, including German ones, may have attributed the "right of the first night" to the Mongols. The right of the first night (Latin: *jus primae noctis*; German: *Recht der ersten Nacht*, also *Herrenrecht*; French: *droit de cuissage*, literally "right of the leg placement," also *droit de prélibation*) was a privilege of landowners and feudal lords that allowed them, after the marriage of dependent peasants, to spend the first night with the bride, depriving her of her virginity. This right was a practice in some European countries during the Middle Ages [16].

Tatar historian Safargaliyev described Spuler as a fascist historian, noting that, despite the vast number of sources, Spuler exaggerated the material contributions of the nomads [17, 282-283 p.]. However, his ideology was not characteristic of Italian fascism or German Nazism. Accusing Spuler of fascism or Nazism is a serious mistake. Spuler was a scholar who had to work within the conditions of his time, which required interaction with local authorities. His studies of peoples not belonging to the European race, predominantly Mongoloid in type, such as in the case of the Ulus of Jochi, show that Spuler was far from Nazi or fascist ideology and demonstrated a sincere academic interest.

Austrian historian Josef von Hammer-Purgstall observed that the Russians adopted Tatar customs, such as wearing fur clothing and beards, and their language underwent considerable Turkic influence. He also highlighted that many members of the Russian aristocracy had Tatar ancestry [18, 409-410 p.]. From

a historical standpoint, the Mongol and Turkic-Tatar influences on Rus should be viewed separately, as they were distinct peoples who temporarily coexisted within the structure of the Ulus of Jochi. "There is no doubt," writes Richard Möller, "it is an established fact that foreign Tatar rule had a profound influence on the Russian state, its economy, society, culture, and the Russian people as a whole. It brought Asian despotism to the country, which was alien to its original nature. The Varangian state, being of Germanic origin, did not know despotism" [19, 27 p.].

Austrian politician and historian Schüselko, in his views, believed that the Normans had a more beneficial influence on Rus than the Mongols [20, 9-10 p.]. The Normans had a positive influence on Europe, while the Mongols influenced Asia, contributing to the centralization of power. However, the positivity in this case is abstract, as it is impossible to know for certain what would have happened if the Normans had not conquered England and the Mongols had not conquered the Chinese Jin and Song dynasties.

Strahl in the 15th century notes that the Tatar aristocracy massively joined the service of Muscovy. He writes that the Tatars married Russian women, and small marital unions between Russians and Tatars occurred [21, 317 p.]. Of course, Russia experienced the influence of the Mongols, but genetically it experienced a greater influence from the Germans. Geneticists claim that European and German haplogroups are characteristic of Russia [22]. Spuler writes that Russian princes often took Tatar princesses as wives, and that the Tatars saw this as a way to strengthen their loyalty to their state interests. Thus, in 1316, Khan Uzbek gave his sister Konchaka in marriage to Grand Prince Yuri Danilovich of Moscow. After the baptism ceremony, which the Khan did not oppose, she received the name Agafya. However, her further life in Rus was not successful [10, 280 p.]. Political marriages between Mongol khans and representatives of other peoples were effective if these peoples had similar anthropological, religious, cultural, and linguistic traits. However, the khans of the Ulus of Jochi (Golden Horde) rarely married Russian princesses for the following reasons:

1) Aesthetic Preferences of the Mongols. The Mongols did not consider women of European descent beautiful. This is evidenced, for example, by the records of Rashid ad-Din, who noted that Maria Despina, the Greek wife of the Ilkhan Abaqa, was not his favorite, main or senior wife. Although the historian Steven Runciman claimed that she was respected [23,66 p.], [24. 331 p.]. Abaqa's Christian upbringing probably created an atmosphere of spiritual respect, but it did not influence his preferences. Spuhler, referring to Ibn Battuta's sources and the article "The Mongols of Iran", argues that, given the high position of the House of Chinggisids, it would be unusual for the khans to seek wives from among representatives of foreign families, since this would be contrary to Mongol traditions. On the contrary, the daughters of aristocratic Mongol families were considered equal, and the khan initially had to choose a spouse from their circle. Uzbek's wives (except for the Byzantine woman) were the daughters of the emirs of his court

2) The discrepancy between European women and Mongolian standards of beauty. Historical sources confirm that the Yuan Emperor Toghon Temur made the Korean Ki his main wife, despite the opposition of the Mongolian chancellor Bayan [25, 47 p.]. Although Queen Ki was inferior to the Byzantine princesses in religious and spiritual qualities, her anthropological and racial proximity to Mongolian standards of beauty proved decisive.

3) Religious and cultural differences. Differences in religion and culture made marriages between Mongols and Russians less attractive. The Islamization of the Mongols increased the distance, creating obstacles to marriages with Christian women. Despite the fact that Islam allowed such unions, cultural prejudices remained.

4) Geographical and social distance. Geographical distance and differences in lifestyle also played a role. Russian princes preferred a sedentary lifestyle, while the Mongols remained a nomadic people. The Mongols did not seek to seize the Russian throne directly, preferring to keep the Russian nobility as vassals.

5) Lack of political necessity. While the Byzantine emperors entered into alliances with the Mongols for protection from Muslim countries such as the Ottoman Empire, the Russian princes did not have such obvious external threats that would require marriage alliances. These factors explain the rarity of marriages between Mongol khans and Russian princesses. Also, in the Austro-German scholarly environment, another researcher, Bernard Nicolla, quotes Solovyov's concept regarding the invariability of the internal

appearance of Rus under the influence of Tatar expansion, which remains relevant and is well supported by historical data. The Tatar people did not seek to live permanently in Russian cities, preferring sparsely populated rural areas with minimal contact with the local population [15, 56 p.].

In Spuler's work, it is stated that Russian civilization did not bring anything new to Tatar society; on the contrary, Tatar ideology and court rituals became the foundation for similar phenomena among the Russians. He argues that the Russians borrowed cultural and lexical elements, military models, cavalry tactics, the system of division into tens, postal services, financial systems, and technical innovations from the Tatars [10, 261 p.]. Spuler considers Russian culture too simple, even claiming that the culture of the Tatar-Mongols surpasses it. However, it seems he wanted to emphasize that Mongol-Tatar culture was inferior to Germanic culture. But there is evidence that Russian cities influenced the Ulus of Jochi in glassmaking. The study of materials from a glassmaking workshop excavated at the Litternoye settlement allowed N. N. Busiatskaya to conclude that the glass recipes produced there were influenced by Russian glassmaking oil [26, 54 p.]. The Mongols also had a slight influence on culture. Findayzen suggested that the Russian balalaika might have been borrowed from the Mongolian topshura, Kalmyk panduri, and Kazakh dombra [27, 172 p.].

Strahl noted that in the Kazan Khanate, a "melting pot of peoples" was forming, where Tatars, Russians, Bulgars, Meshchera, Mordvins, Cheremis, and Mongols intermixed. This blending resulted in the creation of the "Kazan Tatars," who still exist today, though they are now a mere shadow of the people who once instilled fear in Russia [21, 285-286 p.]. Arab-speaking peoples had a significant impact on Europe in the cultural and scientific fields, yet in terms of religious and ideological matters, Spain and Europe remained loyal to their own beliefs. This can be seen in the fact that while Arabs made notable advancements in science and philosophy, Europe continued to uphold its Christian traditions in the religious and ideological domain.

German historian Martin Haldemeyer, who studies Russian history, argues that with the help of the Golden Horde, Moscow was initially at a low level but then surged ahead in terms of statehood. However, in his opinion, it was based on its own indigenous traditions and customs [28: 129-132]. This historian's statement is valid because the Ulus of Jochi, or the Golden Horde, did not impose its ideology on Rus.

German philosopher Karl Marx, in his work *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century*, writes that Russia achieved great success through clever manipulations, using the khans of the Golden Horde, corruption, and sycophancy to strengthen its power. He characterizes the people as being raised in slavery under the Mongols [29, 87]. In a letter to Engels, he negatively describes the Russian people as being linked to the Mongols and Finns [30, 161 p.]. Schneider also attempted to study Russian mentality through the Mongolian paradigm [31, 502 p.].

Spuler also quotes Tromofimov, asserting that the adoption of Islam played a significant role in the fusion of Mongol and Turkic elements. This led to the Mongols, who never constituted a significant majority in the Golden Horde, being absorbed into the mass of the Turkic population (10, 301 p.).

It can be said that the Mongols ultimately distanced themselves from the Russian world, preferring the Turkic one, inheriting its language and ethnographic features.

Bruggemann argued that Russia was lucky that the Khan of the Ulus of Juchi embraced Islam only later, otherwise, during the campaign against Russia, the threat of jihad could have arisen. However, he did not take into account the theological peculiarities of Islam. Specifically, in Islam, there is the concept of "jizya" — a tax levied on non-Muslims under the rule of a Muslim ruler. The tribute established by the Ulus of Juchi can actually be considered an analogue of jizya. Probably due to the religious nature of the khans, this Arabic term could have been used in their political practice.

O. Hötch argued that the Mongol rule, characterized by immoral behavior, cruelty, deception, corporal punishment, and disregard for individuals, distorted the Russian understanding of morality, particularly among their princes, for many centuries. He claimed that the Mongol influence caused the Russians to lose touch with European moral and ethical standards. Hötch suggested that this corrupting impact on the conquered peoples deepened the divide between Russia and Western Europe, reinforcing Russia's alignment with a more authoritarian, eastern model of governance and social structure

[33, 36-37 p.]. The concept of barbarism as described by Hatch is highly abstract. The term "barbarism" is a subjective notion that has often been used in historical literature from an evaluative perspective. Like any other civilization, the Mongols possessed a complex social, political, and military system, a developed culture, and an efficient administrative structure. They demonstrated humane treatment toward their foreign subjects and wore vibrant, aesthetically rich, and practical clothing that was in no way inferior to those of other civilizations.

The relationship between the Ulus of Jochi and Rus' was one of vassalage, but referring to it as "oppression" is unscientific, as this terminology is more characteristic of journalism. Many European kings had vassals from within their own continent. However, since Rus' was a vassal of non-European rulers—Asians, according to their logic—it was often associated with prejudice and viewed negatively.

Another German religious scholar, Vassilos Klein, asserts that the Ulus of Juchi, during the reign of Khan Janibek, was severely impacted by a plague epidemic, which contributed to the decline and eventual disappearance of the Assyrian Christian Church in 1338–1339 [34, 286–289 p.]. It is challenging to trace the influence of this plague period on Russia, as the pandemic may have reached Russia through its interactions with the Ulugh Ulus.

The Ulus of Juchi also possibly unintentionally contributed to the preservation of Russia from the Lithuanian threat. Strahl wrote that the victory of Temür-Kutlug over Vitautas led to the complete abandonment of the latter's attempts to capture Moscow, which made the Ulugh Ulus a buffer against the western threat [21, 228 p.]. Mongols and Turks, according to researchers, only strengthened the religious isolation of Russia, having little influence on its culture. Essentially, this marks the end of Mongol influence on Russia. Ekehard Klug noted that the cooperation of Russian rulers with the Golden Horde not only burdened them with tribute but also provided important support in their relations with other contenders for power [35, 53-54.]. It is also important to note that thanks to the Ulus of Juchi, Russia preserved its demographic potential without engaging in conflicts with other Russian cities and foreign European states. The Mongols mainly did not have a direct religious influence on the Russians, but their rule led to certain changes in the religious policy of the khans. Spuler, regarding religious tolerance, noted that in the Ulugh Ulus, there was no forced conversion to another faith, unlike in Iran [36, 199 p.]. This may have been due to the fact that Iran and its population were closer to the Islamic center, while in the Ulus of Juchi, the Mongols and Turks were less religious and were more strongly guided by the laws of the Yasa.

The Crimean War of 1853–1856 drew attention to the history of Russo-Crimean Tatar and Russo-Turkish relations. During this period, several works were published, including *Russia Under the Yoke of the Tatars, Fighting Against and For* by Franz Schuselka [37], *The Struggle for the Black Sea* by Theodor Mundt [38], *Crimean-Girey—Ally of Frederick the Great* [39], and *The History of the Crimean Khans Under Ottoman Rule* by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall [40]. In these studies, German historians portrayed Russia as an aggressive state and depicted the fall of the Crimean Khanate in a tragic light [4, p. 26].

Marat Gatin made a significant contribution to the study of German historiography. His work *The Conquest of the Kazan Khanate in the Interpretations of German Historians* [41] provides a detailed account of the final struggles of the Ulus of Jochi.

The German historian N. Ernst mentioned the assimilation of the Mongols in Rus', writing about Kudaiqul Peter, who married the sister of Vasily III but remained childless for a long time. Later, historian Khoroshkevich criticized N. Ernst for exaggerating the pace of assimilation of the Horde's descendants in Rus' [42, p. 301]. Nevertheless, some aristocratic families of the Ulus of Jochi, such as the Yusupovs, Bekbulatovichs, and Yermolovs, underwent assimilation. However, the number of Mongols who entered the aristocratic circles in Russia remained relatively small and could not compete in scale with the influx of Germans and other European groups. The rate of assimilation was influenced by the surrounding environment—Mongols who were no longer among their Turkic or Mongol subjects assimilated more rapidly into the Russian majority, particularly through intermarriage. The assimilated Mongols did not prove to be particularly prolific. For example, the Yusupov princes left no male heirs, and this was not an isolated case.

Another USA scholar with German origin, Gustaf Alef, examined the influence of Tatar coinage on Rus'. He noted that Muslims had an aversion to depicting living beings, which led to inscriptions playing a key role, including on Rus' coins. The earliest Moscow coins featured a circular legend on the obverse, bearing inscriptions such as "Grand Prince Dmitry" or "The Sign of Grand Prince Dmitry," alongside an image of a rooster or a male bust. The reverse consistently contained an Arabic inscription, and the reigning khan's name appeared on most of these early coins. For example, on the reverse of some coins minted under Dmitry, an Arabic legend reads: Sultan Tokhtamysh Khan, may his life be prolonged [43, p. 5-6].

Alef also described the establishment of Ryazan by the Tatars [43, p. 16]. The first recorded princes of Ryazan appear only after the Mongol conquest, though it is possible that a Rus' settlement existed there earlier.

Outside the aristocracy, the Mongols of the Ulus of Jochi had little knowledge of Islam and did not impose specific artistic styles on Rus' coinage. Russian princes adhered to vassal etiquette at the mint.

Gustaf Alef also cited the opinion of Spuler that the Kazan Tatar khan Ulugh Muhammad missed an opportunity after his victory at the Battle of Suzdal in 1445, as well as Karamzin's critique that Tsar Vasily III took too small an army into battle [43, p. 44]. However, Karamzin's criticism seems more like an attempt to justify the defeat than a genuine critique of the tsar. Vasily III likely mustered all the troops he could in that era. Most probably, Kazan lacked the necessary demographic resources, and like Hannibal, Ulugh Muhammad did not have the means to besiege Moscow—just as Hannibal lacked the resources to besiege Rome.

According to Ulrich Krökel, the Tatars, rather than directly participating in the socio-political processes in Rus', preferred indirect rule through tribute [44, p 272]. As a result, the country's recovery progressed relatively swiftly. Rus' presented the appearance of loyalty to the Mongols but constantly sought ways to escape vassal dependence on the Ulus of Jochi. Moscow skillfully utilized its diplomatic proximity to the Mongol khans, unlike other principalities, lulling them into a false sense of security with gifts and feigned flattery.

In the Middle Ages, Rus' had little cultural influence on the Ulus of Jochi. For example, the Kazakhs resisted a sedentary lifestyle for a long time. It was only during the reign of Zhangir Khan of the Bukey Horde that the Kazakhs of the Ulus began to familiarize themselves with European culture through Russia. In 1840, Zhangir Kerei Khan was granted the rank of major general in the Russian army. Under the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union, Russia's influence on the peoples of the Ulus of Jochi significantly increased, both materially and culturally.

### **Conclusion.**

German historiography places particular emphasis on Moscow's role in the process of liberation from the rule of the Horde. The successful use of diplomacy and military force in opposing the Horde is regarded as a key stage in Moscow's emergence as the center of a unified Rus'. The Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union disregarded certain Mongol principles regarding religious tolerance and philosophy. However, under the Germanic Romanov dynasty, Russia began to perceive Europe as a threat, which led to the formation of a unique culture distinct from both European and Mongol-Asian philosophical traditions. German historians highlight the role of Mongol rule in shaping centralized authority in Rus'. The political dominance of the Horde contributed to the creation of administrative structures that were later utilized for the consolidation of the Grand Duchy of Moscow.

The Mongol worldview was based on the idea of a single god in the heavens and a single emperor on earth. Unlike Nazi ideology or the Japanese theory of divine sovereignty, the Mongols did not adhere to racial prejudices or xenophobic doctrines. Instead, Mongol khans placed greater value on the recognition of their authority.

Byzantine culture exerted a more dominant influence than others as it brought about a transformation in religion and laid the foundation for Russian identity. The adoption of Christianity along with the introduction of Byzantine ecclesiastical organization, writing, art, and architecture became key factors in shaping the cultural and spiritual roots of Russian civilization.



The Mongols directly ruled Iran within the framework of the Mongol Ilkhanate while in the Yuan Empire they found the culture of these conquered peoples highly appealing. The Mongols of the Ulugh Ulus chose the Turkic world and adapted to its culture. They considered their conquest and assimilation with the Turkic peoples sufficient, rendering Rus' less significant in their geopolitical considerations. It was the Turkic populations that ultimately served as the primary buffer preventing the full assimilation of the Mongols with the Russians.

Most German historians influenced by Eurocentric views or approaching the subject with a negative bias produced journalistic works lacking academic rigor. However, the most significant contribution to the scholarly study of this topic among German historians was made by Berthold Spuler. Despite certain errors he made numerous discoveries that contemporary researchers are only beginning to fully appreciate. Even during the era of the Third Reich Spuler wrote with greater objectivity than many later publicists and historians. It would be unfair to blame early German historians for excessive Eurocentrism as they were largely shaped by the racial prejudices of their time influenced by the intellectual and ideological climate surrounding them.

German historians in both the Middle Ages and later periods often wrote negatively about the Ulus of Jochi or the Golden Horde for several reasons related to the political and cultural contexts of their time.

Conflict with the Mongols followed the Mongol invasion of Europe in the 13th century including their incursions into Rus'. Many European states perceived the Horde as a significant threat. The Golden Horde was a major political and military force and its actions were often viewed as acts of aggression fostering hostile attitudes in Europe.

Religious differences played a role since the Mongol rulers of the Golden Horde adopted Islam which led to negative perceptions among Christian historians particularly in the context of the Crusades and broader religious conflicts of the time.

Lack of understanding and stereotypes were prevalent as medieval Europeans often had a limited understanding of Mongol culture and traditions. As a result they frequently depicted the Mongols as barbarians or savages a portrayal reflected in historical writings.

Political interests influenced some German and other European historians who may have adopted an anti-Mongol stance as part of a broader effort to promote the superiority of European civilization portraying the Mongols as a destructive and barbaric force.

Historical sources shaped perceptions as many European historians relied on accounts written by individuals who had directly suffered from Mongol invasions or had been forced into subjugation shaping their interpretations of historical events.

Nevertheless some German historians wrote favorably about the Ulus of Jochi or Golden Horde despite the prevailing hostility toward the Mongols in the Middle Ages. This more positive perception may have been influenced by several factors.

Historical sources and propaganda shaped some German historians who may have been influenced by sources from later periods when relations with the Horde had become less antagonistic. These historians saw the Horde as a stable and powerful empire capable of maintaining peaceful relations which was reflected in their works.

Gradual globalization and a more tolerant intellectual climate contributed to a shift in perspective. The increased accessibility of scholarly articles and a more open academic environment helped dispel the image of the Mongol-Tatars as mere barbarians. Over time the rigid Eurocentric biases of early German historiography have been increasingly challenged leading to a more nuanced and balanced understanding of the Mongol influence on Eurasian history.

#### *References:*

1. Gatin M.S. *O tatarskom vliyaniy na Rus'-Rossiyu v rabotakh nemetskikh istorikov // Srednevekovye tyurko-tatarskie gosudarstva.* – 2017. – №. 9. – S. 61-65.
2. Gatin M. S. *Padenie Kazani v otsenkakh nemetskikh istorikov // Srednevekovye tyurko-tatarskie gosudarstva.* – 2010. – №. 2. – S. 146-150.

3. Gatin, M. *Nemetskie istoriki o bitve na Kalke [Tekst] / Gatin, M.S. // Gasyrlarr avazy — Ekho vekov. — Kazan, 2003. — №3/4. — S.136—141.*
4. Gatin Marat. *Problemy istorii Ulusa Dzhuchi i postordynskikh tyurko-tatarskikh gosudarstv Vostochnoi Evropy v nemetskoï istoriografii XIX - XX vv. Kazan 2006. Str.*
5. Gatin M. S. *Vzaimootnosheniya Rusi i Zolotoy Ordy vo vtoroi polovine XIV veka v traktovkakh nemetskikh istorikov // Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnye nauki. — 2009. — T.151. — №. 2-1. — S. 90-95.*
6. Gatin M. S. *Ulug-Mukhammad v trudakh nemetskikh istorikov // Zolotoordynskaya tsivilizatsiya. — 2017. — №. 10. — S. 310-314.*
7. Gatin Marat Salavatovich. *"PROBLEMA PROISKHOZHDENIYA KAZACHESTVA V SOVREMENNOY NEMETSKOY ISTORIOGRAFIИ" Srednevekovye tyurko-tatarskie gosudarstva, no.82016, pp. 104-106.*
8. Kappeler A. *Russland und die Ukraine. Verflochtene Biographien und Geschichten. Wien; Köln; Weimar: Böhlau, 2012.*
9. Balanovskaya E.V., Balanovsky O.P. *Geneticheskie sledu istoricheskikh i doistoricheskikh migratsiy: kontinenty, regiony, narody // Informatsionnyy vestnik VOGiS. — 2009. — T.13. — №2. — S. 401-409.*
10. Shpuler B. *Zolotaya Orda. Mongoly v Rossii. 1223—1502 gg. / Perevod s nemetsk. yazyka i komment. M.S. Gatina. Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh.Mardzhani AN RT, 2016.*
11. Zyriak von Gänçä. *Auszüge... S. 459f.; Klaproth H. J. Aperçu des entreprises des Mongols en Géorgie et en Arménie dans le XIIIe siècle. P. 209f*
12. Vorotynev, L. V. *Räzanski gambit Batu: o novykh traktovkakh soobsheni "Povesti o razorenii Rüzani Batyem" v sovremennykh issledovaniyah / L. V. Vorotynev // Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie. — 2022. — T. 10, № 2. — S. 284-302. —*
13. Richards, Donald Sidney, ed. (2010). *The Chronicle of Ibn Al-Athir for the Crusading Period from Al-kamil Fi'l-ta'rikh, Part 3: The Years 589-629/1193-1231: the Ayyubids After Saladin and the Mongol Menace. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing*
14. Rimscha, H. von. *Geschichte Russlands. — Wiesbaden, 1960. — S. 587 p.*
15. Nikolla B. *Opfer des Tatarenjochs oder Besatzungsgewinner?: Die Moskauer Großfürsten und die Goldene Horde in der Darstellung der Historiographie/vorgelegt von Bernard Nikolla.2021.*
16. Michael P. Ghiglieri Ghiglieri: *Ciemna strona człowieka. W poszukiwaniu źródeł męskiej agresji. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo CiS, Wydawnictwo WAB, 2001, s. 75.*
17. Safargaliev, M.G. *Raspad Zolotoï Ordy [Teks] / Safargaliev, M.G. II Na styke vekov i sivilizasiï... İz opyta obrazovaniya i raspada imperii X-XVI vv. / Sost. Ī.B.Muslimov. — M.: ĪNSAN, 1996. — S.280-524.*
18. Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. *Geschichte des Osmanisches 213 Reiches. — Bd.3. Von Regierungsantritte Suleiman des Ersten bis zum Tode Selim's II. 1520—1574 [Text] / Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. — Pest: C.A.Hartleben's Verlag, 1828. — 804 S.*
19. Moeller, R. *Von Rurik bis Stalin. Wesen und Werden Russlands / Moeller, R. — Lpz.: Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, 1939. — 379 S.*
20. Schuselka, F. *Russland im Joche der Tataren, im Kampf gegen und um die Krim in Demuthigung und Übermuth gegen die Türkei [Text] / Schuselka, F. — Dresden: Verlag von Robert Schaefer, 1854. — 300 S.*
21. Strahl, P. *Geschichte des Russischen Staates. — Bd.2. Von dem Einbrucher der Tataren in Russland bis zum Antritt der Regierung des Großfürsten Iwan IIIWasiljewitsch, d.i. von 1224 bis 1505 [Text] / Strahl, P. — H.: F.Perthes, 1839. — 444S.*
22. O. Balanovsky, S. Rootsi, A. Pshenichnov, T. Kivisild, M. Churnosov, I. Evseeva, E. Pocheshkhova, M. Boldyreva, N. Yankovsky, E. Balanovska, R. Villems. *Two Sources of the Russian Patrilineal Heritage in Their Eurasian Context. The American Journal of Human Genetics 82, 236–250, January 2008*
23. Raşid-ad-Din. *Jami at-tavarih. Sbornik letopisei. Toma 1. — M.-L.: İzdatelstvo AN SSSR, 1946. s. 66.*
24. Runciman Steven. *A History of the Crusades. — L.: Penguin Books, 1987. — Vol. 3. p. 331.*

25. Hwang, Kyung Moon (2021). *A history of Korea : an episodic narrative (3rd ed.)*. London. pp. 47
26. M.D. Poluboiarinova. *Ruskie liudi v Zolotoi Orde*. Izdatelstvo «Nauka», Moskva, 1978.
27. M Findeizen, Nikolai. *History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800*. Ed. Miloš Velimirović and Claudia Jensen. Vol. 1. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2008.
28. Hildermeier, Manfred. *Geschichte Russlands. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Oktoberrevolution*. 2022. 1504 S., mit 11. Karten ISBN 978-3-406-79398-1 2022
29. Karl Marx. *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century*. SWAN SONNENSCHNEIN & CO., LIMITED PATERNOSTER SQUARE. 1899. page 87
30. Marx-Engels *Correspondence 1865* In Manchester. Source: MECW, Volume 42, p. 161; First published: abridged in *Der Briefwechsel zwischen F. Engels und K. Marx* Bd. 3, Stuttgart, 1913 and in full in *MEGA Abt. III, Bd. 3*, Berlin, 1930. [London,] 24 June 1865
31. Schneider S. *Das mongolische Paradigma in Russlands Geschichte: eine Spurenlese // Texturen – Identitäten – Theorien: Ergebnisse des Arbeitstreffens des Jungen Forums Slavistische Literaturwissenschaft in Trier 2010. – 2011. – S. 479-505.*
32. Brüggeman A. B. *VLIANIE MONGÖLSKOGO İGA NA KÜLTURU, EKONOMİKU İ OBŞESTVO ROSİSKOGO GOSUDARSTVA // G94 Gumanitarnye nauki v sovremennom vuze: vchera, segodnä, zavtra, k 280-letiu so dnä rojdenia rosiskoi prosvetitelnisy knägini ER Daşkovoi: mater. VI mejdunar. – S. 249. 2023.*
33. Hoetzsch, O. *Grundzuge der Geschichte Russlands [Text] / Hoetzsch, O. — Stuttgart: K.F.Kohler Verlag, 1949. — 224 S.*
34. Wassilios Klein: *Das nestorianische Christentum an den Handelswegen durch Kyrgyzstan bis zum 14. Jh.* Brepols, Turnhout 2000, ISBN 978-2-503-51035-4, S. 286–289
35. Klug, E. *Das Fürstentum Tver' (1247-1485). Aufstieg, Selbstbehauptung und Niedergang [Text] / Klug, E. II Forschungen zur osteuropaischen Geschichte. – Bd.37. – V.: Otto Harassowitz, 1985. – S.7-355.*
36. Şpuler B. *Zolotaia Orda. Mongoly v Rosii. 1223–1502 gg. / Perevod s nemes. iaz. i koment. S.İu. Chuprova. ZAO Sentrpoligraf, 2021. 415 str*
37. Schuselka, F. *Russland im Joche der Tataren, im Kampf gegen und um die Krim in Demüthigung und Übermuth gegen die Türkei. — Dresden: Verlag von Robert Schaefer, 1854. — 300 S.*
38. Mundt, T. *Der Kampf um das Schwarze Meer. Historische Darstellungen aus der Gesehiehte Russlands. — Braunschweig: Druck und Verlag von George Westermann, 1855. — 333 S.*
39. Ders. *Krim-Girai, ein Bundesgenosse Friedriehs des GroBen: ein Vorspiel der russisch- türkischen Kampfe. — V.: Schindler, 1855. — 221 S. Eta rabota v nachale XX v. byla perevedena na ruskiı iazyk: Mundt, T. Krym-Gireı, soiuznik Fridriha Velikogo // İzvestia Tavricheskoı uchenoı arhivnoı komisii. — Simferopöl, 1909.*
40. St.Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. *Geschichte der Chane der Krim unter osmanischer Herrschaft. Aus türkischen Quellen zusammengetragen mit der Zugabe eines Gasels Schachingerai's. Als Anhang zur Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches / Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. — Wien, 1856. — 258 S.*
41. Gatin, M.S. *Zavoevanie Kazanskogo hanstva v traktovkah nemeskih istorikov [Tekst] / Gatin, M.S. // Sbornik materialov konferensii molodyh uchenyh i aspirantov AN RT «Molodej i ee vklad v razvitie sovremennoi nauki», Kazän 25—26 aprelä 2002 g. — Kazän, 2002*
42. Khoroshkevich A.L. *Rus' i Krym: Ot soyuza k protivostoyaniyu. Konets XV - nachalo XVI vv. — M.: Editorial URSS, 2001. — 301*
43. Gustave Alef. *Rulers and Nobles Fifteenth-Century Muscovy. VARIORUM REPRINTS. London 1983.*
42. Khoroshkevich A.L. *Rus' i Krym: Ot soyuza k protivostoyaniyu. Konets XV - nachalo XVI vv. — M.: Editorial URSS, 2001. — 301*
43. Gustave Alef. *Rulers and Nobles Fifteenth-Century Muscovy. VARIORUM REPRINTS. London 1983. P.5*
44. Krdkel, U. *«Zwischen Hammer und AmboP»: das Fürstentum Rjazan. Moskau und die Tataren (1237—1402). Krokkel, U. II Zwischen Christianisierung und Europaisierung: Beitrage zur Geschichte*

*Osteuropas in Mittelalter und fruher Neuzeit. Festschrift fur Peter Nitsche zum 65. Geburtstag. — Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998. —S.269—292. P.272*

Пайдалынылган әдебиеттер тізімі:

1. Гатин М. С. О татарском влиянии на Русь-Россию в работах немецких историков //Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства. – 2017. – №. 9. – С. 61-65.
2. Гатин М. С. Падение Казани в оценках немецких историков //Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства. – 2010. – №. 2. – С. 146-150.
3. Гатин, М. Немецкие историки о битве на Калке [Текст] / Гатин, М.С. // Гасырлар авазы — Эхо веков. — Казань, 2003. — №3/4. — С.136—141.
4. Гатин Марат. Проблемы истории Улуса Джучи и постордынских тюрко-татарских государств Восточной Европы в немецкой историографии XIX - XX вв. Казань 2006. Стр
5. Гатин М. С. Взаимоотношения Руси и Золотой Орды во второй половине XIV века в трактовках немецких историков //Ученые записки Казанского университета. Серия Гуманитарные науки. – 2009. – Т. 151. – №. 2-1. – С. 90-95.
6. Гатин М. С. Улуг-Мухаммад в трудах немецких историков //Золотоордынская цивилизация. – 2017. – №. 10. – С. 310-314\
7. Гатин Марат Салаватович. "ПРОБЛЕМА ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЯ КАЗАЧЕСТВА В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ НЕМЕЦКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ" Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства, no. 8, 2016, pp. 104-106.
8. Kappeler A. Russland und die Ukraine. Verflochtene Biographien und Geschichten. Wien; Köln; Weimar: Böhlau, 2012
9. Балановская Е. В., Балановский О. П. Генетические следы исторических и доисторических миграций: континенты, регионы, народы //Информационный вестник ВОГиС. – 2009. – Т. 13. – №. 2. – С. 401-409.
10. Шпулер Б. Золотая Орда. Монголы в России. 1223–1502 гг. /Перевод с немец. яз. и коммент. М.С. Гатина. Казань: Институт истории им. Ш.Марджани АН РТ, 2016.
11. Zyriak von Gänçä. Auszüge... S. 459f.; Klaproth H. J. Aperçu des entreprises des Mongols en Géorgie et en Arménie dans le XIIIe siècle. P. 209f
12. Воротынцев, Л. В. Рязанский гамбит Бату: о новых трактовках сообщений "Повести о разорении Рязани Батыем" в современных исследованиях / Л. В. Воротынцев // Золотоордынское обозрение. – 2022. – Т. 10, № 2. – С. 284-302. –
13. Richards, Donald Sidney, ed. (2010). *The Chronicle of Ibn Al-Athir for the Crusading Period from Al-kamil Fi'l-ta'rikh, Part 3: The Years 589-629/1193-1231: the Ayyubids After Saladin and the Mongol Menace.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing
14. Rimscha, H. von. *Geschichte Russlands.* — Wiesbaden, 1960. — S. 587.
15. Nikolla B. *Opfer des Tatarenjochs oder Besatzungsgewinner?: Die Moskauer Großfürsten und die Goldene Horde in der Darstellung der Historiographie/vorgelegt von Bernard Nikolla.*2021.
16. Michael P. Ghiglieri Ghiglieri: *Ciemna strona człowieka. W poszukiwaniu źródeł męskiej agresji.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo CiS, Wydawnictwo WAB, 2001, s. 75.
17. Сафаргалиев, М.Г. Распад Золотой Орды [Текст] / Сафаргалиев, М.Г. II На стыке веков и цивилизаций... Из опыта образования и распада империй X—XVI вв. / Сост. И.Б.Муслимов. — М.: ИИНСАН, 1996. — С.280—524.
18. Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. *Geschichte des Osmanisches 213 Reiches.* — Bd.3. *Von Regierungsantritte Suleiman des Ersten bis zum Tode Selim's II. 1520—1574 [Text]* / Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. — Pest: C.A.Hartleben's Verlag, 1828. — 804 S.
19. Moeller, R. *Von Rurik bis Stalin. Wesen und Werden Russlands* / Moeller, R. — Lpz.: Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, 1939. — 379 S.

20. Schuselka, F. *Russland im Joche der Tataren, im Kampf gegen und um die Krim in Demuthigung und Uebermuth gegen die Turkei* [Text] / Schuselka, F. — Dresden: Verlag von Robert Schaefer, 1854. — 300 S.
21. Strahl, P. *Geschichte des Russischen Staates. — Bd.2. Von dem Einbrucher der Tataren in Russland bis zum Antritt der Regierung des Großfürsten Iwan III Wasiljewitsch, d.i. von 1224 bis 1505* [Text] / Strahl, P. — H.: F.Perthes, 1839. — 444S.
22. O. Balanovsky, S. Rootsi, A. Pshenichnov, T. Kivisild, M. Churnosov, I. Evseeva, E. Pocheshkhova, M. Boldyreva, N. Yankovsky, E. Balanovska, R. Villem. *Two Sources of the Russian Patrilineal Heritage in Their Eurasian Context. The American Journal of Human Genetics* 82, 236–250, January 2008
23. Рашид-ад-Дин. *Джами ат-таварих. Сборник летописей. Тома 1.* — М.-Л.: Издательство АН СССР, 1946. с. 66.
24. Runciman Steven. *A History of the Crusades.* — L.: Penguin Books, 1987. — Vol. 3. p. 331.
25. Hwang, Kyung Moon (2021). *A history of Korea : an episodic narrative (3rd ed.)*. London. pp. 47
26. М.Д. Полубояринова. *Русские люди в Золотой Орде.* Издательство «Наука», Москва, 1978.
27. M Findeizen, Nikolai. *History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800.* Ed. Miloš Velimirović and Claudia Jensen. Vol. 1. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2008.
28. Hildermeier, Manfred. *Geschichte Russlands. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Oktoberrevolution.* 2022. 1504 S., mit 11. Karten ISBN 978-3-406-79398-1 2022
29. Karl Marx. *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century*». SWAN SONNENSCHNEIN & CO., LIMITED PATERNOSTER SQUARE. 1899. page 87
30. Marx-Engels Correspondence 1865 In Manchester. Source: MECW, Volume 42, p. 161; First published: abridged in *Der Briefwechsel zwischen F. Engels und K. Marx* Bd. 3, Stuttgart, 1913 and in full in MEGA Abt. III, Bd. 3, Berlin, 1930. [London,] 24 June 1865
31. Schneider S. *Das mongolische Paradigma in Russlands Geschichte: eine Spurenlese // Texturen—Identitäten—Theorien: Ergebnisse des Arbeitstreffens des Jungen Forums Slavistische Literaturwissenschaft in Trier 2010. — 2011. — С. 479-505.*
32. Брюггеман А. Б. *ВЛИЯНИЕ МОНГОЛЬСКОГО ИГА НА КУЛЬТУРУ, ЭКОНОМИКУ И ОБЩЕСТВО РОССИЙСКОГО ГОСУДАРСТВА // Г94 Гуманитарные науки в современном вузе: вчера, сегодня, завтра, к 280-летию со дня рождения российской просветительницы княгини ЕР Дашковой: матер. VI междунар. — С. 249. 2023.*
33. Hoetzsch, O. *Grundzuge der Geschichte Russlands* [Text] / Hoetzsch, O. — Stuttgart: K.F.Kohler Verlag, 1949. — 224 S.
34. Wassilios Klein: *Das nestorianische Christentum an den Handelswegen durch Kyrgyzstan bis zum 14. Jh.* Brepols, Turnhout 2000, ISBN 978-2-503-51035-4, S. 286–289
35. Klug, E. *Das Furstentum Tver' (1247-1485). Aufstieg, Selbstbehauptung und Niedergang* [Text] / Klug, E. II *Forschungen zur osteuropaischen Geschichte.* — Bd.37. — В.: Otto Harrassowitz, 1985. — S.7-355.
36. Шпулер Б. *Золотая Орда. Монголы в России. 1223–1502 гг.* / Перевод с немец. яз. и коммент. С.Ю. Чупрова. ЗАО Центрполиграф, 2021. 415 стр
37. Schuselka, F. *Russland im Joche der Tataren, im Kampf gegen und um die Krim in Demuthigung und Uebermuth gegen die Turkei.* — Dresden: Verlag von Robert Schaefer, 1854. — 300 S.
38. Mundt, T. *Der Kampf um das Schwarze Meer. Historische Darstellungen aus der Gesehichte Russlands.* — Braunsehweig: Druck und Verlag von George Westermann, 1855. — 333 S.
39. Ders. *Krim-Girai, ein Bundesgenosse Friedriehs des GroBen: ein Vorspiel der russisch- turkischen Kampfe.* — В.: Schindler, 1855. — 221 S. Эта работа в начале XX в. была переведена на русский язык: Мундт, Т. *Крым-Гирей, союзник Фридриха Великого // Известия Таврической ученой архивной комиссии.* — Симферополь, 1909.
40. Sl.Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. *Geschichte der Chane der Krim unter osmanischer Herrschaft. Aus turkischen Quellen zusammengetragen mit der Zugabe eines Gasels Schachingerai's. Als Anhang zur Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* / Hammer-Purgstall, J. von. — Wien, 1856. — 258 S.

41. Гатин, М.С. *Завоевание Казанского ханства в трактовках немецких историков [Текст] / Гатин, М.С. // Сборник материалов конференции молодых ученых и аспирантов АН РТ «Молодежь и ее вклад в развитие современной науки», Казань 25—26 апреля 2002 г. — Казань, 2002*

42 Хорошкевич А.Л. *Русь и Крым: От союза к противостоянию. Конец XV - начало XVI в. — М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2001. — 301*

43 *Gustave Alef. Rulers and Nobles Fifteenth-Century Muscovy. VARIORUM REPRINTS. London 1983. P.16*

44 *Krdkel, U. «Zwischen Hammer und AmboP»: das Fürstentum Rjazan. Moskau und die Tataren (1237—1402). Krokkel, U. II Zwischen Christianisierung und Europaisierung: Beitrage zur Geschichte Osteuropas in Mittelalter und fruher Neuzeit. Festschrift fur Peter Nitsche zum 65. Geburtstag. — Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998. —S.269—292. P.272*