

**Simon Franklin**

***Cambridge University***

**Printing Moscow: Significances of the Frontispiece to the 1663 Bible**

The first complete Moscow-printed Bible (1663) was designed to be impressive, starting with its opening two leaves: the illustrated title page, and — in particular — the elaborate woodcut frontispiece. The present study considers the significances of these pages on four levels, in relation to (i) the semantics of production; (ii) precedent in Muscovite and Ruthenian print culture; (iii) immediate responses; and (iv) subsequent longer-term impact. Thus, although based on just two images, the article explores a broad range of issues in Muscovite visual, verbal, technological and political culture across the seventeenth century.

---

**Olga Sevastyanova**

**Establishment of Novgorod as a Republic**

Both Novgorod and Kiev are situated on one of the most important trade-river routes from the Vikings to the Greeks. The union of Novgorod and Kiev under the rule of one prince is considered to be the date of the foundation of the Russian state. It was essential to keep Kiev and Novgorod under the same ruler, as a Novgorod-Kiev axis kept the state together. From the eleventh-twelfth centuries, when different Russian lands, under hereditary ownership of the sons of the Kiev princes, separated from the central power, constant conflict between the princes of Kiev and the people of Novgorod is traced in the sources. On the one hand, the princes of Kiev wanted to keep Novgorod under their power, on the other, the people of Novgorod wanted to have a prince of their own like in other Russian principalities. I maintain the view that the struggle of the people of Novgorod was not against the prince, as was understood by previous scholars, but for a prince. It was the princes of Kiev who were not interested in having a permanent prince in Novgorod.

The establishment of Novgorod as a republic was understood to result either from the expulsion of prince Vsevolod, the son of the prince of Kiev Mstislav in 1136 (A. B. Grekov) or due to a chain of events which culminated in 1136 with prince Vsevolod being expelled from Novgorod by the boyars, and the boyars taking control (V. L. Janin). But why was one of the most important events for the identity of Novgorod, the victory of the people of Novgorod in the battle for their political freedom in 1169 with the prince of Vladimir Andrej Bogolubskij, was celebrated in Novgorod on the 27th of November, the day when Vsevolod Mstislavich is commemorated as a saint? When the prince Vsevolod was expelled from Novgorod in 1136, the posadnik, who was supposed to be the boyar representative of the prince's opposition, and other prominent boyars were on the prince's side. After his death Vsevolod was canonized and for centuries his name was extremely popular in Novgorod. In 1132 after

Vsevolod's father, the prince of Kiev Mstislav, died, an internal conflict started between his descendants and the descendants of the princes Oleg and Vladimir. The head of the Russian church and the Bishop of Novgorod were on the side of the descendants of Oleg. The military support of the people of Novgorod was as usual the condition of getting the throne of Kiev. So it was important for the descendants of Mstislav to gain support among the Novgorod boyars and clergy. This was the time of the reconstruction of the building on the boyar estate E (originally built in 1126), which became the building of the joint court of the prince and *posadnik*, the boyars' representative (which is traced to the birch charters). There are two Novgorod charters from this time: one stated that the sons of Mstislav granted land to the Novgorod monasteries. It is not a coincidence that the head of one of the monasteries received land from Mstislav's son Iziaslav Mstislavich; Arkadij, the protégé of this prince, later became the bishop of Novgorod. It was the first election of the bishops of Novgorod, who had been appointed by the head of the Russian church before. In 1156 Iziaslav Mstislavich appointed his protégé Kliment as a head of the Russian church. The support of the Bishop of Novgorod was essential in this illegal act.

Therefore the establishment of Novgorod as a republic was not only a result of the boyars acting against the prince of Kiev as had been thought before. The boyars of Novgorod struggled to have a permanent prince in Novgorod. The princes of Kiev were interested in keeping Novgorod under their power and were not interested in Novgorod as a principedom. They were also interested in having their protégé as a bishop of Novgorod and didn't want him to be appointed by the Metropolitan. The princes had to allow Novgorod to become a republic.

---

**Georgi R. Parpulov**  
***Oxford University***  
**Slavonic Manuscripts in the United States**

Parpulov reported on his "Pre-1650 Cyrillic Manuscripts in U.S. Public Collections: A Catalogue" prepared in the summer of 2009 and due to be published in *Palaeoslavica* 18 (2010). Of the twenty-one manuscripts described therein, the following were selected for presentation: Baltimore MD, Walters Art Museum, W.548; Cambridge MA, Harvard University, Houghton Library, Mss Typ 221, Russian 19 and Slavic 3; Claremont CA, Pomona College Library, Ms R92; New York, American Bible Society, no. 35077; New York, Morgan Library, Mss M.694 and M.695; Princeton NJ, Princeton University Art Museum, inv. 54-69. Discussion after the talk centered on the usefulness of watermarks for dating manuscripts (Jana Howlett), the possibility of identifying individual scribal hands (Mary MacRobert) and the general criteria for dating medieval Cyrillic handwriting (MacRobert, Francis Thomson).