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Traditions of primary education in East Slavonic lands derive from Byzantium and continue the methods in use there and before that in Classical Greece. They can be traced from Novgorod birch bark inscriptions through the primers under consideration to the last century.

The printed primers continue a tradition of MS primers, of which few survive, although they were very widely used. These contained the alphabet and syllables the *azbuka* proper and sometimes other material as well. The surviving printed books contain a great deal of this other material, and it is according to this that they can be classified.

They fall into three groups, the first following the text of Ivan Fedorov's *azbuka* of 1574, the second that of the Jevje primer of 1618 and the third consisting of a single book. The two main groups originated in West Russia and were later adopted in Muscovy as well. There is some degree of mutual influence.

None of these primers is an original composition: there is evidence that Ivan Fedorov was using a text that already existed when he produced his primer, and certain elements in it already reflect the content of Western primers of the period.

The Muscovite primers are strictly Church Slavonic, but the West Russian ones make extensive use of the vernacular, reflecting its different status in the two areas. Those from West Russia also reflect the continuing polemic between Orthodox and Catholic in this region. All of them seek to impart the official ideology along with the skills of reading and writing.

The Russian *bukvari* of this period thus represent a distinct offshoot of the general Slavonic tradition, incorporating certain features from the West, and provide a good illustration of the flow of cultural influences over the centuries.

**Bibliography**


1.0. It should be stated that the dates are, in a sense, arbitrary. After 1200 the Grand Duchy began to increase its territory at the expense of the E. Slavs. The Treaty of Lublin in 1569 formalised the union of Poland and Lithuania under one dynasty, inaugurated in 1386 by the accession of the first Jagellonian, Ladislas Jogaila. This event had been signalised by the acceptance of Western Christianity.

1.1. There were thus two sources for Slavic loanwords. E. Slavic, latterly White Russian, and Polish, mainly from the 14th century onwards. Slavic-Lithuanian relations were characterised by a cultural gap, certainly in the early period, between the Christian E. Slavs who already possessed an extensive literature and the Lithuanians who were both pagan and "analphabetic", to coin a French term.

1.1. At the beginning of our period it is possible to establish a system of vocalic correspondences which appear to be valid for three and a half centuries. This system (outlined below) based on a quantitative rather than a qualitative opposition, is not affected by the shift to a stress system in both E. and W. Slavic. In other words Lithuanian for the most part substituted its own phonemes for Slavic vowels and consonants. Thus čekas 'Czech' would seem to be a comparatively early loan on account of the velar stop /k/ in place of the Slavic spirant /x/. The appearance of new phonemes may be regarded as a sign of late provenance of a word.

1.2. Vowel Correspondences in Baltic and Slavic

The table below shows the Latvian correspondences where they differ
from the Lithuanian, otherwise only one form is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavic</th>
<th>Baltic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>L. o; La. ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ė</td>
<td>L. ė; La. ė [ē]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĭ</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>L. y; La. ĭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operation of this system can be seen in the following examples:

L. knyga 'book' < OR 2 knygę, La grāmata < OR grāmata; L. bažnyčia 'church', La baņīca < OR baņīaka; L. kuilys 'boar' < OR kūlys

The preservation of the system of vocalic correspondences is maintained even in the smaller number of loans which went the other way, cf. WR doŭliē 'builder' < L. dailidē 'carpenter', and this may indeed reflect the prevalence of wooden over stone architecture in both regions.

1.3. The distribution of the loans is mainly social and cultural. One finds, for instance, hierarchical terms such as L. karalius 'king' < OR korol and 'taxes' is L. muitas < from OR māto. One finds some everyday terms such as L. stālas < OR stānu, yet the Lithuanians must have had tables: in Latvian it is galds. Again there is L. sodas < OR cādā though there is a synonymous Baltic form daržas (La dārzes).

In some instances there may be doubt as to provenance. Is L. miestas 'town' a Polish loan word or is it E. Slavic? The modern Polish form miasto points to a more open value for the phoneme ė while the L diphthong -ie- points to a closed value for ė. An E. Slavic source seems indicated, and indeed město in the meaning 'town' was once more wide-

---

(2) OR is used as a blanket term for E. Slavic loan words between the 13th and 16th centuries. WR is used exclusively for White Russian loans.
(3) Jules Levin, op. cit.: 38
(4) The existence of this word was brought to my attention by the Rev. A. Nadson.
spread. Evidence for a closed value for ė can be found in Ukr micmo. The reason for borrowing a word such as miestas may be sought in the development of a new social unit differing from the older fortified settlement represented by the L word pilis now 'castle' Latvian on the other hand derived pilseta < pil 'castle'. The L opposition miestas: pilis recalls the Pol. opposition miasto: gród.

The provenance of L burmistras from WR 6ypmćmp seems likely, but it could also be said that the WR form has come through Pol. burmistrz. The choice of this sequence is dictated by the fact that the word was originally of German origin, and it was in Poland rather than in White Russia that German influence on urban organisation had the most direct effect. In the larger Polish cities there were German communities with special privileges: they were even subject to German law. This would seem to be the right moment to look at the contribution made by Polish to the Lithuanian lexical stock.

2.0. Polish loanwords in Lithuanian seem to reflect a merger of two societies. In the first place the Lithuanians accepted Roman Catholicism from the Poles. The acceptance of a new religion meant a new hierarchy. The Lithuanians had a word for 'priest' vaidila, but this was a pagan priest and was clearly not suitable. (Curiously enough vaidila came to mean an actor). The choice fell on Lithuanian kunigas. Now kunigas is not a Slavic loan at all but a German one. The Polish influence lies rather in the equation kunigas:ksiądz. Both words (the Polish is from the Cm Gmc *kunigaz) must at one stage have had quite a different connotation, i.e. 'ruler, lord' for Polish ksiądz is cognate with R 'prince'. As applied to priest they are merely translations of Latin dominus, the title of the priest throughout mediaeval Europe. Confirmation of the more general meaning 'lord' is to be found in Lat kungs which is a purely secular term.

2.1. Kunigaikštis: ksiądz: kniże
Since kunigas in Lithuanian and ksiądz in Polish had taken over the

(5) Latvian archaeologists refer to these late Iron Age forts as pilkaini or castle hills.

(6) I am again indebted to the Rev. Nadson for the suggestion that L burmistras is from WR ępymćmp rather than Pol burmistrz.

(7) This is probably an early Middle High German loan, < künec.
connotation 'priest' a gap was left for 'prince' or 'duke'. This gap was filled by derivatives resp. L kunigaikščis, Pol. książe. The West Slavic origin of this development is confirmed by a similar opposition in Czech: kněz: kníže. The loss of a general term for 'lord' if one excludes Viešpats, which is too elevated may have prompted a further borrowing L ponas < Pol pan, L ponia < Pol pani. These are equivalent to the La terms kungs: kundze.

2.2. Some loans such as Lithuanian herbas 'coat of arms' < Pol herb show the introduction of a new phoneme: in the modern language it is an aspirate while in Polish /h/ is identical with /x/ (ch). It is, of course, possible that it has entered Lithuanian from Ukrainian (sepč). In any case the word is a Polish loan in Ukr. The Pol provenance of L šventas is not in doubt, it is from Pol święty 'sacred'; the L Š represents Polish š while the nasal vowel symbol is correctly rendered as a nasal diphthong. La svėtš on the other hand is from OR čAmya, both ā and ą are heard as [Ą]. Indeed OR vacillated here, cf. ęctmu for ãctmu. The Christian names introduced show some vacillation: cf. Adomas < Pol Adam. In revenge two L names entered Polish Witold < L Vytautas (Gd. Duke, 1392-1430) and Olgiertas < L Algirdas (1345-1377). Olgiertas in particular shows: (1) L ā as Pol o; (2) Pol sound change ir - ier was still operating.

3.0. In conclusion we can say that the period of the Polono-Lithuanian condominium was marked by the development of the Lithuanian Grand Duchy into a late feudal state on the Polish model. Apart from the growth of the towns the Polish model provided both the model and the word for the L assembly, L seimas < Pol sejm. At the same time the contact with the E. Slavs was maintained. It was firstly under Algirdas and Kęstutis and then under Vytautas that Lithuania achieved its greatest expansion, reaching as far south as the Black Sea.

Loan words during this period show in the main a consistent pattern. Thus, Slavic neuters appear as masculines: miestas, muitas, muilas

(8) Zdisław Stieber, Historyczna i Współczesna Fonologia Języka Polskiego, Warsaw 1966: 33

(9) It should not be forgotten that the first L orthography was based on that of Polish. All that has been retained are the nasal sign as as in ë and the superscript dot written over é.
Lithuanian has only two genders. There is also a general tendency to put Slavic jo-stem masc. nouns into a new L ju-stem: cf. L karalius < OR король. This practice has continued to this day. Cf. Adomas Mickievičius⁹, the L spelling of the name of the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz.

ANDERS SJÖBERG: Ivan Timofeev and his two still unidentified enemies in Novgorod

In a chapter of his Vremennik Ivan Timofeev describes the origin of the text of the treaty concluded between Novgorod and Sweden after the Swedish occupation of the city in 1611.

This chapter, misleadingly entitled "O krestnom celovanii koroleviču Vladislavu", has been characterised by O.A. Deržavina, editor of the Vremennik, as an incomplete draft, since Timofeev seems to have described the same event twice and was evidently unable to decide which version of the text to consider as final (Deržavina 1951, p. 362).

In my opinion Timofeev deals with two separate matters in this chapter: Novgorod's treaty with Sweden in 1611 and the oath of allegiance, sworn for Novgorod by its delegates to Sweden (Vyborg) in 1613, which made Duke Karl Filip the legal ruler of the city.

Timofeev evidently prepared a version first on the treaty and then on the oath but his suggestions were rejected. In the first case two vlastoljubcy rejected his text and replaced it with one of their own. In the second instance Timofeev's text was rejected by two tajnopisateli, who replaced it with one of their own. Thus, if I am correct in assuming that Timofeev describes two different events in this chapter, it seems likely that Timofeev in the second instance is alluding to the two secretaries (tajnopisateli) who participated in Novgorod's delegation to Vyborg, namely Tretjak Kopnin and Tomilo Sergeev.

The identity of the two vlastoljubcy has been discussed by several scholars. Deržavina (1951) assumes that they are Voevoda Michail Tatiščev and the scribe Jefim Telepnev. Čerepnin (1961) quite rightly observes that this cannot be correct. It is also incorrect to suggest, as has been done in the past, that the treaty was drafted by the scribes Kornil Jevlev and Semen Samsonov, since both had left Novgorod before the Swedish occupation.
According to Čerepnin (1961, p. 467) the most probable solution to the problem is that Timofeev was referring to two scribes who served in Novgorod during the occupation, Pjatoj Grigorjev and Semen Lutochin. His theory is based on the documents of a trial in late March 1615 in which Pjatoj Grigorjev and Ivan Timofeev were the main litigants. Čerepnin maintains that the Swedes arranged this trial in order to cast suspicion on Timofeev as one of the men behind Novgorod's opposition to the Swedes, and that Grigorjev was the Swedes' henchman—a traitor who had deserted to the occupying power.

Documents in the "Novgorod Occupation Archive" in the National Archives in Stockholm, however, provide no evidence for Grigorjev's presence in Novgorod during the summer of 1611. He seems to have assumed the duties of a scribe in Novgorod in the fall of 1612. As for Semen Lutochin, the other suspected traitor, Čerepnin presents no evidence whatsoever to support his theory.

A testimony by Bojar Jacob Bobrykin speaks against the assumption that Lutochin was a traitor. Bobrykin assured Tsar Michail that in Novgorod "no one serves the Tsar and prays for the Tsar like Metropolitan Isidor, Voevoda Odoevskij, Prince Mesčerskij and the scribe Lutochin".

In my opinion we should look for the two vlastoljubcy among the men who served the Swedes on the staff of the Swedish chancellery in Novgorod, led by the Swedish State Secretary Måns Mårtensson. On 23 March 1616 the Swedish commander-in-chief Jacob de la Gardie wrote to the Swedish Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna that a Russian scribe, Grigorij Sobakin, had rendered Sweden valuable assistance during the occupation and was willing to continue offering his services. It was noted among other things that Sobakin's knowledge of local conditions had greatly aided the Swedes in their administration of Novgorod. For this reason De la Gardie requested Oxenstierna to petition King Gustav II Adolf to grant Sobakin a village in the Koporje province as a fief.

The mention of Sobakin's services, particularly the fact that he rendered the Swedes great assistance by acquainting them with local conditions, inevitably brings to mind Timofeev's remark that the two vlastoljubcy instructed the occupiers in unfamiliar matters. It is also evident that as Måns Mårtensson's lieutenant Sobakin was in a position to wield as much power in Novgorod as the Swedes.

We can adduce one more reason for suspecting that Timofeev had
Sobakin in mind when he wrote his chapter about Novgorod's treaty with Sweden. Throughout his Vremennik Timofeev is very careful not to mention persons by their real names. He says of the two vlastoljubcy "ich že imja ne ot del žitija ich posnašasja."

I read this passage "ich že imjana ot del žitija ich posnašasja"

If we apply this reading, which deletes the negation, we find that Timofeev provides a hint as to the names of the two collaborators: their names can be recognized by their actions. Is it not possible to imagine that this may refer to a name like Sobakin, derived from the word sobaka and clearly associated with the expression sukin syn, son of a bitch?

I have managed to point out only one person fitting Timofeev's description. It is my hope that the many still unexamined documents in the Novgorod Occupation Archive will provide us with further materials about people working for Sweden during the occupation of Novgorod.
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21 - 23 MAI 1980, BRUXELLES:

 SYMPOSIUM INTERNATIONAL SUR LE PAGANISME SLAVE

Le symposium est organisé par l’Institut des Hautes Études de Belgique et dirigé par les professeurs C. Backvis et J. Blankoff. Les travaux auront lieu dans les locaux de l’Institut des Hautes Études, 44, avenue Jeanne, B 1050 BRUXELLES, sauf la session du 22 mai qui aura lieu à l'Université de Gand. Le programme prévoit les contributions suivantes:

BLANKOFF J. Deux survivances du paganisme en vieille Russie: 1) les ornements en croissants de lune, 2) le culte de l’ours.
ČERNECOV A.V, (URSS) Drevnerusskie izobrazitel’nye materialy o jazyčestve i dvoeverii.
DONNERT E. (RDA) Das Heidentum der Slawen in der schriftlichen Überliefe­run­g des deutschen Frühmittelalters.
EICHLER E, (RDA) Slavistische Paldolinguistik und slawische Frühgeschichte.
FORRAI I. (Hongrie) Issledovanija verovanija slavjanskich nasional’nostej Vengrii.
GIEYSZTOR A. (Pologne) Couches et paliers de la religion slave.
HENSEL W. (Pologne) Survivances du culte païen en Pologne médiévale.
JANEV S. (Bulgarie) Éléments de paganisme dans la littérature bulgare mo­derne.
POULIK J. (ČSSR) Das Heidentum bei den Slawen oberhalb der mittleren Donau.