



一橋大学機関リポジトリ

HERMES-IR

Title	Novgorodian Travelers to the Mediterranean World in the Middle Ages
Author(s)	Matsuki, Eizo
Citation	Studies in the Mediterranean World Past and Present : collected papers = 地中海論集 : 論文集, 11: 1-24
Issue Date	1988
Type	Journal Article
Text Version	publisher
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10086/14796
Right	

NOVGORODIAN TRAVELERS TO THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Eizo MATSUKI

“Novgorod the Great,” a unique republic city state in the 12th-15th centuries, was situated at the northwest corner of the Russian plain, not far from the Baltic Sea. It was on the northern fringe of the East European regions that shared a common Byzantine cultural heritage. In other words, Novgorod occupied a place on the furthestmost end of “the Byzantine Commonwealth” in Obolensky’s term.¹ In spite of this long distance, Novgorod during that period played an important role in Russia’s cultural contacts with its parent civilization. A series of Novgorodian travel accounts about Constantinople are one of the most noteworthy results of Novgorod’s contribution in this respect. At least four travel accounts to Constantinople can be attributed to Novgorodians taken from roughly ten pilgrim tales left by Russians from many areas until the year of 1453.² They are: (1) the Pilgrim Book of Dobrynia Iadreibovich, later Archbishop Antonii of Novgorod (1200-1204), (2) the anonymous description of Constantinople which is attributed to Vasilii Kaleka, (3) the journey of Stefan of Novgorod (1348 or 1349), and (4) Alexander the Clerk’s description of Constantinople. Besides these, we might just as well add as the tale of the occupation of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204, a description of which is based on a report by a Novgorodian eyewitness.³

The Russian travel accounts in general, *khozhenie*, in literary genre, began to develop first and foremost as pilgrim tales of the holy places in the Eastern Mediterranean World.⁴ All of the above mentioned Novgorodian travel accounts belong to the earliest and beginning examples of Russian pilgrim tales.

1 D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500-1453*. New York, 1971. Obolensky uses “Byzantine Commonwealth” as the term, denoting a medieval international community of East European Countries which commonly adopted Byzantine tradition and many features of its culture, including Orthodox Christianity.

2 The most comprehensive and reliable recent bibliographical work on Russian travelers to the Eastern Mediterranean World is: T. G. Stavrou & P. R. Weisensel, *Russian Travelers to the Christian East from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century*. Columbus, 1986. Taking in the broad sense of the term “travel account” and including only published works, the authors list 32 texts for the 12th-17th centuries, 101 for the 18th century and 1520 for the 19th century. They present ten travel accounts for the period from the beginning of the 11th century to the middle of the 15th century. See: pp. 1-23.

3 T. G. Stavrou & P. R. Weisensel, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

Each has already been published several times and has provided the specialists with a subject of philological analysis.⁵ But the historical background of these accounts from the context of special Novgorodian relation with the Eastern Mediterranean World has not necessarily been referred to sufficiently. Novgorodian travel accounts were often understood and explained only from the general "Russian" point of view. This paper is meant, therefore, not to provide a new comprehension or an analysis of their texts, but to try to examine some historical circumstances or background under which the travel accounts were created in Novgorod. Our attention will mainly be focused on the periods of (1) and (3) from the four travel accounts above. For the period just after the annexation of Novgorod by Moscow (the end of the 15th century), we will refer to the *Legend of the Novgorod White Cowl*, a literary work differing from the travel account, in conjunction with a Novgorodian traveler to the Mediterranean again.

I

The first Novgorodian travel account, Pilgrim Book (*Kniga palomnik*) of Dobrynia Iadreibovich, appeared at the beginning of the 13th century, roughly the century after the Russian pilgrimage to the Christian East was first recorded by Abbot Daniil.⁶ The century dividing Dobrynia from Daniil resulted in a remarkably changed political situation in Russia. Instead of a sole power centralized at Kiev, several decentralized local centers in political, economic and cultural terms emerged. "Lord Novgorod the Great," one of the most important of those centers, had already almost turned into an autonomous city

4 The most important recent works on *khozhenie* as a genre of Russian medieval literature are as follows: N. I. Prokof'ev, *Russkie khozheniia 12-15 vv.*, in: *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta im. V. I. Lenina*. No. 363, 1970, pp. 3-264; N. I. Prokof'ev, *Kniga Khozhenii. Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov 11-15 vv.* M., 1984, pp. 5-19; K.-D. Seeman, *Die altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur. Theorie und Geshichte eines literarischen Genres*. München, 1976; G. L. Vroon, *The Making of the Medieval Russian Journey*. Dissertation. University of Michigan, 1978; G. P. Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 19, Washington, 1984, pp. 1-195.

5 See: T. G. Stavrou & P. R. Weisensel, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-11, 13-16. For the tale by Dobrynia Iadreibovich, consult literature mentioned in footnot (4): N. I. Prokof'ev, *Russkie khozheniia 12-15 vv.* pp. 64-95; G. L. Vroon, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-145. For the pilgrimage of Novgorodian Stefan: N. I. Prokof'ev, *Russkie khozheniia 12-15 vv.* pp. 96-124; N. I. Prokof'ev, *Kniga Khozhenii. Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov 11-15 vv.* pp. 92-98, 268-275, 400-402; G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-47; M. N. Speranskii, *Iz strannoï Novgorodskoi literatury 14 veka*. L., 1934, pp. 5-82 (Monuments of Early Russian Literature. Berkeley Slavic Specialties. 1982.) For the anonymous account of Constantinople in the 14th century: M. N. Speranskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-140; N. I. Prokof'ev, *Kniga Khozhenii. Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov 11-15 vv.* pp. 80-91, 255-267, 396-400; G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-154.

6 The first and the most referred to pilgrim tale that has consistently been estimated to be the prototype of old Russian travel literature, *The Pilgrimage of Russian Abbot Daniil to the Holy Land* is dated at the beginning of the 12th century, 1106-1108. After Daniil no travel accounts by Russians are found until Dobrynia's pilgrimage. Dobrynia's Pilgrim Book is, therefore, the second oldest known travel literature in Russia.

state in the first half of the 12th century.⁷ The autonomy of Novgorod was achieved not only by obtaining relative freedom from princely political control, but also by establishing in the city a special prerogative archbishopric free from religious interference from the Kievan metropolitan. The archbishop who was elected by the citizens and placed in St. Sophia at the city center, became a symbol of Novgorod's independent status.

Since 1156, after the time of Arkadii (1156-1163), Novgorodians had acquired the right to select their own bishop from among the Novgorodian clergymen. After being elected by the *veche*, the bishop was sent to Kiev only for formal appointment. In 1163 they elected a common priest, Iliya as their bishop (1163-1186). In addition, they succeeded in having the Novgorodian bishopric authorized as "archbishopric" officially in 1165 by the "Metropolitan of all Russia" in Kiev.⁸ Therefore the year of 1165 was an important turning point for the history of the Novgorodian bishopric and the city state itself. As Golubinskii pointed out in the *"History of the Russian Church"*, the archbishopric in the 12th century was not only an honorific title, but designated the bishop who was subordinate directly to the patriarchate, not to the metropolitan.⁹ Accordingly, the Novgorod bishopric obtained the possibility of having a direct relationship with the patriarchate in Constantinople. This ecclesiastical status of Novgorod in turn increased its political authority and, as a result, promoted its independence all the more. Similarly Lithuania later strived to get the ecclesiastical "*avtokefaliya*" in an attempt to confirm its political separateness from Moscow, Novgorod also pursued it in the historical context of the 12th century. However, it was important for Novgorod to continue every effort to keep its ecclesiastical status. Since the "Metropolitan of all Russia" gave approval to the Novgorod archbishopric, it was not easy for Novgorod to hold it completely without any interference from the metropolitan. The archbishop of Novgorod never became "autocephalous," one that was consecrated directly by the patriarch. Nevertheless the most trustworthy guarantor for keeping its status had to be the patriarchate at Constantinople. And this became one of the many factors that attracted Novgorodian travelers after the second half of the 12th century. In any event, for the Novgorodian ecclesiastics, Constantinople became much more than an attractive destination of pilgrimage.

7 For the most noteworthy recent studies on the political history of medieval Novgorod, one should consult a series of V. L. Iarin's work based not only on written sources but also on various archaeological materials. See: V. L. Iarin, *Novgorodskie Posadniki*. M., 1962; *ibid.*, *Aktovye pechati Drevnei Rusi X-XV vv.* Vol. I, II. M., 1970; *ibid.*, *Problemy sotsial'noi organizatsii Novgorodskoi respubl'ki, Istoria SSSR*, 1970, No. 1, pp. 44-54; *ibid.*, *Ocherki kompleksnogo istochnikovedeniia. Srednevekovyi Novgorod*. M., 1977.

8 A. S. Khoroshev, *Tserkob' v sotsial'no-politicheskoi sisteme Novgorodskoi feodal'noi respubl'ki*. M., 1980, pp. 34-40.

9 E. E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*. Vol. I, first half of volume, M., 1904, p. 286; J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia. A study of Byzantino-Russian relations in the fourteenth century*. London-New York, 1981, p. 83.

Dobrynia Iadreibovich, who visited Constantinople some time between 1200-1204 and described its holy sites, was also deeply associated with Novgorod's ecclesiastical cause. He was a son of the well-known Novgorodian *voevoda*, Iadrei, who commanded the military campaign against Iugra in 1193 and was killed there.¹⁰ Accordingly, his family must have belonged to a high social class, either big merchant or boyar. His name and his church activities were recorded not only in Novgorodian but also in Muscovite chronicles for the first three decades of the 13th century. When he made the journey to Constantinople he was still a layman. According to the First Novgorod Chronicle, upon returning to Novgorod he entered the Khutin Monastery of the Savior where the famous Varlaam was *igumen*, and became a monk taking the name Antonii. In 1211 he was elected archbishop (1210-1220) unanimously by "the Prince Mstislav and Novgorodians" replacing the previous archbishop Mitrofan (1200-1210), who was exiled to Toropets. The Chronicle writes as follows: "Before Archbishop Mitrofan was exiled, Dobrynia Iadreibovich had come from Constantinople and brought with him (the measure of) the Holy Sepulcher. He had himself shorn at Khutin at the Holy Savior's monastery. By the will of God, Prince Mstislav and all the people of Novgorod came to love him, and sent him to Russia to get him appointed. He returned as appointed archbishop Antonii, and he made the residence of Mitrofan a church, dedicated to St. Antonii."¹¹ He remained archbishop until 1218 without any incident.

Did Dobrynia's pilgrimage to Constantinople have any relationship to his election as archbishop? Of course we can easily suppose that Dobrynia's contribution connected with his journey to Constantinople increased his reputation and made it easy for him to be chosen archbishop. In fact, the purpose of his travel was more than a simple pilgrimage. According to Bel'skii, Dobrynia was sent by Novgorod authorities to collect religious objects and to study Byzantine church protocol.¹² For Novgorod, as well as for other local centers in Russia, to learn every tradition of the Orthodox Church in Byzantium, and then to duplicate it the respective local centers, was a very urgent need of political importance. In this sense the ecclesiastical information and knowledge Dobrynia brought into Novgorod, probably, was enough contribution to elect him archbishop. When reviewing the circumstances, however, a more relevant fact is that during the period in question, there seems to have existed a group of Novgorodians who attached great importance to the relation-

¹⁰ For Dobrynia's biographical information, see: V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Dreverusskie zhitiia sviatykh, kak istoricheskii istochnik*. M., 1871, p. 6; N. I. Prokof'ev, *Russkie khozheniia 12-15 vv.* pp. 64-70.

¹¹ *Novgorodskaia pervavaia letopis' starshego i mladshago izvodob.* M.-L., 1950 (Hereafter NPL), p. 250; Eng. tr. R. Michell and N. Forbes, *The Chronicle of Novgorod*. London, 1914. (Hereafter CN), pp. 51-52.

¹² L. P. Bel'skii, Antonii arkhiepiskop novgorodskii i ego puteshestvie v Tsar'grad, *Panteon Literatury*, 3, 1890, pp. 8-9.

ship with Byzantium and supported clerics of Greek or of "Grecophile" Russian origin.

From late in the 12th century to the thirties of the 13th century a clergyman called "*Grechin*" (literally meaning Greek) was often referred to in the First Novgorod Chronicle. He was nominated for the archbishopric of Novgorod along with two other Russian candidates, twice, in 1193 and 1229. In 1226 "*Grechin*" became the Abbot of the St. Yuriev Monastery, the second highest ecclesiastical position in Novgorod. At times the *veche* of Novgorod was politically split into a few groups backing their own candidates for the archbishopric. Both times, in 1193 and 1229, the *veche* was divided into three groups: one supporting "*Grechin*" and two backing Russian candidates of their own. Interpreting the word "*Grechin*" in the Chronicle ethnically, not to imply a name identifying a specific person, some of the historians in the nineteenth century emphasized that in the late 12th century some political parties of Grecophiles and Slavophiles began to form in Novgorod.¹³ But the archaeologists of the USSR working in Novgorod recently found the medieval homestead where "*Grechin*" lived from the eighties of the 12th century, and proved that he was a Greek icon painter-clergyman settled in Novgorod.¹⁴ Nowadays, therefore, it is impossible to talk about the existence of a Grecophile "party" in Novgorod. But we can not dispute the fact that there was a group who attached special significance to religious and cultural contact with Byzantium and recommended Greek clergymen like "*Grechin*" or a Grecophile Novgorodian like Dobrynia for the most important holy positions in Novgorod. The conflicts among the regional districts of the city (*Ends* = *kontsy*), especially among the most influential three *Ends*, grew evident from about the second half of the 12th century. Accordingly, it is reasonable to think that the disagreements within the *veche* regarding the choice of archbishop also reflected the political conflicts between the three *Ends*: Nerev *End*, Liudin *End* and Slovo *End*.¹⁵ Of course it is unnatural to think that some special *End* always had a consistent foreign policy placing emphasis on the relationship with Byzantium. If some *End* had any special "foreign policy" of its own, it must

13 E. E. Golubinskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 674-676; M. D. Priselkov, *Ocherki po tserkovnopoliticheskoi istorii Kievskoi Rusi*. SPb., 1913, pp. 341-342; A. I. Nikitskii, *Ocherki vnutrennei istorii tserkovi v Velikom Novgorode*. SPb., 1879, p. 32. A recent example of this opinion is: G. L. Vroon, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-111.

14 See: V. L. Ianin, *Otkrytie khudozhestvennoi masterskoi 12 v. v Novgorode*, *BAI SSSR*, 1980; B. A. Kolchin, A. S. Khoroshev, B. L. Ianin, *Usad'ba novgorodskogo khudozhnika 12 v.*, M., 1981.

15 The practice of choosing the archbishop by lot from three candidates elected by the *veche*, later became a custom in Novgorod. This practice is described in detail in the entry of 1388 of the First Novgorod Chronicle. See: *NPL*, pp. 381-382, *CN*, pp. 161-162. Some historians, for example, P. Sokolov and J. Meyendorff point out that this practice stemmed from the Justinian Legislation. P. Sokolov, *Russkii arkhieri iz visantii i plavo ego naznacheniia do nachala XV veka*. Kiev, 1913, p. 320; J. Meyendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 83. But all of the archbishops of Novgorod after this period were not always elected by lot from three candidates. So it is more reasonable to assume that the practice originated from the traditional antagonism among the three most influential *Ends*. V. L. Ianin successfully analyzed and explained the importance of regional conflicts among the *Ends* in the political history of Novgorod. See: V. L. Ianin, *Novgorodskie Posadniki*. M., 1962.

have depended upon the influential boyar representing the End, or upon the Prince that the End recommended and supported as *knyaz*' of Novgorod.

In respect to the problem of special connection between Archbishop Antonii (Dobrynia) and Prince Mstislav, Vroon's opinion attracts our attention. Depending on the information of the First Novgorod Chronicle, Vroon points out that Mstislav was "a Grecophile Prince, who invoked the patronage of St. Sophia in order to gain support against Svyatoslav, and in order to project an image of Novgorod as a divinely protected city, on the model of Constantinople."¹⁶ Indeed the Chronicle indicates his special respect for St. Sophia wherever it describes Prince Mstislav's activities. In 1210 when Mstislav was invited to Novgorod's throne in place of Prince Svyatoslav, who had been deposed by the citizen, he first addressed the people of Novgorod: "I bow down to St. Sophia and the grave of my father, and to all the men of Novgorod." During his reign St. Sophia was put first to symbolize the republic in the Chronicle. In case of battles he always urged his men and Novgorodians to fight for St. Sophia, and then attributed his military success to the "aid of St. Sophia." One of the most famous and frequently quoted phrases from the First Novgorod Chronicle is: "Where St. Sophia is there is Novogord". This was also his word when he encouraged Novgorodian forces against Torzhok in 1215.¹⁷ According to Vroon, the First Novgorod Chronicle consistently links St. Sophia with Byzantium and the Grecophiles. In addition he pays attention to the fact that as soon as Prince Mstislav ascended the throne he caused Archbishop Mitrofan's exile, and replaced him with the monk, Antonii, who had made a pilgrimage to Constantinople and had recently tonsured. What suddenly connected these two people was their common purpose: the establishment of a cult of St. Sophia. In fact, a glance into Antonii's *Kniga Palomnik* shows that the author's interest was obviously concentrated on St. Sophia. Over half of the text is occupied by the details about St. Sophia in Constantinople: its protocol and ceremony, architecture, sacred vessels, relics, its treasures and miracles and signs that show the sacred status of Constantinople. Actually the details about St. Sophia seem to be beyond the range of simple pilgrim tales for future travelers' convenience. Antonii's description of St. Sophia was, "Byzantine blueprints to be implemented in Novgorod. For St. Sophia to become the patron of Novgorod, it had to acquire the trappings of its Byzantine model."¹⁸ Both for Mstislav and Antonii, Constantinople and its Hagia Sophia must have been prototypes for Novgorod and its St. Sophia.

We must also pay attention to the biographical information about Antonii also after he became archbishop in 1211. In 1218 Prince Mstislav, Antonii's patron, left Novgorod to obtain the throne in Galich. Just after his leaving, the

¹⁶ G. L. Vroon, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

¹⁷ *NPL.*, pp. 249, 252, 254, 256; *CN.*, pp. 50-51, 53-55, 57.

¹⁸ G. L. Vroon, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-111.

previous Archbishop, Mitrofan, who had been exiled to Toropets, returned to Novgorod and entered the monastery of the Annunciation. The next year, in Antonii's absence when he went out to Torzhok, the Novgorodians again elected Mitrofan archbishop and sent Antonii a messenger saying that he could go anywhere he pleased. He returned immediately to Novgorod and refused Novgorod's new election. After all Novgorod decided to dispatch both archbishops to Kiev and to leave the ultimate choice to the metropolitan. The metropolitan's decision was in favor of Mitrofan (1220-1223), and Antonii was assigned to the eparchy of Peremyshl', part of the Galich principality. Here again we recognize the evidence of the relationship between Antonii and Mstislav. The fact that Antonii was deposed immediately after Mstislav's leaving Novgorod was more than coincidence. Antonii's assignment to the eparchy in Galich where Prince Mstislav kept power also witnesses this. But what attracts our attention most is the fact that metropolitan Matfei of Kiev, showed a preference for Mitrofan, Antonii's rival. Prokof'ev regarded the metropolitan's decision as the result of his consideration for Novgorod's latest will.¹⁹ But Novgorod's final decision was not the election of Mitrofan, but was the dispatch of both archbishops to Kiev in order to allow ruled by the metropolitan. "The prince and the people of Novgorod said to Mitofan and Antonii; 'Go to the metropolitan. That whom he send us from both of you, that one be our archbishop'."²⁰ The metropolitan apparently by its own preference chose Mitrofan, rival of Antonii, because the latter was the very leading figure who pursued Novgorod's direct relation with the patriarchate in Constantinople, bypassing the metropolitan as a mediator.

After the death of Mitrofan, Antonii returned to Novgorod again in 1225 and was welcomed by the citizens. He took the archbishop's post to serve for a second term (1226-1228). But in 1228 he suffered a stroke and lost his power of speech. He retired "of his own free will" to the Khutin monastery of the Savior. Arsenii (1228-1229) succeeded his chair. In 1225-1228 Novgorod and its land was filled with many natural calamities: bad weather, famine and epidemic. In archbishop Arsenii's terms it continued: "The same autumn, great rain came down day and night. On Our Lady's Day and till St. Nichola Day (Dec. 19) we had no daylight. The people could not get the hay nor till their fields."²¹ At last the common people's turmoil burst against Archbishop Arsenii. After making a veche at Yaroslav's Court, they came to the archbishop's residence saying: "Warm weather lasts so long because he drove away Archbishop Antonii to Khutin monastery and he himself took the seat, having bribed the Prince."²² Having been driven off by the people, Arsenii left for

19 N. I. Prokof'ev, *Russkie khozheniia 12-15 vv.* p. 68.

20 *NPL.*, p. 261; *CN.*, pp. 61-62.

21 *NPL.*, p. 272; *CN.*, p. 71.

22 *NPL.*, p. 273; *CN.*, p. 71.

Khutin Monastery. They summoned Antonii back to the archbishopric a third time (1229), and appointed two assistants to help the sick archbishop. However, Antonii was unable to fulfill his duty as archbishop because of his failing health. In 1229 Prince Mikhail, who came to Novgorod's throne from Smolensk in 1228, urged the citizens to choose Antonii's successor. "Listen, now you have no archbishop. The absence of the archbishop does not suit this city. Since God has punished Antonii (by his sickness) you should elect an appropriate man, whether from among priests, abbots or monks."²³ The people of Novgorod were split into three groups recommending their own candidates for archbishop: Spiridon, Osaf and *Grechin* mentioned above. Since the 12th century it was the custom to draw lots on the altar of St. Sophia when the *veche* split on the choice. Three lots with three names each were put on the altar, and the young son of the Prince drew the lot. Spiridon (1229-1249) was chosen "by God". Greek icon-painter *Grechin* failed to become archbishop this time too, and died at St. Iuriev Monastery in 1231. Antonii returned to the Khutin monastery of the Savior and died there in 1232. Thus ended a period when Greeks or Grecophile Novgorodians frequently appeared on the pages of the First Novgorod Chronicle.

II

For at least about a hundred years after the time of Dobrynia, there is no record of any Russian travel accounts. The Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 and, above all, the Mongol conquest and the establishment of the Golden Horde in the 13th century almost stopped the flow of pilgrimages in most parts of Russia. But contacts with the Mediterranean World were not necessarily cut off everywhere in Russia. Speranskii points out that unlike in northeast Russia (Suzdal' and Vladimir), in northwest Russia (Pskov, Tver', and especially in Novgorod), the tradition of traveling to the Christian East continued with some degree of regularity even in the 13th and 14th centuries.²⁴ As the only Russian city state which escaped from the Mongol devastation and from its full subjugation, Novgorod prospered by maintaining commercial contacts with many countries both within and outside the boundaries of Russia. While eastern or north-eastern Russia remained isolated under the Tatar yoke, Novgorod kept its close connections with western and southern countries, including Byzantium. Especially in the 14th century, its political and cultural zenith, Novgorod seems to have made active contact with the Christian East, including Mt. Athos and Constantinople.²⁵ In fact, during this century Nov-

²³ *NPL.*, p. 274; *CN.*, pp. 72-73.

²⁴ M. N. Speranskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109.

²⁵ Novgorod's connection with Constantinople and Mt. Athos, which stood as the cultural center of medieval south-slavonic countries and Russia, was reflected vividly in the 14th century frescoes in Nov-

gorodians left three travel accounts regarding Constantinople: the anonymous pilgrim tale that many scholars considered to be written by Vasilii Kaleka (Vasilii the Pilgrim), the archbishop of Novgorod (1330-1352) known to have pilgrimaged to Constantinople before he was elected to the post²⁶; the journey of Stefan of Novgorod (1348 or 1349); and the description of Constantinople by D'iak Alexander (Alexander the Clerk, 1391-1397). Since only four travel accounts are known from all of Russia in the 14th century, those of Novgorod occupy 75 percent of all we have in this period. This fact obviously testifies how important a role Novgorod played in Russia's contact with Byzantium in the 14th century.²⁷ Not only did Novgorodians go to the Christian East, but the church people of Mt. Athos, Mt. Sinai and Jerusalem went to Novgorod, seeking its economic help and donations, since the Eastern Mediterranean churches suffered a great deal from lack of material support as a result of constant wars between the Muslim and Christian countries in this century.²⁸

The relative prosperity of Novgorod, however, does not give full explanation of its constant contact with Constantinople in the 14th century. As in the 12th and the 13th centuries, the Novgorodian church was seeking support at the patriarchate to preserve its previous prerogative status. Just as Dobrynia Iadreibovich who had recorded his pilgrimage to Constantinople later became Archbishop Antonii in the 13th century, Gregori Kaleka, the supposed writer of an anonymous pilgrim tale, was elected archbishop as Vasilii Kaleka in the fourteenth century. But the political situation in the days of Vasilii Kaleka differed profoundly from that of Dobrynia Iadreibovich's period. The change, during the century dividing Vasilii from Antonii, was much more fundamental

gorod as well. Novgorod frescoes in this period had a much more "Grecophile" tendency than Novgorod icon-painting. These frescoes were influenced by works of immigrant Greek painters, including, probably, the ones from Mt. Athos. The Chronicles of Novgorod mentioned the names of two of them: "Isaiia the Greek (Grechin Isaiia) and others", who were invited by the Archbishop Vasilii Kaleka in 1338 and painted the Church of Entry into Jerusalem, and the famed Theofanes the Greek (Feofan Grek), who came from Constantinople and painted the Church of the Savior of the Transfiguration in 1378. According to V. N. Lazarev, there is a strong probability that the fresco of the Church of the Savior in Kovalyovo was decorated by the painters from Mt. Athos. See: V. N. Lazarev, *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva*, Vol. II, AN SSSR, M., 1954, p. 202.

26 The problem of authorship and dating of this account remain open. Most Russian and Soviet scholars (D. F. Kobeko, Kh. M. Loparev, A. D. Sedel'nikov, M. N. Speranskii, D. S. Likhachev, N. I. Prokof'ev) suggested that the author was the Archbishop Vasilii Kaleka and dated it to the years from the end of the 13th century to the first half of the 14th century. In contrast, European and American scholars (C. Mango, K.-D. Seeman, G. P. Majeska) dated it to the end of the 14th century (1389-1391). See: N. I. Prokof'ev, *Russkie khozheniia 12-15 vv.* pp. 100-120; T. G. Stavrou & P. R. Weisensel, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-41; G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-119 footnote 18.

27 Besides the three Novgorodian travel accounts, the famous travel tale of Ignatii of Smolensk who accompanied Metropolitan Pimen from Moscow to Constantinople is dated at the end of the 14th century. In the recent impressive work by G. P. Majeska concerning the topographical study of Constantinople, five Russian pilgrim descriptions of the city in the 14th and the 15th centuries were published and translated into English. Three of the five travel accounts in this book are the Novgorodian tales mentioned above. This fact also suggests Novgorod's great interest in Constantinople in this period. G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

28 For example, the Novgorod Chronicle describes that in 1376 a metropolitan of Mt. Sinai and an archimandrite of Jerusalem went to Novgorod in search of donations.

than the one that separated the latter from Abbot Daniil. The Mongol conquest completely ended the historical role of Kiev. In the second half of the 13th century Novgorod and Northeastern Russia became the two focal centers. The metropolitan of Kiev was finally removed to Vladimir in 1300. But at this time Moscow still did not attract Novgorod's attention. Therefore the Novgorod Chronicles scarcely referred to the city during the 13th century.²⁹ But suddenly in 1325, we find the archbishop of Novgorod visiting Moscow for confirmation by "the metropolitan," just as Ivan Kalita (1325-1340) succeeded in moving the metropolitan's residence from Vladimir to Moscow. Having found supporters both in Mongol Khan and the head of Russian Orthodox hierarchy, the principality of Moscow swiftly grew strong. Lithuania, another strong center which emerged in the west and southwestern parts of old Kievan Russia in the 14th century, was also seeking a separate metropolitan. But the metropolitans in Moscow, for example Feognost (Theognostos) which actively pursued good relations with Constantinople, succeeded in closing the metropolitan sees in Lithuania (1328) and Galich (1347) one after another. Thus Moscow obtained the sole metropolitan "of all Russia" in the middle of the 14th century.³⁰ With the close of Galich's metropolitan see, Moscow now began to threaten the independent status of the Novgorodian archbishop. Vasilii Kaleka who was consecrated by the metropolitan at Galich,³¹ seems to have begun an appeal to the patriarchate to preserve Novgorod's old privileges just after it was closed in 1347.

It is not by accident that Stefan of Novgorod, the author of a travel account, visited Constantinople in the year 1348 or 1349. The name of Stefan does not appear in the Novgorod Chronicles or other documents. But his visit to Constantinople must have been related to Novgorod's political intention to preserve its previous status. G. P. Majeska precisely points out as follows: "Stephan's visit and Novgorod's appeal might not be unrelated. Stefan was certainly not an ordinary pilgrim. He had money enough to hire a competent guide to show him and his companies around the shrines of Constantinople, and moreover, Stephan and his companions were recognized by a high imperial official and were presented to the patriarch."³² In fact, Stefan was accompanied by eight men. The beginning style of his account also suggests that he

29 In 1238, the Novgorod Chronicle first referred to "the men of Moscow" who ran away from the Russian allies fighting vainly with the Mongols to save Riazan. After being recorded as one of the Russian towns destroyed by the Mongols in 1238 and 1293, Moscow scarcely appeared in the Novgorod Chronicle until the year 1325. See: *NPL.*, p. 76, 288, 327, 340; *CN.*, pp. 82, 83, 111, 123.

30 J. Meyendorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-161. The success of the Moscowite ruler and the metropolitan seems to have been gained by a huge donation to the patriarch Isidore and Emperor John Cantacuzenus for the rebuilding of St. Sophia. See: E. E. Golubinskii, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, first half of volume, M., 1900, p. 162; N. I. Prokof'ev, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114.

31 Vasilii Kaleka was elected archbishop by the veche in 1330 and went to the metropolitan in Galich to be confirmed in 1331. Ironically enough, Vasilii was consecrated by the hand of Feognost, then the metropolitan in Galich. See: *NPL.*, pp. 342-344; *CN.*, pp. 126-127.

32 G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

was not just a private pilgrim, but a public representative or an envoy sent from the city of Novgorod. "I, sinful Stefan of Novgorod the Great, came to Constantinople with my eight companions to venerate the holy places and kiss the bodies of the saints. It was thanks to God, St. Sophia the Divine Wisdom."³³ The fact that "Novgorod the Great" and "Constantinople" are mentioned first and the gratitude to St. Sophia, the patron for both cities, are referred to at the beginning, shows a somewhat formal character. Actually, Stefan suggests that he met the patriarch Isidore officially at St. Sophia Cathedral, writing as follows: "The holy patriarch of Constantinople, named Isidore, met us there, and we kissed his hand, for he loves Rus' very much. What a great wonder the humility of the saints is! They don't have customs such as those in our country."³⁴ In addition, Prokof'ev's interpretation of the second half of this sentence is very interesting. According to Prokof'ev, Stefan's comment that patriarch Isidore's humility could not be seen in Russia, was a bitter tongue addressed to the metropolitan Feognost of Moscow, whose severe and high-handed behavior and his attempts to dominate Novgorod had caused strong discontent in the city in those days.³⁵ However, the fact that merits attention most in Stefan's text is that an "imperial noble" (tsarev boliarin) called "Protostrator" recognized the party of Stefan in St. Sophia and guided them to the Lord's Passion relics. If the "imperial noble" was, as G. P. Majeska notes, Protostrator Phakeolatos who had been appointed to supervise the massive repairs in St. Sophia necessitated by the collapse of the dome in 1346, it is doubtless that he recognized the Novgorodian party because they had donated for the repair a sizable amount of money from Novgorod the Great. We already know that Moscow had also made a large contribution for the same repair shortly before, and was rewarded by the closing of the metropolitan see in Galich.³⁶ It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the "pilgrim" party of Stefan, with Novgorod's generous donation to Constantinople, was sent by the Archbishop Vasilii Kaleka, who took the same steps to protect autonomous status as Moscow did to destroy the religious autonomy in Lithuania and Galich.

Vasilii Kaleka had the flexibility of a capable politician. In Novgorod, located between the two growing powers, there were emerging two ruling class "parties" in the 14th century: pro-Moscow and pro-Lithuania groups. But

33 G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29; N. I. Prokof'ev, *Kniga Khozhenii. Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov 11-15 vv.* pp. 92, 268; M. N. Speranskii, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

34 G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31; N. I. Prokof'ev, *Kniga Khozhenii, Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov 11-15 vv.* pp. 93, 269; M. N. Speranskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.

35 N. I. Prokof'ev, *op. cit.*, p. 117. In fact the metropolitan Feognost who went to Novgorod two times in 1329 and 1341, forced a heavy financial burden on Novgorodian churches. The Novgorod Chronicle complains: "In this winter the metropolitan Feognost, a Greek by origin, came to Novgorod with many people: the feeding and gifts imposed a heavy burden on the archbishop and the monasteries." *NPL.*, pp. 342, 353; *CN.*, pp. 125, 136.

36 See footnote 30 supra. see also G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19, 30.

Vasilii was not so native as to be a supporter of either of them.³⁷ Taking advantage of the antagonism between the two strong states, west and east, Vasilii succeeded in preserving and even extending the traditional independent status of Novgorod. When the Moscovite aggressed on the Novgorodian land or "colony," and diplomatic negotiations turned out fruitless, Vasilii Kaleka attempted rapprochement with Lithuania and Pskov, which had close relations with Lithuania at that time. Of course, the reverse case also occurred.³⁸ By this way peace was made with Moscow in 1335. The Grand Prince of Moscow invited Vasilii Kaleka and all the ruling boyars of Novgorod with "great honour." In 1346, the Chronicle of Novgorod reports that, "the Archbishop Vasilii went to the prince and to the metropolitan in Moscow in order to invite the Grand Prince to Novgorod. And there the metropolitan Feognost blessed Vasilii, the archbishop of Novgorod, and gave him cross-covered vestments (rizy krestsaty)".³⁹ According to J. Meyendorff, this means that metropolitan Feognost "granted to Basil the right to wear a *polystavriion*, ornamented with four crosses, a privilege bestowed upon distinguished Byzantine prelates only".⁴⁰ Thus, about the same time that Vasilii himself was establishing a "peaceful" relationship with the metropolitan and the Grand Prince of Moscow on the one hand, he sent Stefan's party to Constantinople in order to prevent Moscow's possible attack on its independent status on the other hand. Needless to say Vasilii made an effort to introduce Byzantine cultural traditions. The Novgorod Chronicle notes that in 1338 the Greek painter "Isaiya Grechin" was invited by Vasilii, and painted the Church of the Savior of the Transfiguration.⁴¹

The Black Death reached from the west and devastated Russia in 1352-1353. When it began in Pskov, the Pskovian envoy came to Novgorod and asked Archbishop Vasilii to bless the people of Pskov. He complied with their request, but on his way back from Pskov he was seized with the Black Death and died in 1352. Within the same year the Black Death also killed metropolitan Feognost, and next the year Grand Prince Simeon Ivanovich of Moscow and his two sons. The death of Simeon and Feognost served to decrease the power of Moscow until 1359, when metropolitan Alexei became the practical

37 Once B. A. Rybakov argued that Vasilii was a democrat supported by the craftsmen of Novgorod, and followed anti-Lithuania or pro-Moscow foreign policy. But later, his argument was refuted by L. V. Cherepnin and V. L. Ianin. The latter especially proved Vasilii's strong connection with an influential boyar family of Nerev End. As far as foreign policy is concerned, Khoroshev's opinion merits attention. He points out that Vasilii's diplomatic talent, above all, his exploitation of the confrontation between Lithuania and Moscow, helped Novgorod's success in stabilizing its foreign policy in his days. See: B. A. Rybakov, *Remeslo drevnei Rusi*. M., 1948, pp. 767-776; V. L. Ianin, *op. cit.*, pp. 335-336; A. S. Khoroshev, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-67.

38 See the incidents in the years of 1331-1335, 1337, 1340, 1341, 1346; *NPL.*, pp. 344-359; *CN.*, pp. 126-141.

39 *NPL.*, pp. 343-344; *CN.*, p. 140.

40 J. Meyendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

41 See footnote 25 supra.

ruler of the Moscow principality as Dmitrii Donskoi's protector.⁴² Meanwhile in Novgorod, the office of archbishop was occupied by Moisei, who obviously had a more anti-Moscow tendency than Vasilii. In fact, Moisei (1325-1330) was Vasilii's predecessor, who resigned the archbishopric "of his own will" in 1330 just after the Grand Prince of Moscow, Ivan Kalita, and metropolitan Feognost visited Novgorod. But after the death of Vasilii and Feognost, Moisei again went back to the office of archbishop of Novgorod in 1352 (1352-1359). In 1353, Archbishop Moisei sent his envoys to Constantinople and complained to the patriarch about "the compulsion by the metropolitan." It is described in the Chronicle as follows: "This year Archbishop Moisei sent his envoys to Constantinople, to the Emperor and the patriarch, asking for their benediction, and for redressing the improper oppression brought about by the compulsion of the metropolitan."⁴³ Novgorodians who held discontent with the metropolitan, or the anti-Moscow tendency which had been, more or less, restrained in the Vasilii's period, came to the surface.⁴⁴ In order to obtain "the benediction" of the Emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople, Moisei probably used the same strategy as Vasilii, having the envoys relay a sizable donation. He succeeded admirably.⁴⁵ In the entry of 1354 the Chronicle reports: "This year the envoys of Archbishop Moisei of Novgorod returned from Constantinople and brought with them vestments ornamented with crosses (rizy krestsaty) and documents of a gold seal (gramoty . . . zlatoyu pechat'yu), with bestowal of great favor from the Emperor and from the patriarch. The Greek Emperor was then Ivan Kantakuzin (John Cantacuzenos), and the patriarch was Filofei (Philotheos), previously metropolitan of Iraclia".⁴⁶ Moisei was granted the right to wear *polystavrion*, the same honor Vasilii Kaleka received from metropolitan Feognost, but now from the patriarch of Constantinople. This was probably more the fruit of Vasilii Kaleka's 23 year (1330-1352) political and religious effort than Moisei's good fortune. In any event, the honorable vestments came into the hands of two archbishops of Novgorod in the middle of the 14th century one after another. And thereafter, it became the symbol of political independence of Novgorod and the special status of the Novgorodian church. It was sometimes illustrated in the Novgorodian icons or frescoes, and also was mentioned in the literature of Novgorod. It is no doubt

42 R. O. Crummey, *The Formation of Muscovy 1304-1613*. London & New York, 1987, p. 42.

43 *NPL.*, p. 363; *CN.*, p. 145. Of course, this complaint was against metropolitan Feognost.

44 In the same year that Moisei sent his envoy to Constantinople, Novgorod sent another envoy to "the Tsar of the Horde, and asked for the bestowal of the title of the Grand Prince on Konstantin, the prince of Syzdal." But this attempt was refused by the Horde, and the title was bestowed on Ivan the Second of Moscow. Nevertheless, "the people of Novgorod remained hostile to the Grand Prince for one and a half years." *NPL.*, p. 363; *CN.*, p. 145. Cf. A. S. Khoroshev, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.

45 Taking advantage of the political support of the Horde and the temporary diminution in Moscow's power, Grand Prince Olgield of Lithuania struggled to restore the separate metropolitan of Lithuania, which was vacant after 1328. He sent his candidate to Constantinople to be consecrated "Metropolitan of Russia." But Cantacuzenos refused this request. See: J. Meyendorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-165.

46 *NPL.*, p. 364; *CN.*, p. 146.

that the popular *Legend of the White Cowl* (see discussion below) emerged in connection with this historical fact.

In light of this it is not difficult to examine the reason why Novgorodian travel accounts to the Christian East were concentrated in Constantinople. All of the four Novgorodian travel accounts before 1453 or before 1478 (the annexation of Novgorod to Moscow) were completely confined to Constantinople. Novgorodians, as well as most Russians in other regions, looked to Constantinople as the spiritual, cultural and administrative center of the Orthodox Christian World, since the baptism of Russia was accomplished and Christian belief prevailed among Russian people. Many holy relics and holy images for the churches of Constantinople had been gathered by the Byzantine Emperors from generation to generation from all over the Empire and even beyond its borders: the relics of Christ's Passion; a piece of the "true cross" collected by Helena, mother of Emperor Constantine the Great; the relics of Apostles, many saints and martyrs; various miraculous icons and what not. These holy relics and images sanctified "*Tsar'grad*" and made it the most important depository of Christian holy things in the Eastern Mediterranean world. For medieval Russians, *Tsar'grad* was not only the most civilized and magnificent city ever seen but also was a sacred city, the fountainhead of their faith. As a result, by the eleventh century when the first Russian travel account appeared, Constantinople had become a more popular destination for Russian pilgrims than Palestine itself, which had fallen under the control of Islam from the 7th century onward.

A similar situation occurred in Novgorod. During the entire period of its political independence, from the 12th to the 15th century, *Tsar'grad* remained Novgorod's religious and cultural, if not political, center. An historical episode during the time of Vasilii Kaleka explicitly reveals the Novgorodian image of *Tsar'grad*, or their attitude toward it. In 1348 King Magnus Eliksson of Sweden began threatening Novgorod. Magnus sent an ambassador to Novgorod to propose a disputation of whether the Catholic or Orthodox faith was better. According to the Chronicle, the King said "Send your philosophers to a conference, and I will send my own philosophers, that they may discuss faith; they will ascertain whose faith is the better. If your faith is the better, then I will go into your faith, but if our faith is the better, you will go into our faith. And we shall all be as one man. But if you do not agree uniformly, then I will come against you with all my forces." Vasilii Kaleka and all the Novgorodian citizens having taken council together, replied thus: "If you wish to know whose is the better faith, ours or yours, send to *Tsar'grad* to the patriarch, for we received the Orthodox faith from the Greeks. But with you we will not dispute about faith."⁴⁷ This episode indicates that Novgorodians regarded Constantinople, but not Moscow, as the administrative center of their own faith. Of course,

47 *NPL.*, p. 359; *CN.*, p. 141.

introducing and duplicating every cultural and religious element of *Tsar'grad* also continued to be a very important social and political need.

But Novgorod's most urgent necessity of contact with Constantinople stemmed from its desire to keep the autonomous status of Novgorod's archbishopric, because religious "*avtokefaliya*" was directly connected with political independence. In fact, the archbishop of Novgorod symbolized the political autonomy of the city state Novgorod ever since the 12th century. In order to avoid interference by the metropolitans of Kiev (later of Moscow) and the grand princes behind them, Novgorod always had to seek protection of the patriarch in Constantinople. It is not, therefore, a mere coincidence that most of the Novgorodian travel accounts about Constantinople were closely associated with the archbishop of Novgorod. Two of the authors, Antonii and Vasilii Kaleka, became archbishops after returning from their pilgrimages. Stefan of Novgorod was also probably sent by Archbishop Vasilii as his special envoy to the patriarchate in Constantinople. Although the authors of these descriptions of Constantinople concentrated their attention exclusively on the St. Sophia, holy shrines, churches, relics, icons, miracles and religious legends, their accounts were not always the outcome of pure private devotional pilgrimages. Scholars point out that roughly from the 16th century on, Russian visitors to the Eastern Mediterranean were mainly merchants, diplomats and ecclesiastics on official religious business, and therefore, their travel accounts lost their previous character as the simple reports of religious experiences in the holy places.⁴⁸ However, the fact that the Novgorodian accounts in the preceding centuries pay attention only to the holy things, without describing the profane points of Constantinople, does not necessarily testify to their unpolitical, pure devotional character. Because placing emphasis on Constantinople's "sacred" character and on its superiority as religious center of the Orthodox Church, had very important political meaning for Novgorod, insisting on its independent status toward the metropolitan of all Russia and the grand prince.⁴⁹

III

A series of historical events during the 15th century drastically changed the traditional relationship between Russia and Byzantium. The attempt of the Greeks to form a union with Rome at the Council of Florence in 1441 gave rise to a critical attitude toward the Greeks among the Russians, and above all, among the Muscovite Russians. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks

48 See: N. I. Prokof'ev, *Kniga Khozhenii. Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov 11-15 vv.* p. 11; G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, p. 5; T. G. Stavrou & P. R. Weisensl, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxi-xxxv.

49 Only one description of Constantinople by D'iak Aleksandr, who went there in regard to trade in 1394-1395, seems not to have any connection with the archbishop of Novgorod. Regarding this text, see: N. I. Prokof'ev, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-173; G. P. Majeska, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-165.

in 1453 was interpreted as punishment for their having betrayed the Orthodox faith. The establishment of the metropolitanate of Moscow in 1448⁵⁰ and the fall of Constantinople in 1453 increased Moscow's independence from the ancient ecclesiastical centers of both Kiev and Constantinople. The annexation of "the Great Novgorod" to Moscow first in 1471 and then finally in 1478, almost finished the process of concentrating Russian lands under the hegemony of Moscow, a movement which had begun as early as the period of Grand Prince Ivan Kalita.⁵¹ And the final liberation from the Tatar yoke in 1480 made Moscow the center of the largest independent state in the world of Eastern Orthodoxy. All these historical events inspired Muscovy to be filled with confidence and brought profound changes in traditional and established Russian beliefs. The religious ideologues under the influence of the Grand Prince of Moscow developed the well-known theory, "Moscow the Third Rome." Monk Filofel of Pskov, the first man to elaborate the doctrine of the "Third Rome," declared that Moscow, the capital of the only remaining independent Orthodox state at the time under consideration, become the sole guardian of the true faith and the heir to the Roman-Byzantine imperial tradition.⁵² He wrote: "Two Romes have fallen, but the third stands, and a fourth there will not be."⁵³ In any event, the fall of Constantinople brought the history of a close relationship between Russia and Byzantium to an end, and opened the period in which Moscow became one of the most important centers of Eastern Orthodoxy. Thus, Novgorod disappeared from the front stage of history, and also its constant contact with Constantinople.

It is worth noting, however, that Novgorod's religious tradition of the independent archbishopric did not disappear as easily as its political one did. Even after its annexation by Moscow, some of the archbishops of Novgorod continued to pay serious attention to the Novgorodian traditions, and remained relatively independent from the Muscovite ideologies, although they were now appointed by the metropolitan and the grand prince of Moscow.⁵⁴ Under

50 This year a local synod in Moscow chose Iona, previously a bishop of Riazan, as the metropolitan (1448-1461). It marked a very important and historic turning point in the history of the Orthodox church. An old traditional law in the Orthodox church was destroyed and replaced by a new one. See: P. Sokolov, *op. cit.*, p. 577.

51 For the details of Novgorod's struggle against Moscow and its defeat, see: V. N. Bernadskii, *Novgorod i novgorodskaiia zemlia v XV veka*, M.-L., 1961. After Novgorod was annexed in 1478, the Grand Principality of Tver' fell to Moscow in 1485, Pskov and Smolensk lost self rule in 1510 and 1515 respectively.

52 There are many works about Filofei's theory of "Moscow the Third Rome." For a brief survey of this, see: Ia. S. Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaiia bor'ba v russkoi publitsistike konsta XV-nachara XVI veka*, M.-L., 1960, pp. 346-357.

53 N. Andreyev, Filofey and his epistle to Ivan Vasilyevich', *Slavonic East European Review*, No. 38, 1959, p. 28; D. Stremoukoff, Moscow the Third Rome: sources of the doctrine, *Speculum*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1953, p. 94.

54 This tendency was recognized in the activities of, for instance, Gennadii, Serapion and Makarii. For a brief description of the characteristics and activities of the archbishops of Novgorod after the annexation see: A. P. Pronshtein, *Verikii Novgorod v XVI veke*, Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii russkogo goroda. Kharikov, 1957, pp. 228-236.

the leadership of Archbishop Gennadii Gonošov (1484-1504), the so-called "Gennadii circle" of learned men, compiled a series of Novgorodian literature that placed emphasis on the traditional and special status of Novgorod, and in consequence had a more or less anti-Moscow tendency: chronicles, historical tales, saints' lives, writings for liturgical services and special tracts on the practical problems of the time.⁵⁵ Of a number of literary works by the members of the "Gennadii circle," the most interesting from the view-point of our theme under consideration, is "*The Legend of the Novgorodian White Cowl*."⁵⁶ This legend stresses the unique position of the Novgorodian church and demonstrates the superiority and truth of its Orthodox faith as compared with that of other Russian cities, including Moscow. The most essential story of the *Legend* can be summarized as follows:

«Pope Sylvester (314-335) of Rome received the White Cowl, a special headpiece as a gift from Emperor Constantine the Great (306-337) after the latter was healed of leprosy and converted to Christianity. Sylvester and his successors venerated the cowl greatly, but its miraculous value came to be neglected, after the reign of Emperor "Charlemagne" (768-814) and the tenure of Pope Formosus (891-896). It was then concealed in the wall of a Roman church. A pope, however, was ordered by God to send it to the patriarch of Constantinople. The cowl was received with veneration by Emperor John Cantacuzenos (1347-1354) and Patriarch Philotheos (1353-54, 1364-76). Philotheos wanted to keep it in Constantinople. But after having been foretold by God of the forthcoming fall of Constantinople, the New Rome, he sent the White Cowl to Archbishop Vasilii Kaleka of Novgorod (1330-1353), again by the order from heaven. Thus, the White Cowl was inherited by the archbishop of Novgorod. From the time of Vasilii Kaleka, therefore, the cowl, a symbol of the true Orthodox faith, became the distinctive headpiece of the archbishop of Great Novgorod.»⁵⁷

55 For biographical data on Gennadii, see: *Russkii biograficheskii slavar'*, Vol. 4, pp. 396-402; For the literary works of Genadii and the "Gennadii circle" see: Ia. S. Lur'e, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-112, 232-234. Gennadii is well known for his energetic struggle against the heretical movement of Novgorodian Judaizers. Cf. D. S. Likhachev, *Novgorod Velikii*, Ocherk istorii kul'tury Novgoroda XI-XVII vv., L., 1945, pp. 83-90.

56 Several kinds of texts concerning this legend have already been published and studied in the 19th century and early in the 20th century by N. I. Kostomarov, D. E. Kozhanchikov and A. A. Nazarevskii. But a full-scale philological study was first made by N. N. Rozov in the 1950s, and then a decade ago by M. Labunka. See: N. N. Rozov, *Povest' o Novgorodskom belom klobuke kak pamiatnik obscherusskoi publitsistiki XV veka*, *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury Instituta russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii Dom)*, t. IX, M.-L., 1953, pp. 178-219; *ibid.*, *Povest' o Novgorodskom belom klobuke*, *Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, No. 173, 1954, Seria filologicheskikh nauk, vyp. 20, pp. 307-327; M. Labunka, *The Legend of the Novgorodian White Cowl: The study of its "Prologue" and "Epilogue"* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation), Columbia University, 1978, pp. 1-565.

57 N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-184. N. N. Rozov divides this long story that stretches over a thou-

Apparently, the contents of this legend is very controversial and defiant against Moscow. What this literary work pursues, as can easily be understood, is very political and ideological. Actually, the *Legend* alleges that after the collapse of the first two Romes, Novgorod and not Moscow became "the third Rome."⁵⁸

This legend was very popular. So far, over two hundred manuscript copies of various versions from the beginning of the 16th century to the 18th century are known to exist.⁵⁹ Although the *Legend* as a literary work comprises a variety of sources of different origins: Russian, Byzantine and Latin, the first and most basic element consists of local Novgorodian sources, including oral tradition. It appears not to be an accident that the White Cowl allegedly arrived in Novgorod in the days of Archbishop Vasilii Kaleka. As we referred to previously, the archbishops of Novgorod, Vasilii Kaleka and Moisei, actually received the cross-covered vestments (*polystavrion*) first in 1346 from the Greek metropolitan Theognost in Moscow and then in 1355 from the patriarch Filofei (Philotheos) and Emperor Ivan Kantakuzin (John Cantacuzenos).⁶⁰ These historical events were probably reflected in Novgorodian oral traditions, which were used later as one of the essential elements of this legend. A version of the *Legend*, in fact, makes mention of *polystavrion*, which was allegedly brought from Constantinople to Vasilii Kaleka along with the White Cowl.⁶¹ In addition, and of greater interest is the fact that Vasilii Kaleka actually wore an elaborate white headpiece. It was, indeed, discovered in his grave.⁶² The figure of Moisei wearing a white cowl is also depicted on the frescoes of the Church of the Assumption located on Volotovo field in the suburb of Novgorod. Therefore the tale of the White Cowl is not just groundless fiction. It must have been a popular oral tradition rooted in the history of Novgorod. The White Cowl was probably a component of the cross-covered vestments, and must have made a strong impression on Novgorod's people. The White Cowl of the Novgorodian archbishop stood in contrast to the black cowl, a

sand years into four periods: the Roman (from Constantine the Great), Medieval (from Charlemagne), Byzantine (John Cantacuzenos) and Russian: M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-29. The longer version of the *Legend* is comprised of roughly 6000-7000 words, and the short version contains about 1300 words. The problem of which version is the earlier Novgorodian prototype, remains open. See: M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-42.

⁵⁸ According to V. Malinin, however, the *Legend of the Novgorodian White Cowl* was one of the sources from which Filofei's theory of the "Moscow the Third Rome" was created. See: Ia. S. Lur'e, *op. cit.*, p. 351. Cf. D. Stremoukhoff, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

⁵⁹ N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, p. 180. For an inventory of these manuscripts, see also pp. 209-217; M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-42.

⁶⁰ See footnotes 39, 40, 46 *supra*.

⁶¹ M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27, 31-32.

⁶² N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-192 footnote 2. In 1946 the grave of Archbishop Vasilii Kaleka was found at the St. Sophia Cathedral. Besides the remains of the cross-covered vestment (*polystavrion*) which the Novgorod Chronicle mentions, some parts and ornaments of the white cowl such as pearls, jewels, beads, and ribbons of silver lace, etc. were discovered. For the detail, see: *Kratkie soobschenie IIMK*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 92-102.

common headpiece for the Russian church prelates at that time, including the metropolitan of Moscow. The *Legend*, insisting on Novgorod's special status in the Russian Orthodox church, was unpleasant for the grand prince of Moscow. In order to destroy the dangerous elements of this legend and take advantage of the ones useful for Moscow, in 1564 Ivan the Terrible bestowed the right to wear the White Cowl on the metropolitan of Moscow.⁶³ After 1589 when the metropolitanate of Moscow became the patriarchate, the White Cowl was kept as a privilege for the head of the Russian Orthodox church.

By the way, the *Legend of the Novgorod White Cowl* as a literary work comprises three separate parts, which usually form a cycle in the codices that contain it.⁶⁴ The texts of the legend are usually preceded by a personal "letter" that was supposedly sent from Rome to Gennadii Gonošov by Dimitrii Gerasimov, a member of the "Gennadii circle" of literati.⁶⁵ Demonstrating to readers how the texts of the *Legend* were found in Rome and brought to the hand of Gennadii, this "letter" serves as a kind of introductory note to the *Legend* itself. Besides this, the texts are often followed by an additional explanation by Gennadii himself on the practical and actual veneration of the White Cowl in the church liturgies of Novgorod.⁶⁶ As M. Labunka testified, these components of the *Legend* clearly indicate that it was compiled in Novgorod by the members of the literati, forming a circle around Gennadii.⁶⁷ But what attracts our attention here is the former, the "letter" by Dimitrii Gerasimov. According to the "letter," Dimitrii Gerasimov—he calls himself "Mitia Malyi" (Dimitrii the small)—had been sent to Rome by Archbishop Gennadii in order to search for some written information about the White Cowl. A synopsis of the "letter" is like this:

63 Cf. P. Sokolov, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

64 N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, p. 181; M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

65 Except Dimitrii Gerasimov, the circle of learned men organized by Gennadii included: (1) Dimitrii's brother Gerasim Popovka, who was an archdeacon at St. Sophia Cathedral of Novgorod and supervised the group's literary activities at the court of archbishop Genadii; (2) Dominican Friar Benjamin, who was a Slovenian by birth and gave Genadii much information about Catholicism and translated Latin books into Russian in collaboration with Gennadii; (3) the Trachaniotes brothers Iurii (George) and Dimitrii, the Greek exile who came to Russia from Italy and settled there with Zoe Paleologa at her marriage to Ivan III. Their father Manuel Trachaniotes was a close collaborator of Emperor Johannes VIII and an organizer of the Union of Florence. In Russia the brothers served Ivan III as his diplomatic envoys. In Moscow they became friends of Gennadii and participated in the cultural activities of "Genadii circle." They introduced Gennadii to the "inquisition" of Spain, which helped his fight with the "Judaizers." But they remained uniate believers. See: Ia. S. Lur'e, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-227, 266-267, 279, 314 and *passim*; M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

66 M. Labunka's dissertation mentioned above is the first full-scale and elaborate philological research for both preceding and following parts, or "prologue" and "epilogue" by the author's term, of the *Legend*. See: M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-436. A text of the "epilogue" was published at the end of Rozov's monograph. N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-219.

67 *Ibid.*, pp. 427-429. P. Sokolov once insisted that the *Legend* was created much later in the 17th century. P. Sokolov, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-195. But after full-scale research done by N. N. Rozov and M. Labunka, his opinion became unsupportable.

«Greeting to the most venerable archbishop of Great Novgorod, Lord Gennadii, from your servant Dimitrii the small. I reached the city of Rome safely. I pursued your order about the White Cowl, but at first I was not able to find anything written in Roman chronicles. After becoming familiar with the librarian, Jakov, of the Roman church, and after many gifts I managed to succeed in persuading him to provide me with the necessary information. According to Jakov, the old written records do not remain. But after the fall of Constantinople a number of Greeks left for Rome taking many books about the Orthodox faith with them. The Latins translated these Greek books into their language, and then burned them. Therefore, about the White Cowl there is only the Latin writing translated from the Greek books. I repeatedly pleaded with him to give me that writing, and under a firm promise of secrecy I was allowed to copy it word for word. I have sent it to you with two other books: "Osmochastnaia kniga" and "Mirotvornyi krug." I trusted the Muscovite merchant Foma Sarev with all of them. »⁶⁸

At the end of the 15th century, Dimitrii Gerasimov would now supposedly travel to Rome, and not to Constantinople. And he would make his appearance there as a traveler and not a pilgrim in travel accounts. But again he would have a very close connection with the archbishop of Novgorod. Besides this, the purpose of his travel would be to find out the way through which the special status of the Novgorodian bishopric was testified and confirmed, the same purpose as that of Antonii, Vasilii Kaleka and Stefan in the preceding centuries.

The alleged writer of the "letter," Dimitrii Gerasimov (ca. 1465-1530), as M. Labunka proved, was a Novgorodian by birth, or a naturalized citizen from Greece. Because his older brother Gerasim was nicknamed "Popovka," their father is considered to have been a priest of the Orthodox church. Dimitrii knew the language of Latin and German Languages because he was probably educated in German-Latin school in Livonia.⁶⁹ His main activities were the translation of foreign books or documents into Russian, and diplomatic missions to European countries during both the periods when he was under Gennadii in Novgorod, and later when he was employed in the Posol'skii prikaz (foreign ministry at that time) in Moscow after Gennadii's having been deposed from the archbishopric in 1504.⁷⁰ His collaborator as a translator was

68 M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 437-441.

69 Ia. S. Lur'e, *op. cit.*, p. 266; M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, p. 67. For his biographical information, see: *Russkii biograficheskii slavar'*, Vol. 4, pp. 467-469.

70 As diplomatic envoy Dimitrii went to Rome, Sweden, the Teutonic order, Denmark and to Emperor Maksimilian. See the biographical dictionary in footnote 55 supra.

Dominican Friar Benjamin in Novgorod, and then Maksim Grek (ca. 1470-1556) in Moscow.⁷¹ In the days of Novgorod he translated, for example, the two books referred to in the "letter" above: Donatus' Latin grammar and one part of Durandus' book on church rituals, feast days, architectural data for church buildings, the astronomical calendar and what not. The eighth part of the latter, dealing with the computation of the calendar, was translated in conjunction with Dominican Friar Benjamin.⁷² Completion of the church calendar was of utmost importance to Archbishop Gennadii because the year 1492, the closing year of the seventh millennium of the Orthodox church era, was approaching. At that time rumors were spreading and creating much confusion among the people and clergy that the end of the world was coming.⁷³ And Gennadii indeed succeeded in getting the translation of Durandus' book completed around 1492. It is most probable, therefore, that Durandus' book had, in fact, been sent from Rome by Dimitrii Gerasimov as is stated in the "letter." Judging from every circumstantial evidence, there can be little doubt that Dimitrii actually visited Italy as an envoy sent by Gennadii at the end of the 15th century, most likely in 1491-1492. In the additional "writing" following the text of the *Legend*, Gennadii states: "Dimitrii, the Translator, stayed in Rome and Florence for two years in order to conduct certain necessary investigations."⁷⁴ It seems highly probable that he went to Italy, accompanied by the ambassador Iurii Tarchaniot, a member of the "Gennadii circle," dispatched to the Holy Roman Empire as a diplomatic journey by Ivan III in 1490. A family of Russian merchants called Sarev, one member of which was supposedly trusted by Dimitrii to carry the "letter" and two books to Novgorod, has been confirmed to have actually existed.⁷⁵ There is no need, therefore, to doubt the fact that Dimitrii Gerasimov visited Rome in order to investigate some urgent theological questions for Archbishop Gennadii, and sent some letter and books to him through a certain merchant. Dimitrii

71 Regarding the Dominican monk, Benjamin, see footnote 65 supra. Regarding Maksim Grek, there is too much literature to refer to. As far as the connection between Dimitrii Gerasimov and Maksim Grek is concerned, at present see: Ia. S. Lur'e, *op. cit.*, pp. 449, 484-485.

72 Of the two books mentioned in his "letter" to Gennadii, "Osmochastnaia kniga" has been identified as a popular textbook of Latin Grammar: Aelius Donatus, "*De octo partibus orationis*." This book was translated by Dimitrii probably in the nineties of the 15th century. The other "Mirotvornyi krug" was: Gulielmus Durandus, "*Rationale divinarum officiorum*," which was a very popular practical manual of liturgy for the Roman Catholic clergy at that time. In the 15th century alone (in addition, after 1459) forty-three editions of this work appeared. The eighth part of the work was translated by the order of Gennadii, who had felt an urgent need for it in connection with the polemic problem regarding the end of the seventh millennium, which was imminent in 1492. Besides these, Dimitrii translated some anti-Jewish treatises from German or Latin, and "Slovo kratko" (Short Word) that was against the alienation policy of church property by Ivan III. See: M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-56, 64, 80-84, 88-90 and passim; Cf. Ia. S. Lur'e *op. cit.*, pp. 227, 270, 272-273, 449 and passim.

73 E. E. Golubinski, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, first half of volume, p. 547; Ia. S. Lur'e, *op. cit.*, pp. 267-269.

74 N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, p. 219; M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, p. 494. See also: Makarii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, Vol. VII, pp. 232, 235.

75 M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

Gerasimov's authorship of the "letter" in the *Legend* was also elaborately testified to by M. Labunka.⁷⁶ This does not necessarily mean, nevertheless, that the "letter," an introductory note to a legendary literary fiction, was in fact composed in Rome and sent to Novgorod. It could have been written in Novgorod when the compilation of the *Legend* was completed after his returning home from Rome, regardless it was written in the nineties of the 15th century.

The main idea of the compilers of the *Legend* was to show that the city of Great Novgorod had been chosen by Providence as the religious center of Russia. An oral Novgorodian tradition about the White Cowl, worn by their archbishop must have existed in some form or another since about the mid-fourteenth century, shortly after the time of Vasilii Kaleka. From that time on, the White Cowl has symbolized the spiritual supremacy of the Novgorodian church and its exceptional position among the Russian hierarchy. In the Novgorodian oral tradition, however, the historical documentation testifying to the importance and legality of the White Cowl, as a matter of course, was lacking. When Gennadii and his "circle" thought of compiling the *Legend* and keenly felt the need to collect the necessary documents, they did not choose Constantinople, now under the control of the Turks, as the place to search for them, although the White Cowl had been brought from there. Perhaps due to the influence of the Gennadii-circle's Catholic members, like Benjamin or the Trachaniotes brothers, they developed an idea to connect the *Legend* with the medieval Latin legend of *Donatio Constantini*, a narrative about the "phirigium" (a special headpiece) that Emperor Constantine the Great created for Pope Sylvester in Rome. Thus, Gennadii sent Dimitrii Gerasimov to Italy for two years. Probably there, in Rome and Florence, Dimitrii collected all the Latin and Western sources that were necessary to compose the full story of the *Legend*. Dimitrii's searching and collecting activity is suggested by the story of his contact with Jakov, a librarian of the Roman church. The role played by Dimitrii for completing the *Legend* must have been considered to be a large contribution. Gennadii rewarded him for his investigations. He notes in the additional "writing" of the *Legend*: "When he returned from there (Italy), I, humble Gennadii the archbishop, granted him many possessions, and remunerated him with garments and meals."⁷⁷ Consequently, the *Legend* as a literary work was completed. Now the *Legend* alleges that the *phirigium Constantini* or the White Cowl, the symbol of religious authority of the Orthodox church, which once had been held by the ancient political and religious centers, i.e. Rome and Constantinople, was eventually transferred to the city of Novgorod. Such an elevation of Novgorod over other cities as the religious center in Russian lands, must have been implicitly anti-Muscovite. It was, as it were,

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-124.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 494.

as an attempt to insist on spiritual domination over the whole of Russia, and consequently it represented a challenge to Moscow.

But what was the reason behind the challenge to Moscow by Gennadii and his "circle"? Dimitrii Gerasimov, a native literatus of Novgorod, was apparently an actual believer in the religious and cultural superiority of Novgorod over other Russian cities, and may have been, also a devout lover of the former liberty of the city.⁷⁸ Dimitrii's attitude can be recognized not only in the "letter" of the *Legend*, but also in the information about Novgorod he gave to Paolo Giovio, a Roman writer, at the time of his second journey to Rome (1525-1526), when he was already in the service of the Muscovite government. Dimitrii Gerasimov told Giovio that "the city of the Great Novgorod was, until very recent times, the head of the whole of Muscovy. And it had always received the highest respect in Russia."⁷⁹ Unlike Dimitrii Gerasimov, however, Gennadii was a Muscovite by birth, and was sent to Novgorod by the metropolitan and Ivan III of Moscow for the purpose of confirming the Muscovite interests in Novgorod. Nevertheless, he was the first Muscovite archbishop of Novgorod who wore the traditional White Cowl and showed his devout veneration for it in the city.⁸⁰ This was the practical realization, although only within the archdiocese of Novgorod, of the very ideology revealed in "*The Legend of the White Cowl*." How could Gennadii, a Muscovite in origin, be on the side of Novgorod's traditional inclination toward independence? His attitude can not easily be attributed to the influence of Novgorodian native intelligentsia, neither can it be explained as his tactical pretense in an attempt to pacify Novgorodian separatism. Probably, the most important motive was his opposition to the expropriation and secularization policy of the church property in Novgorod by Ivan III of Moscow. Within thirty years after the annexation, Ivan III expropriated almost all of the Novgorodian nobles and wealthy citizens from their land-estate, and forced them to move to the periphery of the Muscovite realm.⁸¹ The church property was no exception. About three-fourths of the land-estate belonging to the Novgorodian monasteries was confiscated. As a whole, roughly 1.2 million hectares of populated

⁷⁸ N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 177. Being a diplomat and translator of the Muscovite government, Dimitrii Gerasimov met Sigismunt von Herberstein, who visited Russia in 1517 and 1526 as the German envoy from the court of Emperor Maximilian and provided the best description of Russia of the 16th century: *Renum Moscoviticarum commentarii*, Vindobonae, 1549. Probably, Dimitrii was one of the native informants who gave him a lot of data and information about Muscovy. Paolo Giovio, another European who wrote about 16th century Muscovia, was also provided with information by Dimitrii Gerasimov, and left his: *Libellus de legatione Basilii magni principis Moscoviae ad Clementem*, Romae, 1525.

⁸⁰ N. N. Rozov, *op. cit.*, p. 201. His respect and veneration of the White Cowl is illustrated in detail by the concrete cases of the church rituals, shown in his "epilogue" of the *Legend*, see also: pp. 218-219; M. Labunka, *op. cit.*, pp. 493-500.

⁸¹ For the historical process and result of the land-confiscation in Novgorod, see: S. B. Veselovskii, *Feodalnoe zemlevladienie v severno-vostochnoi Rusi*, M.-L., 1947; V. N. Bernadskii, *Novgorod i novgorodskaja zemlia v XV veke*, M.-L., 1961; A. L. Shapiro, *Agrarnaia istoria severo-zapada Rossii: vtoraiia polovina XV-nachalo XVI v. L.*, 1971. In order to promote the confiscation-redistribution policy of

agricultural land were alienated, and redistributed to about 2000 men of Muscovite origin and others who were loyal to the Grand Prince of Moscow. The confiscation and secularization of Novgorodian church property, including that of St. Sophia Cathedral which was previously the largest land-owner in the republic of Novgorod, continued from 1478 to 1505 (death of Ivan III). The main confiscations took place, for example, in 1480 a little before Gennadii's appointment to the archbishop see, and in 1500 and 1504 during his tenure. Being one of the leading ecclesiastics at that time in Muscovy, Gennadii often had a critical eye toward the religious policies of the Grand Prince and the metropolitans of Moscow.⁸² In 1498 Gennadii ordered Dominican Monk Benjamin to prepare a special treatise in defense of church property. Being based upon Roman Catholic sources and arguments, the treatise, titled "Slovo kratko," was written by Benjamin first in Latin and then translated by Dimitrii into Russian.⁸³ It presented severe opposition to secular power, in this case, the authority of the Grand Prince who was promoting the secularization of church property. Perhaps along the same line, Gennadii and his "circle" prepared and compiled "*The Legend of the Novagorodian White Cowl*". Indicating and testifying to the religious superiority and legitimacy of the Novgorodian church, they probably expected to be able to defend their church property from the confiscation policy of the Grand Prince of Moscow, Ivan III. Thus, the archbishop of Novgorod at the end of the 15th century paid his attention again to the Mediterranean center, in an attempt to defend its previous state from Moscow's attack. Just as Vasilii Kaleka did a century before, Gennadii also sent his missionaries to the center of the Mediterranean, Rome, not Constantinople. Dimitrii's "necessary investigation" in Rome was successful, and the *Legend* was completed. But their effort turned out to be in vain. Gennadii was removed from the post in 1504, and died the next year. The Novgorodian period was now completely over.

Novgorodian lands, the Muscovite government created the vast and comprehensive "Land-Cadastre" of Novgorod (pistsovyie knigi). The studies above are mainly based on this source. As far as the confiscation of the church property is concerned, see also: N. A. Kazakova, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi obschestvennoi mysli. Pervaia tret' XVI veka*, L., 1970.

⁸² In 1482 when he was the archimandrite of the Chudov Monastery, Gennadii was already in conflict with metropolitan Gerontii about the church ritual, and was punished. After receiving the archdiocese of Novgorod either, he was sometimes in disagreement with Ivan III and the metropolitan of Moscow on certain church problem, e.g., the problems of Judaizers in Novgorod, and then church property. These disagreements gave rise to Moscow's disfavor, and led eventually to his removal from the archbishop see of Novgorod in 1504. E. E. Golubinskii, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, first half of volume, pp. 567-568, 617.

⁸³ Ia. S. Lur'e *op. cit.*, p. 227.