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Panel 1: News and Early Newspapers

“Muscovy and the 17th-century 'News Revolution': Translations of West-European Newspapers and Pamphlets ('Vesti-Kuranty')”

Ingrid Maier (Uppsala University)

During the 17th century Muscovy became increasingly involved in the European “news revolution”: hand-written newsletters, printed newspapers and pamphlets were translated in the Diplomatic Chancery to inform the tsar and his boyars – orally – about the political situation in Europe. These texts have been labeled “Vesti-Kuranty”, because they contain “news” (vesti), but more specifically news derived from translated foreign sources (kuranty, from the Dutch word courant(e) ‘newspaper’).

In my paper, I will give a general introduction about the “Vesti-Kuranty”: what was translated, from which languages, by whom, and how? A special case in focus will be the Stepan Razin uprising, culminating in the years 1670–1671. The printed newspapers – especially the German ones – reported extensively about the disorder, until the very day of Razin’s execution (6 June 1671), usually exaggerating the rebel’s successes, and diminishing the achievements of the tsar’s army. In this special case, we can be quite sure that the “consumers” of the kuranty did not need these translations in order to be informed about the military situation, particularly because the news first took around one month to arrive at the publishers’ desks in Berlin, Hamburg, or Amsterdam, and then one additional month to make its way back to Moscow. Why, then, did the Russians consistently include such news in the kuranty? It will be argued that one reason was to preserve these texts in order to make use of them in international
negotiations in later years, for instance to be able to complain about the “lies” certain newspapers had printed during the Razin uprising. I will also try to say something about possible sources (authors) of news items from Moscow that made their way into the Western print media.

“Pickleherring in the Kremlin: New Sources for the History of the Muscovite Theatre”

Claudia Jensen (University of Washington) and Ingrid Maier (Uppsala University)

The marvelous events that took place in the Kremlin on 17 October 1672 have long been known to scholars. This is the date of the opening night of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich’s court theater with a sumptuous production that was performed by foreign youths resident in Moscow and which included costumes, singing, instrumental music, sets, and comic interludes. The event, prepared especially for the tsar and a limited audience, marks the beginnings of Western-style theater in Muscovy, the opening act of a long tradition that was to flower during the eighteenth century and, of course, beyond.

This theatrical interlude, from its premiere in Oct. 1672 to Tsar Aleksei’s sudden death early in 1676, has been the subject of many types of scholarly inquiry: historians have situated it within the context of Muscovite court culture; theater specialists have hunted for appropriate models in Western performance traditions; and linguists have examined its rich textual sources (the half-dozen surviving play texts). All of this work has been illuminating, but it has never answered, or even clearly posed, a crucial question: was there a specific stimulus that sparked Aleksei’s interest in theater in the first place?
The answer to this question is yes: this paper will present evidence describing two linked and previously unknown performances in the spring of 1672 that introduced the tsar to Western-style entertainment (including the comic character Pickleherring) and led directly to the establishment of his own theater several months later. More broadly, these recently discovered documents show the importance to cultural historians of the communications revolution in Early Modern Europe, with its emphasis on regular transmission of current news and information, including newspapers and the voluminous diplomatic dispatches that criss-crossed the continent, spreading news of events in Moscow to a surprisingly large audience. Our presentation will survey the results of our on-going research into the pre-history of the Muscovite theatrical experience.

“Beyond the Kuranty: What was News and How was it Communicated in Muscovy?”

Daniel Waugh (University of Washington)

The development of printed newspapers and postal communication networks is commonly cited as one of the most important factors in the emergence of “modern” European society. If we are to understand the impact these new “technologies of communication” in Russia, where indeed the 17th century witnessed the establishment of a foreign post and the importation and translation of Western newspapers (the kuranty), we must also attempt to establish more broadly what constituted “news” and how it was communicated. This paper will introduce some of the subjects that merit further investigation regarding what we can loosely term “traditional” sources of news.

An obvious complement to the information obtained from foreign newspapers, and in fact arguably a more
important source of operative intelligence for the government, was communications from border commanders, whose sources might include interrogations of arriving foreigners or captives or reports from spies. While at one level such information was restricted for use in official circles, clearly it might spread much more widely amongst the population. To what degree can we document the impact of oral transmission of news through gossip and rumor? If our purview is to include “ordinary people,” should we assume that their concerns about current “events” necessarily were the same as the concerns of military commanders or those who formulated state policy? Muscovite authorities had a vested interest in controlling public responses to news disseminated through unofficial channels which might lead to political or social unrest.

Once we start asking such questions, we might well need to explore such “traditional” sources as the late Muscovite chronicles or saints’ vitae and texts about wonder-working icons (with their appended lists of “cures” and other miracles). Public announcements and rituals, their messages emphasized by an important visual component, were clearly significant for communication of important news to a broad swath of the Muscovite population. The official desire to control and direct such communication may be seen as evidence of Muscovy’s “modernity” at the same time that the “technologies of communication” and the content of the “news” that was communicated embraced a wide range of possibilities, many of them solidly anchored in established tradition. This fact complicates any effort to map out the roads which were beginning to offer Muscovy an entrée into the “modernizing” European world.
Panel 2: Communication Networks

“The Art of the Extract: Gathering Intelligence on the Mongolian Frontier, 1755-1768”

Greg Afinogenov (Harvard University)

In the middle of the eighteenth century, relations between the Russian and Qing Empires began rapidly deteriorating due to the Qing defeat of the region’s other dominant power—the Junghar Confederation—in 1755. The result was a cold war, in which both powers used the threat of military confrontation as leverage while feverishly jockeying for influence among the peoples of the imperial borderlands, including Mongols, Kazakhs, former Junghars, and others. The most important Russian actor in this struggle was a highly obscure figure: Varfolomei Iakobii, the commandant of the Trans-Baikal border town of Selenginsk. With only a handful of poorly-equipped troops under his command, Iakobii’s influence was not determined by his military capability. Instead, it was his remarkable aptitude for keeping a finger on the pulse of Qing Mongolia. Every troop movement and rumor of war was reported to the Senate, sometimes on a biweekly or monthly basis, in the form of extracts summarizing up to a dozen encounters with Qing subjects, both in the Mongolian capital of Kuren and on the Russian border. This paper will examine just how Iakobii gathered and presented his intelligence by reconstructing part of his network of intermediaries and Mongol informants. In the process, it will look at the interpersonal relationships that successful intelligence operations required, as well as the knotty entanglement between knowledge and secret diplomacy.

“Siberia. In Good Time. Commercial Communications in Early Modern Siberia”
Erika Monahan (University of New Mexico)

The title of this paper alludes to the slogan of Fed-ex, the global document/freight forwarder, which is "The World. On Time." Considering the same core impulse executed through very different means, this paper examines how Russian merchants transmitted urgent and valuable communications across the vast expanses of early modern Siberia. The establishment of a postal service in the late seventeenth century served as one more tool in the tool box for wealthy merchants.

“Technique, Obligation, Communication: The Horse Relay and the Politics of Information Transfer in the Russian Empire of the Eighteenth Century”

John Randolph (University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign)

Communication—like technology—is often assumed to be a broadly progressive phenomenon, opening up ever-broader vistas of social and cultural development. For the many centuries preceding wireless, industrial communication, however, any circulation of people, things, and information depended on vast networks of transportation resources, usually maintained through direct labor obligations assigned to imperial populations. The most infamous of these in human history is the horse relay, common to most land empires and (with those of a few early modern European states providing a rare, if important exception) generally maintained through punishing levies of man- and horse-power. From the late 15th century through the mid-19th century, the Russian Empire used one such system, the iamskaia gon’ba with its associated iamskaia povinnost’. This paper will explore, on the basis of ongoing research, how this system of obligations interacted
with attempts to introduce new, market-based communications services (postal letters, mail coaches, stage coach routes organized by private companies) in late 18th and early 19th century Russia. It will create, thereby, a case study for considering how pre-modern empire—with its associated reliance on obligation as a way to mobilize social power—interacted with the development of both information technology and information transfer, during the Russian Enlightenment. The paper will contain opening remarks on the relationship between communication and obligation in human history; present the author’s attempts to map (using GIS) systems of obligation undergirding provincial level communications in late 18th century Russia; and then discuss how this fixed infrastructure affected Russian engagements with the so-called “transportation revolution” of the late 18th century, created in Europe through the expansion of new organizational, technological, and economic infrastructures, to better support human communication.
Panel 3: Later Newspapers and Journals

“Fugitives, Vagrants, and Found Dead Bodies: Finding the Missing in the Provincial Press”

*Alison Smith (University of Toronto)*

According to official decree, by the end of the eighteenth century virtually every subject of the Russian Empire was in principle supposed to belong to a specific, locally based *soslovie* society. Furthermore, that membership was meant to be not merely an abstract identity, but something made real by inscription in residency books or other variants of records of local societies. In many cases, perhaps particularly in towns, individuals were recorded not just by their names, but by significantly more detailed physical descriptions, of height, of hair color, of distinguishing marks or features. This information served two purposes. First, it suggested that these local town societies had real knowledge of their members—that the societies could recognize who belonged, and therefore also could recognize possibly dangerous outsiders. Second, these descriptions were reflected in similar descriptions found in columns in the provincial press in the early nineteenth century. These provincial *Vedomosti* ran regular, often lengthy columns that were simply lists of “arrested vagrants” and “found dead bodies,” all identified primarily by their physical appearance. Matching such descriptions with those in their books (or, of course, with individual memory) could allow local societies to find missing or fugitive members—or serfowners to find fugitive serfs. This paper will investigate these related practices of recording and circulating information about the population in general, and about fugitives, in particular, both of which served an important purpose in the imperial state’s efforts to see and know its population.
The Ministry of National Education, established in 1802, from the beginning published an official journal with different titles. Its golden age was associated with Serguei Uvarov (1786–1855).

Being a Secretary of national Education (1833–1849), Uvarov implemented a programme based on the historical principles of Russian statehood and culture. He viewed them as the basis of the Ministry activities. Uvarov ambitiously adopted the role of the leading ideologist of the Russian Empire. Uvarov re-founded a monthly “Journal of the Ministry of National Education” to advocate and popularize his policy in culture.

Uvarov used the Journal as a kind of mass media with great success. With the help of the Journal he managed to attract the public attention to his educational reforms which urged the Russian science to flourish.

It was the purpose of the Journal to be not only as an official source but also as a kind of Russian „Journal des savants“ to watch the development of all branches of science. Uvarov obliged university professors to write an article to the Journal annually. In 1830-40s various branches of knowledge were presented in the Journal; yet, the articles relating to the issues of the liberal arts prevailed.

The Journal was considered to be a substitution of foreign scientific journals unavailable for most people, to communicate news about science abroad, and to inform about the history of education in different countries. The Journal made it a rule to review scientific books published in Russia.
and regularly provide detailed topical reports on periodical press in Russia and abroad.

The Journal was a vigorous valuable chronicle of Russian education till the very resignation of Uvarov which followed immediately after the revolutionary upheavals in Germany and Austrian-Hungary.

Thanks to Uvarov, the Journal became one of the best departmental periodicals; it combined the best attributes both of a dignified official edition and a serious scientific journal.

“Archaeology: Writing, not Digging”
Louise McReynolds (University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill)

How did material objects enter the “graphosphere”? Archeologists early in the nineteenth century faced a particular conundrum. Having begun as collectors of antiquities, primarily numismatists, they met with each other in social settings to show off their latest acquisitions, much of which had been pillages from kurgans, the thousands of burial mounds across the steppes. In the eighteenth century Peter the Great had introduced some fundamentals of archeology as it was developing in Europe, though his kunstkamera was in essence as a cultural space that put marvels and oddities on display. But by the turn of the nineteenth century, the hobby was transforming into a science, and the prized collections morphed into primary sources for documenting the historical past. The most prominent numismatist was Sergei Uvarov, a learned Orientalist, the Minister of Education who coined the ideology “Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality,” and also President of the Academy of Sciences, 1818-55. Uvarov’s son Alexei became the driving force behind the professionalization of archeology, and founder of the Russian Archeological Society
in 1846. The first archeological society, though, had been founded in Odessa, in “New Russia,” in 1839, co-founded by Napoleon’s stepson, Eugène de Beauharnais; “New Russia,” conquered during the reign of Catherine the Great, enjoyed the glamor of the sites of Greek colonies mentioned by Herodotus. This society began publishing its journal in 1844.

Significantly, this was the age when the search began in great earnest for a usable historical past. In 1828 Tsar Nicholas I dispatched the first of a number of important archeographical commissions into the provinces; initially, the commission’s objective was to gather written texts, largely those housed in monasteries. Led by Peter Stroev, the commission spent six years at its task, often at odds with the Holy Synod about who enjoyed the property rights over the texts. The stakes were higher than simple ownership: those who possess the texts enjoy a privileged position of how they will be interpreted. The same held true for the imperial Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg, which enjoyed status for its artistic collection, until another young Orientalist on the staff, Vasilii Grigor’ev, fought to alter the notion of “museum” by assembling for display artifacts that had historical rather than aesthetic value. Thus were archeologists also central to changes in cultural tastes.

In sum, archeology was coming into its own through a variety of venues and being developed by politically important individuals (already so, or soon-to-be, such as Grigor’ev). Their most fundamental task was to find a new medium for communicating their finds: they knew how to “show,” but now had to learn how to “tell.” It was incumbent upon them to develop a new language of description, to transmit the details that they considered superior to analysis because they purported to be so strictly objective; an infelicitous choice of a word to denote a color, for example, could change the connotation of the object. The variety of my sources (including Grigor’ev’s letters, the archive of Stroev’s archeographical
commission, and the journal of Odessa’s Society of Antiquities) reflects the interdependence of sociocultural domains. I will chart how archeologists developed a medium of communication unique to their endeavors, but capable of exchanging and transforming their knowledge into a much broader public sphere. In the process, I will be meeting the conference’s goal of exploring “questions about the way information has been encoded, stored, distributed, exchanged and retrieved.” How did kamennye baby transfigure from crass curiosities to historicized heroines? Stay tuned!
Panel 4: Authority and the Public Graphosphere

“Dynamics of Growth in the Public Graphosphere, 1450-1850”
Simon Franklin (University of Cambridge)

In the modern city, as in the city of classical antiquity, public spaces are filled with visible words. The technologies may differ, as the ‘speaking stones’ of classical inscriptions are replaced by modern multimedia display, but in antiquity, as now, the presence of public writing was integral to assumptions about urban space. The medieval city was different. Much of its public life moved indoors, as did its visible words. The graphosphere no longer extended into the street and the square. In Rus, public writing was concentrated in the internal display and decoration of the church. This paper outlines the emergence of a public graphosphere in Russia from its halting beginnings in the late 15th century until the mid-19th century, when graphic display had (again) become a habitual feature of the cityscape, and considers the respective roles of three institutions – the Church, the State, and commerce – in the dynamics of this process.

“Pravda voli monarshei (1722): Message, Media, and Mass Manipulation in Russia, 1722-1730”
Tony Lentin (Wolfson College, Cambridge)

Nothing was more important to Peter the Great towards the end of his reign than the continuity of his reforms. The affair of the Tsarevich Alexei 1714-17 revealed the degree of opposition that might revive and nullify them after Peter. Peter’s dilemma became acute with the death in 1719 of his
infant son by Catherine and the claims of Petr Alekseevich, son of Tsarevich Alexei, generally regarded as the undoubted heir.

Peter’s revolutionary solution was his imperial succession law of 1722, which empowered him to appoint a successor at will, regardless of customary succession. Knowing this innovation to be deeply controversial and unpopular, he commissioned Feofan Prokopovich, vice-president of the newly created Synod, to compose an official apologia – Pravda voli monarshei – in the significant words of its subtitle, ‘for the benefit of honest but ignorant persons’.

PVM was published by the Synod in church and ‘civil’ type, with a large print-run. It also appeared in a German edition at Berlin in 1724, for PVM was also intended to improve Russia’s image abroad. A synopsis appeared in 1723 at Leipzig in Acta Eruditorum, the principal medium of enlightenment in Germany.

PVM was designed (1) as an exhaustive rebuttal of critics of the 1722 statute, (2) to supplement the universal oath (enforced by the military) of loyalty to the statute, and (3) as a vehicle of mass indoctrination through dissemination, including recitation in church. It was an instrument of ideological control in Peter’s last two years and also under Catherine I, when it was republished with an unprecedented print-run to counter unofficial opposition (podmetnye pis’ma). Conversely under the ‘legitimist’ reign of Peter II, PVM was called in and proscribed.
“Signs, Shops and Imperial Pomp: A Stroll Down Nevskii Prospekt”

*Katherine Bowers (University of Cambridge)*

Between 1830 and 1835, publisher and art patron Andrei Prèvost published a large grayscale lithograph as a scroll. Measuring 23 feet by 10 and a half inches, the scroll was taken from artist Vasilii Sadovnikov’s late 1820s watercolors depicting Nevskii Prospekt. In its entirety, the scroll faithfully reproduces the grand boulevard in lithograph from Palace Square to the Anichkov Bridge and back. When it was published, the work caused a stir because of the unique look at the city it provided, allowing viewers across the Russian Empire to “visit” the famous street and “take in” its notable sights from their homes. This paper will embark upon just such a “stroll,” but will focus on the public graphosphere depicted therein. While the graphosphere portrayed is limited to a small segment of the grand street and, therefore, is by no means a comprehensive overview of urban space, this limitation nonetheless proves productive, inviting historical digressions and raising a series of initial framing questions: What can we learn from analysis of this captured graphosphere? What does it omit, and why? And where do we look for more information about the graphosphere in early nineteenth-century Russian urban space? Ultimately the information technologies we see present within the Nevskii Prospekt graphosphere give us insight into commercial development and marketing in the early nineteenth century, but the limited sample means we must look to other sources for a slightly more complete vision of information technologies within the public graphosphere at this time.
Panel 5: Institutional Knowledge and Communication

“Foreign Expertise and Knowledge Exchange in the Seventeenth-Century Chancery System”

Clare Griffin (University of Cambridge)

The seventeenth-century chancery system can be viewed as a form of information technology: it provided the means to procure, transmit, and store information and expertise (in the form of reports) that were considered to be valuable by the Russian court. One such type of expertise was medical knowledge, provided by the foreign medical practitioners employed by the court’s medical department, the Apothecary Chancery. Medical knowledge did not remain in that department, but was made available to various other chanceries, to the tsar, and to courts, in the form of reports. These reports contained medical knowledge in the broadest sense of that term, as they cover a range of topics from causes of death and disease through to medical organisations and the sourcing and properties of natural objects. Devoting attention to these reports, and to the document-collections in which they reside, shows an exchange of questions and answers in which foreign expertise played a significant, but not dominant role. The foreign experts of the Apothecary Chancery provided information and opinions, but it was in response to direct questions composed by Russian bureaucrats, and it was Russians who determined what action to take on the basis of those reports. This paper will examine the process of Apothecary Chancery report production and consumption to demonstrate how the chancery system worked to facilitate and shape knowledge exchange.
“Что правительство России знало о собственных финансах второй-третий четверти 18 века (на примере подушной подати)?”

Elena Korchmina (Humanities Research Center, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration)

Перед правительствами всех стран и эпох стоит задача получения оперативной и адекватной информации о событиях, происходящих на всех уровнях. Как обстояло дело с информированием правительства в условиях России 18 века? Рассмотрим этот вопрос на примере подушной подати, прямого налога введенного Петром I, поскольку система была создана таким образом, что налоги собирались и распределялись на местах, центральное правительство знало о ситуации на местах только на основании отчетов.

В нашей работе мы впервые выявляем особенности технологий сбора и передачи информации - отчетности о недоимках по подушной подати, и показываем, как эта информация фактически искажала представление правительства (и историков) о финансовом положении России в указанный период.

Проведенное исследование выявило несколько узких мест, где могла и искажалась информация:
- местные чиновники с трудом адаптировали требуемые государством "простые" формы о недоимках, которые не отражали сложности социальной структуры населения в конкретных уездах и провинциях;
- местные чиновники не могли составить отчеты вовремя из-за нехватки квалификации, времени, а также сложности бюрократических процедур;
- отчеты не присылались вовремя в центр, из-за удаленности некоторых провинций и уездов.
В результате чиновники центральных ведомств оказывались в ситуации, когда они, с одной стороны, не могли обрабатывать поступающие отчеты из-за их обилия и их неунифицированности, с другой, они не получали многих отчетов с мест.

Искажения в передаче информации на каждом из уровней имели свои последствия, но основная проблема в том, что в итоге правительство принимало решения, не имея достаточно информации.

Особое внимание уделено вопросу: была ли решена эта проблема в 18 веке, и если да, то как?

Вывод: особенности технологий сбора и передачи информации - существенный фактор, который мы недооцениваем при изучении русской истории.
Panel 6: Material Objects

“Geografija i geograficheskie pribory v Rossii XVIII veka: postavki oborudovaniia kak proiavlenie mezhdunarodnogo nauchnogo sotrudnichestva”

Aleksei Golubinskii (The Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (RGADA))

Изучение поставок географического и геодезического оборудования является органичной частью проблемы передачи знаний и международного научного сотрудничества. Наиболее характерно это сотрудничество проявлялось в области геодезических приборов, так как они были более массовыми, чем в других областях науки. Начавшиеся в первой половине XVIII в. первые поставки, необходимые для геодезических измерений и последующего картографирования, были единичными, и связаны с работой в России известного французского астронома и географа И.-Н. Делиля. Материалы фондов Сената, XVII разряда Госархива (Наука, культура и искусство), портфели Миллера, а также Сенатской Межевой экспедиции и Межевой канцелярии позволяют проследить, как факты закупок единичных образцов, а также существовавшая практика выкупа или дарения научных приборов (общее количество астролябий в Академии наук и Адмиралтейской коллегии насчитывало 7 штук) превращались в сотенные и даже тысячные поставки.

Так, чтобы создать необходимый объем техники для обследования территории России, были привлечены английские мастера, которые выполнили заказ сначала на 100, а затем еще на 900 астролябий. Русским послом в Лондоне графом Чернышевым были размещены заказы практически у всех местных мастеров. Вторым же заказом английские предприятия были загружены на несколько
лет вперед. Видимо, поставляя в Россию геодезическое оборудование, европеcцы рассчитывали восполнить точными данными скудость представлений о территории огромной и незнакомой России.

Эти закупки позволили начать важнейшую и очень масштабную задачу - создание всеобщей карты земельных владений в России очень крупного масштаба. Это мероприятие - Генеральное межевание - стало крупнейшим и беспрецедентным измерением территории для России и Европы Раннего Нового времени и обеспечило Россию картами крупного масштаба, составленными по единой программе.

В чем заключалось отличие небольших поставок, производимых частными лицами, от государственных, решавших общероссийские задачи? Это скорость поставки, относительная гибкость правительства относительно цены, стремление создать, если возможно, импортозамещающее производство (параллельно был размещен контракт в Академии наук на 200 астролябий). Эти свойства государственных поставок в области науки проявлялись и во время закупок экспонатов для Кунсткамеры и библиотеки Вольтера.

“Explaining the Visual: Medieval Russian Commentaries on Icons”

Agnes Kriza (University of Cambridge)

One of the most exciting phenomena of the Russian culture is the appearance of Russian icons with new, extremely complex and sometimes barely comprehensible theological content from the 15th century onwards. That even contemporaries were puzzled by these icons is shown by the fact that commentaries were created on these complex allegorical images to explain their individual visual elements. The
manuscript of the earliest commentary on the *The Novgorod Sophia* icon derives from the mid-15th century, than Joseph of Volokolamsk wrote an explanation of the *Old Testament Trinity icon* in his famous *Enlightener* most probably on the turn of the 15-16th centuries, while the commentary on the late 15th-century icon „*You are a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedek*” outraged the Greek monk, Maksim Grek in the 1530s. Interestingly, however, despite these explanatory texts, the meanings of the uncommon icons are often still unclear and undeciphered. Why were these unusual icons created and why were they commented by texts that are just as obscure as the icons themselves? The aim of this paper is to explore the literary history of the Russian commentaries on icons, a genre which was unknown in the Slavonic literature before the 15th century. Investigating these texts the paper will focus on the manuscripts containing the earliest commentaries on the *Novgorod Sophia icon*. The investigation of these collections, which the 19th-century Russian scholar, Vasily Mochulsky called „*tolkovye sborniki*”, as they contain almost exclusively explanatory texts, such as the different pieces of the Byzantine erotapokriseis (questions and answers) literature, parts of the Slavonic *Corpus Dionysiacum* and different exegetical fragments, may shed new light not only on the commentary texts themselves, but also on the icons explained by them.

“*Ukrainskie i russkie pechatnye razreshitel'nye gramoty XVII-XVIII vv.: problemy atributsii i bytovaniia*”

*Iuliia Shustova (Russian State University for the Humanities)*

Поднимается проблема атрибуции кириллических печатных изданий разрешительных грамот XVII–XVIII вв.
Прослеживаются механизмы распространения традиции использования разрешительных грамот в православной церкви, проводятся аналогии с католической практикой подобных грамот и ставится вопрос о европейском влиянии на распространение подобных грамот в XVII–XIX в украинской, русской, молдавской, греческой практике печатных разрешительных грамот.
Уже с рубежа XIV и XV веков в древнерусской книжности наступают важные перемены, свидетельствующие о появлении тенденций принципиально новой информационной ситуации. Появляются первые библиотеки общежительных монастырей, возникает краткий опыт описания их состава, распространяются многочисленные новые южнославянские и византийские сочинения, приходит бумага как писчий материал, на которой переписываются сборники с новыми полууставными почерками, с новой орнаментикой. Тогда же зарождается общерусское сводное летописание.

Но настоящая "информационная революция" в древнерусской книжности происходит в середине XV века (около 1450 г.). Она была обусловлена существенным расширением информационных ресурсов. С середины XV в. заметно увеличивается количество сохранившихся до наших дней рукописных книг; библиотеки наполняются светскими «беллетристическими» сочинениями, рассказывающими о легендарных героях, заморских странах и чужеземных диковинах. Мир древнерусского человека словно раздвинул свои границы. В это же время в книжность начинают активно проникать тексты устного происхождения, от фольклорных "бродячих сюжетов" до записей живой повседневной речи. Наконец, появляются книжные описи, представляющие кодификацию и структурирование накопленной информации. В конце
XV века в Кирилло-Белозерском монастыре создается беспрецедентная по полноте и подробности Опись его библиотеки, включающая постательную роспись сборников. Кроме того, вторая половина XV века — это время широкого распространения сводного летописания, как официального, так и неофициального. В книжности начинают конкурировать и сталкиваться различные оценки событий, порой прямо противоположная информация и точки зрения.

Целая плеяда древнерусских книжников XV века, в большинстве своём неизвестных по имени, создала новую информационную реальность, включавшую сведения о мире от Атлантического до Индийского океана, новые ракурсы и возможности его описания.

“Vozniknovenie knigopechataniia v Moskve i voprosy knizhnoi spravy”

*Andrei Voznesenskii (Russian National Library – Rare Books Dept (ORK))*

Из всех препосылок возникновения в Москве книгопечатания, которые обычно называют исследователи, единственным, что не вызывает никаких сомнений, является собственно изобретение уже к тому времени печатного способа производства книг. Это стало необходимым условием учреждения там типографии, решение о заведении которой возникло в связи с выполнением постановлений Собора 1551 г., касавшихся обеспечения церквей исправными богослужебными книгами.

Свою роль в принятии именно такого решения сыграла, вероятно, активизация русско-сербских связей в середине 50-х гг. XVI в. По крайней мере, первым русским типографам были хорошо известны южнославянские
издания, напечатанные в Венеции. Об этом свидетельствуют выходные сведения заблудовской Псалтири с Часословцем 1570 г. и львовского Апостола 1574 г.

Анализ текста выходных сведений московских изданий позволяет говорить о том, что целью, стоявшей перед русскими типографами, было удовлетворение недостатка не в книгах в целом, а только в исправных богослужебных книгах. Мотив исправления книг встречается в колофонах московских печатных книг с завидной регулярностью, отсутствую при этом в изданиях, принадлежавших всем другим традициям книгопечатания кирилловским шрифтом.

Вопросы книжной справы представляли особую важность для Ивана Федорова, который, судя по всему, в Москве занимался именно подготовкой текста, тогда как техническую сторону процесса обеспечивал Петр Тимофеев Мстиславец, в том числе и резал шрифт. Только так, распределением обязанностей, можно объяснить то, что в начальную пору деятельности типографии ее делами управляли не один, а сразу два мастера.

Связь учреждения книгопечатания в Москве с выполнением задачи исправления богослужебных книг позволяет объяснить и один из ярких феноменов развития русской культуры: длительного сосуществование рукописной и печатной традиций. В Западной Европе книгопечатание довольно быстро вытеснило рукописный способ производства книги; перо и чернила продолжали использоваться, но уже при создании орiginalов печатных книг, для личных записей, в переписке и делопроизводстве. В Московском государстве этого не произошло, поскольку заведение типографии изначально не воспринималось с точки зрения замены одного способа производства книг другим.
In my paper I will discuss how the Church and the State used printed liturgical texts of the 17th and 18th centuries as information technologies to exert political and social control. When both the Church and the State realised that book-printing meant power, they sought to increase their control over the press and through it to convey a certain ideology to the public. As a result, a number of services related to particular political events began to appear in various liturgical books. Most of them were placed in the Festal Menaion, some of them then moved to the Monthly Menaion, others were published separately in special editions. For example, in the 18th century, the service to St. Elizabeth (5 September) was commissioned as an addition to the existing service to the Prophet Zachariah. It was due to the birth of the future empress Elizaveta Petrovna in 1709, as the Greek Menaion provided the service only to Prophet Zachariah and the empress needed to celebrate her name day properly. This service was published as a separate edition in 1723 in Moscow and in 1793 in Moscow and Kiev. Another example of the imposition of the political situation on liturgical life is the service dedicated to the Battle of Poltava (27 June 1709), which compares Peter the Great to Christ and his victory over death. These texts are largely understudied and I hope to contribute to our knowledge of the impact the secular events had on the ecclesiastical life at the time with regard to transferring information to society.

“Staroe i novoe in Post-Soviet Studies on the Early Modern Codex and Old Printed Book”
In these remarks I will interpret some of the factors which have influenced the evolution of early modern book studies, and characterize some of the ‘old’ and ‘new’ directions in the study of pre-secular Russian (Muscovite and Rus’ian) book culture.

Concerning the overall transformation of research and university libraries in both the West and Russia, I observe that the “centre cannot hold” given the personnel, material budgets, and administrative structures that book studies require. The paper comments on the publications of established academics and traditional centers in Moscow and Novosibirsk (and, to a lesser degree, St. Petersburg), the numbered and serial publications which began in the Soviet period and continue publication, and the re-publication of historic works from the pre-Revolutionary and early Soviet period. I acknowledge the appearance or emergence of younger (“new”) scholars, publications, and the hitherto unaddressed themes to which they are turning their attention—for example, the “Stalinist” sales of codices and old printed books, and most especially the positive contributions of the “old pre-revolutionary cadres” such as N.P.Likhachev—among other, fresh topics.

Students of the pre-Petrine book in Russia, while now facing some of the same obstacles as their colleagues in the West, have succeeded in harboring, exploiting and even modestly enhancing some of the rich book studies legacy of the Soviet period. That being said, major challenges remain, not the least of which is the integration of Russian—and by extension Ukrainian and Byelorusian—book studies into both the broader skein of post-Soviet humanities, Western histories of the book and writing, and the sociocultural history of information technologies and the “graphosphere” in Russia.
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