



Who is Who in Fourteenth- Century Novgorod? Evidence from Hanseatic Sources*

Jos Schaeken

Leiden University
Leiden, Netherlands

Кто есть кто в Новгороде XIV века? Свидетельства ганзейских источников

Йос Схакен

Лейденский университет
Лейден, Нидерланды

Abstract

This article analyses the names of Novgorodians that appear in two Hanseatic documents from the beginning of the fourteenth century. Together, they shed further light on the identities and relationships of individuals in medieval Novgorod. In the first document, dated 1331 and written in Middle Low German, I will concentrate on a person called *Thyrentekey*. I will propose that this individual is the same person that is mentioned in a birchbark document (under the name *Terentij Koj*) and in the First Novgorod Chronicle (*Terentij Danilovič*). With regard to the second Hanseatic document (1311–1335), which is in Latin, I will examine a mysterious and distorted list of names of Novgorodians (and Pskovians), who “were betrayed by their own slave, who is called *drelle* in the vernacular.” This list most probably includes the name of the *posadnik* Semen

* I would like to express my gratitude to my Moscow colleagues Evgenij V. Akel'ev, Pavel V. Lukin, Sergej V. Polexov, and Andrej Ju. Vinogradov for their comments and help with practical matters pertaining to the two Hanseatic documents discussed in this paper. I am also greatly indebted to Aleksej A. Gippius for his detailed feedback on the tentative interpretation of the document from the years 1311–1335 (see Section 3), and to Marina A. Bobrik for further insightful remarks.

Klimovič (*symon filius klementis*), whose son, Jakun, figures in the 1331 document (*jacone symonen sone possatnicke*), together with *Thyrentekey*.

Keywords

medieval Novgorod, Hanseatic league, birchbark letters, First Novgorod Chronicle, social network analysis

Резюме

В статье речь идет об именах новгородцев, упоминаемых в двух ганзейских документах начала XIV века. Оба эти документа вместе позволяют продвигаться в идентификации людей, живших в Новгороде в эту эпоху, и взаимосвязей между ними. В первом документе, написанном в 1331 году на средненижненемецком языке, я сосредоточу внимание на человеке по имени *Thyrentekey* и постараюсь показать, что речь идет о том же человеке, который упоминается как *Терентий Кой* в одной из берестяных грамот и как *Терентий Данилович* — в Первой Новгородской летописи. В другом, составленном на латыни документе Ганзы, датируемом 1311–1335 гг., меня интересует загадочный (с искажениями) список имен новгородцев и псковичей, которые “были выданы их собственным рабом, в просторечии *drelle*”. В этот список, очевидно, включено имя посадника Семена Климовича (*symon filius klementis*), сын которого Якун фигурирует вместе с *Thyrentekey* и в документе 1331 года (*jacone symonen sone possatnicke*).

Ключевые слова

древний Новгород, Ганзейский союз, берестяные грамоты, Первая Новгородская летопись, анализ социальных сетей

1. Introduction

Over the last decades much progress has been made in establishing the identities and social networks of persons who lived and worked in medieval Novgorod. These persons were not only public figures such as *posadniks*, *tysiatski* and other *boyars*. We also know the names of ordinary people and their business: merchants, household or estate managers, financial administrators, craftsmen, priests, etc., or simply what their concerns in daily life were—of men and women, young and old, most notably dealing with family affairs and legal matters. All these people who can be associated with a single medieval city appear in historical documents that have come down to us in a variety and quantity that is unparalleled if we compare them with the historical evidence from other major cities in the Middle Ages.

In studying medieval Novgorod, we encounter public figures and ordinary people primarily in writings on parchment, birchbark, and in stone.¹ The

¹ Other writing surfaces, on which we mostly find single words or short texts, include (precious) metal (coins, ingots, “snake amulets,” liturgical objects, etc.), lead (seals), slate (spindle whorls), wax (coated on wooden tablets), and wood (cylinder-seals, tally-sticks, panel icons, etc.). For a detailed overview, see [Franklin 2002: 16–82].

social elite is predominantly present on parchment, especially in the chronicles and particularly in the First Novgorod Chronicle. However, the names of the upper strata of society are also frequently attested in writings on birchbark and even graffiti on church walls. These two writing surfaces were also used by many other individuals to communicate with each other (on birchbark) or to leave their traces—their names, hopes and thoughts—in a public space (on church walls). A telling example is the boyar, priest and icon-painter Olisej Grečin, who lived at the turn of the thirteenth century and appears in the First Novgorod Chronicle (under the year 1196), in several birchbark letters, and most probably as the author of graffiti in the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul as well [see Schaecken 2017a: 133, with further references].

In addition to the chronicles we find other parchment documents in which Novgorodians appear who also make their appearance elsewhere, most prominently in birchbark letters. The contents of these parchment documents can be of a personal or public nature; in the latter case they mainly relate to formal contacts with other principalities or internal governmental affairs. A special subgroup are the documents that testify to the close commercial relations between Novgorod and the Hanseatic league. They have been preserved from the late twelfth century onwards and have survived in different languages: Middle Low German, Old Russian, and Latin. Already in the oldest extant treaty (1191–1192), between Novgorod, Gotland and the German Cities, we find a prominent boyar, Miroška Nesdinič, who served as *posadnik* of the city and occurs on several occasions in the First Novgorod Chronicle and in correspondence on birchbark. Even the envoy of the treaty, a person called Griga—“I (Prince Jaroslav Vladimirovič) have sent my envoy Griga to (conclude) these terms”—, seems to be mentioned in a list of names on birchbark [Schaecken 2017a: 128]. In fact, this birchbark list (N^o 935, ca. 1180–1200) also includes the name of the aforementioned Olisej Grečin [NGB 12: 32–34].

In this paper, we will further explore the social networks in medieval Novgorod by concentrating on evidence provided by two Hanseatic documents. Both documents are dated to the first decades of the fourteenth century and contain names of Novgorodians whom we also encounter in the birchbark corpus and the First Novgorod Chronicle.

2. The Hanseatic document from the year 1331: the case of *Thyrentekey*

The first Hanseatic document to be discussed is a well-known report of German merchants to the council of Riga about conflicts with the Novgorodians. The Middle Low German manuscript is dated to the year 1331 and consists of a single parchment sheet, which is kept in Riga in the National Archives of Latvia (f. 673, app. 4, no. 18/26). The most recent edition can be found in

Lukin's 2014 monograph [2014: 521–531, with Russian translation],² in which he carefully examines the function and composition of the Novgorod *veche*. The 1331 document mentions a number of Novgorodians who played a role in the confrontation with the Hanseatic merchants. The passages, in which they occur, are given below:

Table 1

	1331 Original (edition [Lukin 2014: 521–531])	1331 Translation [Ibid.]
[1]	des sanden se boden vte deme dinghe to den duschen. eynen de heyt phylippe . vnn eynen de heyt zyder den olderman	Тогда они послали посланцев с веча к немцам, одного звали Филипп , а второго звали Сидор , староста
[2]	vnn worpen en Jowanen vor. de to darbete slaghen wart // de dar heytet Jowane Cypowe // de borchgreue [. . .] vann Jowanen kindere weghene sines swaghers // mit Jowanen nicht to donde // eren boyernen Jowanen	и сослались ¹ на Иоанна , который был убит в Дерпте // которого звали Иоанн Сып // посадник [. . .] от име- ни детей Иоанна , своего зятя // ничего не делали с Иоанном // своего боярина Иоанна
[3]	do sprach eyn rusce de heyt Thyrentekey	Тогда говорил один русский, по имени Терентий
[4]	eynen de heyt Matphe Coseken . vnn eynen de heyt zyluester vnn Oliferien den Olderman // Och warf deselue olyferie de Olderman. men scholde eme gheuen. V. stucke syluers. vnn syluester . V. stucke. vnn matphe coseken eyn scarlakens cleyt // eyn de heyt matphe Coseke	одного по имени Матфей Козка , одного по имени Сильвестр , и Олферья , старосту // Также тот самый Олферий , староста, добивался, чтобы ему дали 5 гривен серебра и Сильвестру 5 гривен и Матфею Козке — багряное платье // один по имени Матфей Козка
[5]	do quam eyn de heyt boris zyluesters sone	пришел некто по имени Борис Сильвестров сын
[6]	eyme de heyt zacharie phyfilate . vnn eyme de heitet jacone symonen sone possatnicke	одному по имени Захария Феофилактович и другому по имени Якун сын Симона посадника

The document identifies ten individuals by name from the Novgorodian side. As already pointed out by Lukin [2014: 420–421], two of them are well known from the First Novgorod Chronicle:

- *Jowane Cypowe* (see [2]) is Ivan Syp. He is mentioned under the year 1329 as an envoy, who was killed in Jur'ev (“Того же лѣта убиша въ Юрьевѣ новгородчкого посла мужа честна Ивана Сыпа”; [NPL 1950: 342], and

² See [Polechov 2017: 38–39] for further references to the scholarly literature.

- *Matphe Coseken* (see [4]) is Matfej (Varfolomeevič) Kozka, who was Ivan's uncle and whose name occurs several times as of the year 1331.³

Furthermore, in the same chronicle we find another name, which is related to one of the persons mentioned in our document:

- The *posadnik* Semen Klimovič, who must have been the father of Jakun, i. e. *jacone symonen sone* (see [6]), mentioned for the first time under the year 1293 [Lukin 2014: 343]. We will return to Semen Klimovič in Sections 3 and 4 below.

As for three other individuals, Lukin is of the opinion that an identification on the basis of evidence from the First Novgorod Chronicle is less clear:

- *Thyrentekey* in [3] might be identified as Terentij Danilovič, mentioned under the years 1333, along with a certain Danil Maškovič, and 1340, along with Matfej Kozka. In view of [4], it is obvious that the latter connection contributes to the plausibility of the identification proposed by Lukin [Lukin 2014: 336].
- *zyluester/syluester* in [4] might be the same person, whose name is attested as Selivestr Vološevič under the year 1339, although the identification is merely of a speculative nature [Lukin 2014: 337].
- The same holds for *boris zyluesters sone* in [5]: a relative of *zyluester/syluester*? [Lukin 2014: 343].

The names of the four remaining Novgorodians do not appear in the First Novgorod Chronicle and a possible identification remains inconclusive:

- Is *phylippe* in [1] the same person mentioned under the same name in another Hanseatic document, dated to the year 1338 [Lukin 2014: 336]?
- Is *zyder den olderman* in [1] the same person as mentioned under the same name in yet another Hanseatic document, from the year 1342 [Lukin 2014: 336]?
- Who is *Oliferien den Olderman* in [4] [Lukin 2014: 292–230, fn. 313]?
- Who is *zacharie phyfilate* in [6] [Lukin 2014: 343]?

If we now look at the evidence on birchbark, we first encounter Matfej Kozka (see [4]), who was *posadnik* between ca. 1332 and 1345, and figures several times in the correspondence from the early 1340s between a group of boyars, including Davyd, Esif Davydovič, and Mark [see DND 2004: 534–538].

Second, we encounter the likely wife (widow) of Ivan Syp (see [2]) in the birchbark document № 261–264 (ca. 1360–1380), which consists of a list of

³ Matfej Varfolomeevič Kozka was the son of Varfolomej Jur'evič Kozka; Ivan Syp was the husband of Varfolomej's sister. The "borchgreue" (*posadnik*) not mentioned by name in the 1331 document (see [2]) was undoubtedly Varfolomej Kozka, who held office between 1316 and 1342 [Lukin 2014: 421; Janin 2003: 502].

names and goods that should be understood as a memorandum of wedding gifts received from the invitees to the ceremony [DND 2004: 608–611].⁴ The third entry of the list reads in the Russian translation: “От Сыповой жены 5 (блюд), сафьян”. As Zaliznjak points out in [DND 2004]: “Учитывая редкость имени *Сыпъ*, следует признать некоторую вероятность того, что *Сыповая* — это вдова «мужа честна» Ивана Сыпа, новгородского посла, убитого в Юрьеве в 1329 г. (НПЛ). В момент гибели ее мужа она вполне могла быть еще молода, т. е. около 1370 г. ей могло быть 60–70 лет” [Ibid.: 611].

In the remainder of this section, I will try to show that the person named *Thyrentekey* in our Hanseatic document (see [3]) might be identified as *Terentij Koj*, who appears in the ninth entry of the birchbark list № 261–264: “От Терентия Коя 5 (блюд), отрез. . .”.

First it should be pointed out that *Thyrentekey* must have had a special connection with Ivan Syp if we read the Hanseatic text in more detail (cf. the excerpts in [2] and [3] above), which says in the Russian translation: “Тогда русские не захотели давать немцам времени, но говорили так: дайте нам виновных или вы все будете мертвы, и сослались на Иоанна, который был убит в Дерпте. Тогда немцы говорили: вы можете нас всех вместе убить, [хотя] мы ведь приезжаем под рукой великого князя и всех новгородцев. Тогда говорил один русский, по имени Терентий: пришло теперь время, чтобы вы все умерли от нашей руки” [Lukin 2014: 409].

Second, the spelling of *Thyrentekey* is unique if we compare it with other attestations of the same name in Hanseatic documents: *Tyrentey*, *Terentey*, *Terentejen*, *Terente(n)*, *Terenteen*, *Therenti*, *Therotheren*.⁵ It seems that *-key* in *Thyrentekey* represents some sort of addition to the basic name. In fact, final *-kej* may be identified with the nickname (*Terentij*) *Koj* as attested in the birchbark list.⁶ According to Vasil'ev [2005: 144], *Koj* can be connected to Proto-Slavic **kojiti* ‘to calm, to silence’ (cf. Russian *počit'*, *pokoj*, etc., as well as the personal names *Koj* in Old Czech, *Koya* in Old Polish, *Kojić* in Serbian, *Kojka* in Bulgarian, etc.). The unexpected spelling *-e-* in *-kej* instead of *-o-* in *Koj* can be corroborated by other examples in Hanseatic documents; for instance,

⁴ See also [Schaeken 2017b], with comments on the specific meaning of two lexemes, *čator* and *bljudo*, which occur in the birchbark list.

⁵ See for instance the Middle Low German and Latin Hanseatic documents from the years 1286 (*Tyrentey Rutenus*; see [Goetz 1916: 147], 1345 (*Terentey*; [LUB 2: 385]); 1392 (*Terentejen*; [LUB 3: 693]); 1392, 1396, and 1550 (*Terente(n)*; [Ibid.: 693]; [GVNP 1949: 83]; [RLU 1868: 375]); 1392 (*Terenteen*; LUB 3: 695); 1392 (*Therenti*; [LUB 3: 694]); 1423 (*Therotheren*; [GVNP 1949: 103]).

⁶ Elsewhere on birchbark we find the name *Terentij* in № 69 (ca. 1280–1300; [DND 2004: 512–514]), № 1064 (second half of the thirteenth century; [Gippius and Zaliznjak 2016: 8]), and № 1097 and 1098 (two birchbarks from the fourteenth century, which were recently found in the 2017 excavation season; see the preliminary report by Zaliznjak and Sičinava [2017]).

in the text under discussion we find the same variation in *zyder* for Sidor (see [1] above).⁷ Incidentally, if we take a closer look at the original we see that the scribe experienced some difficulty in writing down the name. He first left out the syllable *-te-* between *Tyren-* and *-key* and inserted it afterwards above the word: *Thyrē^ekey* (*ē* = *en* according to medieval spelling conventions); this may indicate that he was not very familiar with the unusual name.

Finally, I would like to return to Lukin's observation, according to which *Thyrentekey* might be the same person as Terentij Danilovič, who appears twice in the First Novgorod Chronicle, together with Danil Maškovič (1333) and Matfej Kozka (1340). This first person was a boyar whose family, the Maškovy, must have lived on St. Elijah's Street (*Il'ina ulica*) on the Trade Side of the city [Janin 1981: 55, fn. 12]. It remains a matter of speculation whether Terentij's companion, Danil Maškovič, was somehow connected to Maksim Maškov, who figures in the last entry of the birchbark list № 261–264: “От Максима Машкова 5 (блюд), сафьян.” The same holds for the eighth entry where we read the name Jakun: “От жены Якуна, Фоминой снохи, 3 (блюда),” it might be pure coincidence that the same name appears in our Hanseatic document (*jacone symonen sone*; see [6] above).

In sum, if our *Thyrentekey* in the Hanseatic document (1331) can be identified with Terentij Danilovič in the First Novgorod Chronicle (1333 and 1340), and with Terentij Koj on birchbark (ca. 1360–1380), it is quite plausible that he must have been around 20–30 years in the late 1320s, hence of the same young age as Ivan Syp, and of the same age as Ivan's widow at the moment of his mention in birchbark document № 261–264, let's say 60–70 years old.

3. The Hanseatic document from the years 1311–1335: *Isti sunt viri qui proditi sunt. . .*

The next Hanseatic document is more obscure than the one discussed in the previous section. It is kept in Moscow in the Russian State Archive of Early Acts (RGADA, f. 1490, op. 1, no. 21).⁸ The text is written in Latin on three parchment sheets and was included several times in nineteenth-century collections of Hanseatic documents.⁹ Editions are provided in Sartorius and Lappenberg

⁷ See also for instance in the Hanseatic document from the year 1392 *Cidere(n)* for Sidor and *Iwanewitz/Ywanewitze* for Ivanovič [LUB 3: 693–694]. Besides *e-o* variation, we also encounter *e-a* variation in the rendition of Russian names, such as *Cidaren* for Sidor (in the same document; [Ibid.: 695] or *eren boyernen Jowanen* (“своего боярина Иоанна”) in [2] above).

⁸ *Olim* Archiv der Hansestadt Lübeck, Urkunden, Externa, Ruthenica, no. 18.

⁹ For an extensive overview see the website of the Lübeck City Archive: *Lübeck City Archive* (<http://www.stadtarchiv-luebeck.findbuch.net>; last access on: 06.06.2018) (> “07 Urkunden, Testamente, Kassenbriefe” > “07.1-3/25 - Russland (Ruthenica); Kontor zu Novgorod” > “Ruthenica 18”).

[1830: 156–161] and in *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck* [LübUB 2/1: 565–569]. As far as I know, later references are sparse and marginal.¹⁰

The document is dated 1335, after June 4, on the basis of two identical notes in the manuscript, at the end of the second and third sheet: *Hanc litteram dominus Hinricus de Bocholte tulit de Nogard(ia) anno MCCCXXXV, post Penthecosten* (“Sir Heinrich of Bocholt brought this document from Novgorod in the year 1335, after Pentecost”).¹¹ The main body of the text consists of a list of goods, which were stolen by Russians from German merchants on their travels between Novgorod and Pskov in the years 1288–1311. Skvajrs and Ferdinand [2002: 160] speculate that the text must have been compiled shortly after 1311.

The main text can be found in three different versions (in different handwritings),¹² on the first, second and third parchment sheet (basically starting with *Hec dampna Theutonicis mercatoribus infra Nogardiam et Pleschow in bonis suis contingebant. . .*). On the other side of the second and third sheet we find two similar versions of further specifications regarding the nature of accusations made against the Russians (*Hij sunt articuli contra Ruthenos. . .*). It remains unclear what the purpose was of drawing up different versions of the same event.¹³

But what is most interesting in the light of the present article is a supplementary note of ten lines on the back of the first sheet, which contains a list of names, designations, and specific locations of people from Novgorod and Pskov. The note is included in the edition of Sartorius and Lappenberg, who comment on the bad condition of this part of the manuscript: “fast ganz verlöscht, meist entstellte Nahmen und kaum lesbar” [1830: 161]. *Liv-, esth- und curländisches Urkundenbuch* [6: 44] only gives the beginning of the text and notes that the names are of no particular interest (“von keinem besonderem Interesse”). This is far from true. The relation between the note and the main text remains enigmatic,¹⁴ including the dating; perhaps the supplement may also have been compiled shortly after 1311, or later, somewhere before 1335. Nevertheless, it is significant in its own right, because it contributes to our knowledge and understanding of the people and their social networks in the medieval Novgorodian lands.

The following edition of the supplement is based on [Sartorius and Lappenberg 1830: 161; LübUB 2/1: 567, fn. 15], and my own inspection of the

¹⁰ Cf., e. g., [Skvajrs and Ferdinand 2002: 159–160; Squires 2009: 58, 70, 90, 220].

¹¹ Cf. [LUB 6: 44]: “von dem Lübeck’schen Rathsherrn *H. von Bocholt* nach Pffingsten 1335 aus Nowgorod mitgebracht”.

¹² See [LübUB 2/1: 569] for paleographic details.

¹³ Cf. the conjectures in [Sartorius and Lappenberg 1830: 156, fn. 1].

¹⁴ See [HUB 2: 78], with reference to [LübUB 2/1: 567, fn. 15]: “auf der Rückseite des Blatts Namen ‘verrathener’ Russen, die in diesem Zusammenhange nicht unterzubringen sind.”

original. The first entry ([1]) was also published in [LUB 6: 44] and has been taken into account as well.

Table 2

Supplement on the first sheet of the 1311–1335 document			
[1]	Isti sunt viri qui proditi fuerunt a proprio seruo qui drelle in vulgo dicitur veraciter ² in ante quam suspenderetur et fuit de villa sla[n/u]kauice ³		
[2]	primus dicitur dymiter rospope.	[17]	Item poppe de sla[n/u]kauis ex villa abraham.
[3]	Item stepan sistnich.	[18]	filiu clericu cuseman.
[4]	Item manul.	[19]	Item petrus filius. symeonis.
[5]	Item jurie	[20]	Item cuzma [my]de.
[6]	Item ro[g/z]be[n/u].	[21]	Item sydile.
[7]	Item essip cusila[m/ni/ui]s.	[22]	Item domaz.
[8]	Item gleba dimit[ini/riu/rui]s.	[23]	Item kanan duo fratres.
[9]	Item ywan posudnich.	[24]	Item foma vter strate. Item rouaz vlich[se]. ⁴
[10]	Item yvt[um] micula ex uilla regina de plescowe	[25]	Item cusa[m]a kalikenis.
[11]	paulus de villa conradi.	[26]	Item stepan copuil vter strate cusma demian vlychse
[12]	Item ratimer de plescowe.	[27]	symon filius klementis vter state rogatece
[13]	Item [f]ere [m]echdonie.	[28]	jone filius gleben.
[14]	Item vechsen barde.	[29]	yvan posudnich
[15]	Item jurien knegse:	[30]	allochsa de dj[mini]ssa
[16]	Item misinich.	[31]	Item cusile ex villa regina cum pueris suis

First of all, it should be noted that the transcription above can only be tentative. In several instances, an exact reading of the text is impossible because it is not clear which specific word is implied. This is especially the case regarding the distinction between *n*, *u* and *v*, and the interpretation of *m*, which might also be read as *ni*, *ui* or *vi*.¹⁵ Ambiguous readings have been placed between square brackets; for instance, *cusila[m/ni/ui]s* in [7] might be read as *cusilams* (as in [Sartorius and Lappenberg 1830: 161; LübUB 2/1: 567, fn. 15]), but also as *cusilauis* (as suggested below). A correct interpretation of the text is all the more difficult

¹⁵ Note the scribe's inconsistent use of an accent mark to distinguish the letter *i* (*i*); see, e.g., *misinich* in [16], with an accent mark only on the first *i*.

because the scribe obviously had little understanding of the Russian words he was copying. He must have been a German considering the Middle Low German words he uses in [1] (*drelle* as a translation of Latin *servus*) and in [24], [26] and [27] (*vter strate* as a translation of Russian *ulica*); see further below.

The first sentence ([1]) is an explanation of the list of names in the remainder of the text: “These are the men, who were betrayed (*proditii fuerunt*) by their own slave (*a proprio seruo*), who is called *drelle* in the vernacular (*in vulgo*), truthfully,¹⁶ before he would have been hanged (*suspenderetur*), and he was from the village/estate (*de villa*) *sla[n/u]kauice*.” Since we have no further context or any other relevant historical sources, it is impossible to reconstruct the specific course of events. It looks as if the scribe wanted to make clear to his fellow countrymen in their own language that the ‘servus’ in question was a *drelle*, which is a translation of Old Russian *xolop* ‘(dependent) serf’; perhaps he wanted to avoid a misinterpretation of ‘servus’ as *rab* ‘slave’? The word *drelle* in a medieval Russian context is attested in another Hanseatic document (1268/1269), which mentions the place *Dhrelleborch*, i. e. *Xolopij gorodok*, located near Novgorod.¹⁷ The toponym *sla[n/u]kauice*, where the *drelle* came from, cannot be identified with certainty. As far as I was able to find out, there is a place called *Slavkoviči* near Pskov, which is mentioned by Vasil’ev [2005: 345]; a possible identification would imply the conjecture *slauk(o)uice* for *sla[n/u]kauice*.¹⁸

Let us now take a look at the list of names, designations and locations. Most of the personal names are well known: *Dmitrij/Dmitr* in [2], *Stepan* in [3] and [26], *Manu(i)l* in [4], *Jurij* in [5] and [15], *Esip* in [7], *Gleb* in [8] and [28], *Ivan* in [9] and [29], *Mikula* in [10], *Pavel* and *Konrad* in [11], *Ratъmir* in [12], *Barda* in [14] [see Tupikov 1903: 40; Vasil’ev 2005: 358], *Avram* in [17], *Kuzьma* in [18],¹⁹ [20] and [25], *Petr* in [19], *Sim(e)on* in [19] and [27], *Sudil* in [21],²⁰ *Kanan* in [23],²¹ *Foma* in [24], *Klement* in [27]. In addition, *allochsa* in [30]

¹⁶ Obviously, the qualification “truthfully” refers to the testimony of the slave.

¹⁷ See [HUB 1: 230; Goetz 1916: 112]; cf. also [Skvajrs and Ferdinand 2002: 121; Squires 2009: 25].

¹⁸ Another possible identification, as suggested by M. A. Bobrik (p.c.), is *Slavenskij konec* (*Slavno*), located to the south of the Trade Side of the city of Novgorod. This alternative interpretation is far removed from the original spelling *sla[n/u]kauice*, but not entirely implausible considering the corrupt state of the transcription of Russian names and designations.

¹⁹ *Cuseman* for *Kuzьma*: cf. similar spellings in other Middle Low German and Latin Hanseatic documents, e. g., *Cusemann(um)* [HUB 1: 379] and *Kuseman* [RLU 1868: 135, 145–147].

²⁰ Cf. *Sudilъ* in birchbark letter № 121a [DND 2004: 275]; note that the word has a question mark in the glossary on p. 803), but also variants of the type *Sudilo* in the First Novgorod Chronicle (the *posadnik* *Sudilo Ivankovič*; see [Janin 2003: 509] and *Sъdilъ*, *Sъdila*, *Sъdyla* in other birchbark documents [DND 2004: 795–796; NGB 12: 187].

²¹ Cf. the names *Kanan* and *Konon* in two Old Russian documents from the beginning of the fifteenth century [DND 2004: 687, 692].

might well be *Alëksa (Oleksa)*; *cusile* in [31] is perhaps *Kuzilo/Kuzila*;²² and *domaz* in [22] could be read as *Domaš* [see Vasil'ev 2005: 299]. Other words, which are probably also names, are far from clear: *jone* in [28] (*Ioann?*), *vechsen* in [14] (*Уець?*),²³ *ro[g/z]be[n/u]* in [6] (connected with *Rox?*),²⁴ and *fere* in [13] (*fe(de)re = Fedor?*).

The situation becomes more difficult with regard to the interpretation of further designations accompanying these names:

- *Dmitrij/Dmitr* in [2] is apparently a defrocked priest (*Rospop*). The name of the priest in [17] is not mentioned; he is simply called *Pop*.
- *Stepan* in [3] might have been called *Šestnik* or perhaps even was a *šestnik*,²⁵ whereas the *Stepan* in [26] is further named *Kopyl* [see Tupikov 1903: 195].
- *Esip* in [7] could be *Esip Kuzil(o)vič* if we read *cusilauis* (cf. *cusile* in [31]).
- *Gleb* in [8] could be *Gleb Dmitr(ie)vič* if we read *dimitruis*.
- *Ivan* is identified twice as *posudnich*, in [9] and [29], and seems to be the same person, who perhaps was a *pos(a)dničij (čelovek)* or an (unknown) *pos(a)dnik*.
- *Kuzьma* in [25] is apparently *Kuzьma Kalikenič*.²⁶
- Further identification of *Kuzьma* in [20] as [*my*]*de* is unclear (*Mude?*).²⁷
- Unclear is also *de dj[mini]ssa* in [30]: Latin *de* 'from' (?), followed by a toponym (?), perhaps something like *Diminiči*?²⁸
- Equally mysterious is the designation [*m*]*echdonie* in [13].
- A very speculative interpretation of (*jurien*) *knegse* in [15] might be *knjazь* or *knjažij (čelovek)*, parallel to *posadnik* and *pos(a)dničij (čelovek)* as

²² This was suggested by A. A. Gippius (p.c.), who also points to the toponym *Kuzilovo* in the Yaroslavl Oblast. An alternative reading of *cusile* might be *Kozel* (cf. [Tupikov 1903: 187]; also attested in birchbark letter № 410, [DND 2004: 508–509], which, however, seems less plausible because of the deviating spelling (*cu-*, not *co-*, and esp. *-sil-* instead of *-sel-*).

²³ Cf. the spelling *vechsen* = *Уець* (?) and *vlich[se]/vlychse* = *ulica* in [24] and [26]. The name *Uець* is attested in birchbark letters № 1046 and 1047 [NGB 12: 147–149].

²⁴ Cf. the name *Rox* in birchbark letter № 610 [DND 2004: 571]; also *Rox*, *Roško* in [Tupikov 1903: 339] and [Vasil'ev 2005: 221–222]. As an alternative interpretation, as suggested by A. A. Gippius (p.c.), the word might be a distortion (*rogb-* instead of *gorb-*) of the name *Gorbень/Gorbany/Gorbunъ* (cf. [Tupikov 1903: 113–114]).

²⁵ This was suggested by A. A. Gippius (p.c.); the meaning of the social term *šestnik* is unclear (see [DND 2004: 669]).

²⁶ Cf. the village *Kalikiniči* and the personal name *Kalika* [Vasil'ev 2005: 273], which is also attested in birchbark letter № 917 [DND 2004: 641].

²⁷ Cf. *Mudo* as recorded as a nickname of a certain Ivanko Elizar'ev in [RIB 1912: 352]. I owe this reference to M. A. Bobrik (p.c.). A similar form ending in *-e*, like in [*my*]*de*, might point to a dual form.

²⁸ Cf. the toponym *Diminiči* in the Kaliningrad and Kaluga Oblast.

suggested above for [9] and [29].²⁹ We know of a *knjazь Jurij* in the period the list may have been compiled; between 1316 until his death in 1325, there was a Jurij Danilovič, Prince of Novgorod [see Janin 2003: 247, 263; Stepanov 2007]. However, if we would combine [15] with the next entry, which says *misinich*, we might also think of another public figure, namely Jurij Mišinič, a prominent member of the leading Mišiniči boyar clan in Novgorod (*Nerevskij konec*), who served as *posadnik* from 1291 until his death in 1316 [see Janin 2003: 252–253, 511; DND 2004: 511].

Finally, in a number of instances the list tells us more about the places associated with the individual names:

- In [10] we read that (*yvt[um]?*) *Mikula* is *ex uilla regina de plescowe*, which is obviously the city of Pskov. Pskov is also mentioned in [12], but now without the specification *villa regina*, which might point to the region (principality) rather than the city. In [31] we find *villa regina* for the second time: “*Kuzilo/Kuzila (?)* from the city together with his children.” The city is not indicated, which probably means that we are dealing with the metropolis of the region, Novgorod.³⁰

- We already discussed *de villa sla[n/u]kauice* in [1], which reappears in [17] as *de sla[n/u]kauis* with the addition *ex villa abraham*. Apparently, *villa* (without *regina*) should be understood as ‘village’ or ‘estate’. The word is also attested in [11]: “*Pavel* from the village/estate of *Konrad*.”

- It is clear that *vter strate* in [24] and [26], and *vter state* in [27], should be read as Middle Low German ‘from the street’, especially in view of *vlich[se]* in [24] and *vlychse* in [26], which undoubtedly should be interpreted as *ulica*. The streets mentioned in the three entries are all located in Novgorod: *rouaz vlich[se]* in [24] is *Rozvažā ulica* in the *Nerevskij konec* on the Sophia Side of the city. Only one street further on, in the same *konec*, we find *cusma demian vlychse* [26], i.e. *Kozmodemjanskaja ulica*. This means that *Foma* [24] and *Stepan Kopyl* [26] must have lived very nearby. *Sim(e)on*, the son of *Klement* [27], lived elsewhere in town, in the street *rogatece*, i. e. *Rogatica*, in the *Plotnickij konec* on the Trade Side of the city.³¹

Whereas it is not possible to establish the identity of the neighbours *Foma* and *Stepan Kopyl*, there is good reason to assume that *Sim(e)on*, the son of *Klement* [27], is the same person as the *posadnik* Semen Klimovič, who held office between 1292 and 1316, roughly in the same period as Jurij Mišinič (see

²⁹ Cf. spellings such as *knese*, *knesa*, *knesz*, *knessz* for *knjazь* in other Hanseatic documents. I was unable to find a spelling of the word that includes the letter *g* (*knege*) or, similarly, *j* (*knejse*).

³⁰ In the corpus of birchbark texts, the city of Novgorod is usually simply referred to as *gorod*.

³¹ See the street maps of medieval Novgorod in [Gordienko 2007, esp. pp. 460, 464].

above). The historical sources do not reveal the exact year of his death, which must have been somewhere after 1317 [see Janin 2003: 252–253, 260, 509; Xorošev 2007]. Semen not only appears several times in the First Novgorod Chronicle, but also in a Hanseatic document dated to the year 1301, where we also find his seal, which says *Smenova pečatъ Klimoviča* [RLU 1868: 24–25; GVNP 1949: 63; see also Janin 2003: 304].

It is interesting to note that Semen Klimovič was a member of a boyar family which is usually associated with the Prussian Street (*Prusskaja ulica*) [see Janin 2003: 242, 278, fn. 65; Lukin 2014: 343], on the other side of the city, on the Sophia side, not with the *Plotnickij konec* on the Trade Side, as recorded in our list of names. However, there is evidence of a strong coalition between the leadership of the Prussian Street and the *Plotnickij konec*, known as the *Prusko-plotnickaja bojarskaja gruppirovka* [see Janin 1991: 20; Idem 2003: 259, 401–402; Dubrovin 2010, Idem 2013]. Of course, we do not know the exact dwelling of Semen Klimovič, but the alliance between the two locations in the city may well have caused confusion on the part of the compiler of the list (or his informant).

4. Concluding remarks

The occurrence of the *posadnik* Semen Klimovič in the mysterious list of names presented in the previous section brings us back to the first Hanseatic account which was discussed in this paper. In the document from the year 1331, we encountered his son Jakun: *jacone symonen sone possatnicke*. It turned out that two seemingly unrelated Hanseatic documents from the early fourteenth century together shed further light on the identity and relationships of individuals in medieval Novgorod.

Novgorodians left behind marks of their existence in “domestic” writings, in the records of the chroniclers, in their testaments, their financial transactions, and many other official documents on parchment; in everyday correspondence on birchbark; as well as on church walls in Novgorod. At the same time, the names of some of these individuals have also survived in historical sources that testify to the relations of the city of Novgorod with the world ‘outside,’ with other principalities on East Slavic territory and far beyond, as an international hub for traders. Undoubtedly, Hanseatic documents are among the most prominent witnesses. There is a true wealth of evidence—in an unparalleled variety—that gives us the unique opportunity to further reconstruct comprehensive sets of social networks, and, ultimately, a full-fledged prosopography of medieval Novgorod.

Bibliography

DND 2004

Зализняк А. А., *Древненовгородский диалект. 2-е изд., переработанное с учетом материала находок 1995–2003 гг.*, Москва, 2004.

Dubrovin 2010

Дубровин Г. Е., “О боярстве Плотницкого конца средневекового Новгорода”, *Древняя Русь: Вопросы медиевистики*, 3 (41), 2010, 48–54.

——— 2013

Дубровин Г. Е., “Формирование Плотницкого конца и государственные реформы в Новгороде в середине–второй половине XIII в.”, *Древняя Русь: Вопросы медиевистики*, 1 (51), 2013, 41–53.

Franklin 2002

Franklin S., *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950–1300*, Cambridge, 2002.

Gippius and Zaliznjak 2016

Гиппиус А. А., Зализняк А. А., “Берестяные грамоты из новгородских раскопок 2015 г.”, *Вопросы языкознания*, 4, 2016, 7–17.

Goetz 1916

Goetz L. K., *Deutsch-russische Handelsverträge des Mittelalters*, Hamburg, 1916.

Gordienko 2007

Гордиенко Э. А., “Улицы Великого Новгорода в пределах Окольного города”, in: Янин В. Л. и др., ред., *Великий Новгород. История и культура IX–XVII веков. Энциклопедический словарь*, С.-Петербург, 2007, 459–465.

GVNP 1949

Грамоты Великого Новгорода и Пскова, Валк С. Н., ред., Москва, Ленинград, 1949.

HUB 1–11

Hansisches Urkundenbuch, K. Höhlbaum et al., eds., 1–11, Halle, 1876–1939.

Janin 1981

Янин В. Л., *Новгородская феодальная вотчина. Историко-генеалогическое исследование*, Москва, 1981.

——— 1991

Янин В. Л., *Новгородские акты XII–XV вв. Хронологический комментарий*, Москва, 1991.

——— 2003

Янин В. Л., *Новгородские посадники*, 2-е изд., Москва, 2003.

LUB 1–12

Liv-, esth- und curländisches Urkundenbuch nebst Regesten, Bunge F. G., von, et al., eds., 1–12, Reval etc., 1853–1910.

LübUB 1–11

Codex diplomaticus Lubecensis. Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck, 1–11, Lübeck, 1843–1932.

Lukin 2014

Лукин П. В., *Новгородское вече*, Москва, 2014.

NGB 12

Янин В. Л., Зализняк А. А., Гиппиус А. А., *Новгородские грамоты на бересте. Из раскопок 2001–2014 гг.*, Москва, 2015.

NPL 1950

Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов, Насонов А. Н., ред., Москва, Ленинград, 1950.

Polechov 2017

Polechov S. V., "Neue russische Quelleneditionen zu den altrussisch-livländischen Beziehungen," *Forschungen zur baltischen Geschichte*, 12, 2017, 11–59.

RIB 1912

Приходо-расходные книги московских приказов, 1 (= *Русская историческая библиотека*, 28), Москва, 1912.

RLU 1868

Russisch-Livländische Urkunden, Napiersky K. E., ed., St. Petersburg, 1868.

Sartorius and Lappenberg 1830

Sartorius G. F., Lappenberg J. M., *Urkundliche Geschichte des Ursprunges der deutschen Hanse*, 2, Hamburg, 1830.

Schaecken 2017a

Schaecken J., "Comments on birchbark documents found in the twenty-first century," *Russian Linguistics*, 41 (2), 2017, 123–149.

——— 2017b

Schaecken J., "What to give as wedding gifts in medieval Novgorod? On birchbark document nos. 261–264," in: Genis R., Haard E., de, Lučić R., eds., *Definitely Perfect. Festschrift for Janneke Kalsbeek*, Amsterdam, 2017, 557–567.

Skvajrs and Ferdinand 2002

Сквэйрс Е. Р., Фердинанд С. Н., *Ганза и Новгород. Языковые аспекты исторических контактов*, Москва, 2002.

Squires 2009

Squires C., *Die Hanse in Novgorod: Sprachkontakte des Mittelniederdeutschen mit dem Russischen. Mit einer Vergleichsstudie über die Hanse in England*, Köln; Weimar; Wien, 2009.

Stepanov 2007

Степанов А. М., "Юрий Данилович," in: Янин В. Л. и др., ред., *Великий Новгород. История и культура IX–XVII веков. Энциклопедический словарь*, С.-Петербург, 2007, 543–544.

Тупиков 1903

Тупиков Н. М., *Словарь древнерусских личных собственных имен*, С.-Петербург, 1903.

Vasil'ev 2005

Васильев В. Л., *Архаическая топонимика Новгородской земли (Древнеславянские деантропонимные образования)*, Великий Новгород, 2005.

Хорошев 2007

Хорошев А. С., "Семен Климович," in: Янин В. Л. и др., ред., *Великий Новгород. История и культура IX–XVII веков. Энциклопедический словарь*, С.-Петербург, 2007, 403.

Zaliznjak and Sičinava 2017

Зализняк А. А., Сичинава Д. В., "Новые открытия академика Зализняка в 2017 году (видео + текст лекции)," *Православие и мир. Электронное периодическое издание*, 24.12.2017 (<http://pravmir.ru>; последнее обращение: 27.06.2018).

References

Dubrovín G. E., "O boiarstve Plotnitskogo kontsa srednevekovogo Novgoroda," *Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki*, 2010, 3 (41), 48–54.

Dubrovín G. E., "Formirovanie Plotnitskogo kontsa i gosudarstvennye reformy v Novgorode v seredine–vtoroi polovine XIII v.," *Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki*, 1/51, 2013, 41–53.

Franklin S., *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950–1300*, Cambridge, 2002.

Gippius A. A., Zaliznjak A. A., "Berestianye gramoty iz novgorodskikh raskopok 2015 g.," *Voprosy iazykoznanii*, 4, 2016, 7–17.

Gordienko E. A., "Ulitsy Velikogo Novgoroda v predelakh Okol'nogo goroda," in: V. L. Yanin et al., eds.,

Velikii Novgorod. Istorii i kul'tura IX–XVII vekov. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', St. Petersburg, 2007, 459–465.

Khoroshev A. S., "Semen Klimovich," in: V. L. Yanin et al., eds., *Velikii Novgorod. Istorii i kul'tura IX–XVII vekov. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, St. Petersburg, 2007, 430.

Lukin P. V., *Novgorodskoe veche*, Moscow, 2014.

Polechov S. V., "Neue russische Quelleneditionen zu den altrussisch-livländischen Beziehungen." *Forschungen zur baltischen Geschichte*, 12, 2017, 11–59.

Schaeken J., "Comments on birchbark documents found in the twenty-first century," *Russian Linguistics*, 41/2, 2017, 123–149.

Schaeken J., "What to give as wedding gifts in medieval Novgorod? On birchbark document nos. 261–264," in: R. Genis, E. de Haard, R. Lučić, eds., *Definitely Perfect. Festschrift for Janneke Kalsbeek*, Amsterdam, 2017, 557–567.

Skvajrs E. R. [Squires C.], Ferdinand S. N., *The Hanse and Novgorod: linguistic aspects of the historical contacts*, Moscow, 2002.

Squires C., *Die Hanse in Novgorod: Sprachkontakte des Mittelniederdeutschen mit dem Russischen. Mit einer Vergleichsstudie über die Hanse in England, Köln–Weimar–Wien*, 2009.

Stepanov A. M., "Turii Danilovich," in: V. L. Yanin et al., eds., *Velikii Novgorod. Istorii i kul'tura IX–XVII vekov. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, St. Petersburg, 2007, 543–544.

Vasilev V. L., *Arkhaischeskaia toponimiia Novgorodskoi zemli (Drevneslavianskie deantroponimnye obrazovaniia)*, Velikii Novgorod, 2005.

Yanin V. L., *Novgorodskaiia feodal'naiia votchina (Istoriko-genealogicheskoe issledovanie)*, Moscow, 1981.

Yanin V. L., *Novgorodskie akty XII–XV vv. Khronologicheskii kommentarii*, Moscow, 1991.

Yanin V. L., *Novgorodskie posadniki*, 2nd ed., Moscow, 2003.

Yanin V. L., Zaliznyak A. A., Gippius A. A., *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste. Iz raskopok 2001–2014 gg.*, Moscow, 2015.

Zaliznyak A. A., *Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt. Vtoroe izdanie, pererabotannoe s uchetom materiala nakhodok 1995–2003 gg.*, Moscow, 2004.

Zaliznyak A. A., Sichinava D. V., "Novye otkrytiia akademika Zalizniaka v 2017 godu (video + tekst lektsii)," *Pravoslavie i mir. Elektronnoe periodicheskoe izdanie*, 24.12.2017 (<http://pravmir.ru>; last access on: 27.06.2018).

Prof. Dr. **Jos Schaeken**

Department of Russian and Eurasian Studies,

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics,

Faculty of Humanities,

Leiden University

P.O. Box 9515

2300 RA Leiden

Netherlands

j.schaeken@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Received January 2, 2018