

Sergei Bogatyrev (University College London)
Guest Editor

Introduction: A Printer on the Move

The present collection completes a joint project of University College London (UCL) and the British Library on the history of early Cyrillic printing.¹ It focuses on the figure of the printer Ivan Fedorov, who began his career in publishing in Moscow in 1564 and died in L'viv in late 1583. Working first in co-operation with his partner Petr Mstislavets and later alone, Ivan Fedorov printed almost exclusively religious texts plus some primers and reference aids to the Bible. Ivan Fedorov's magnum opus was the first full printed Bible in Church Slavonic that he published under the patronage of Prince Vasyl'-Kostiantyn Ostroz'kyi in Ostroh (then in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, now Ukraine) in 1581. The overwhelming majority of Ivan Fedorov's books are printed in Cyrillic characters, though he occasionally used Greek type.

Ivan Fedorov usually attracts the attention of academia and mass media in connections with various anniversaries of his editions. Our project followed this established path by organizing an international conference at the British Library, "Revisiting Ivan Fedorov's Legacy in Early Modern Europe," in the anniversary year of 2014.² The present collection includes selected papers from the conference and K.Iu. Erusalimskii's paper which was submitted after the conference. What is special about the project is that it celebrated not one, but two anniversaries in 2014: the 450th anniversary of the *Apostol* (Apostolos, Acts and Epistles), the first book Ivan Fedorov printed in Moscow in 1564, and the 440th anniversary of his L'viv Primer, the first book he published in the territory of modern Ukraine in 1574.

¹ The project was sponsored by UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies, the Centre for East European Language Based Area Studies, UCL European Institute, and UCL Centre for Early Modern Exchanges. The publication of this volume became possible thanks to Russell Martin who took an active interest in the project in his capacity of the editor-in-chief of *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*.

² Conference podcast: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HrHamrcb90Q>

There were several reasons for this dual celebration. In practical terms, the idea to mark two anniversaries was inspired by the excellent holdings of the British Library which has unique copies of both editions: the 1564 *Apostol* from the collection of the famous Russian impresario Serge Diaghilev and one of two known copies of the 1574 Primer. A digital publication of the 1574 Primer from the British Library has been prepared within the framework of the project and is available now in the public domain (for more details, see Ekaterina Rogatchevskaia's paper in the present volume).³

But there were also conceptual reasons to celebrate both anniversaries. Ivan Fedorov happened to work in several places that are now within the borders of modern Russia and Ukraine. After printing three editions in Moscow, Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets moved to Poland-Lithuania, where they worked under the patronage of the Ruthenian magnate Hryhorii Khodkevych in Zabłudów (now in Poland). Having split with Petr Mstislavets, Ivan Fedorov continued printing books in L'viv and Ostroh (both in modern Ukraine). Ivan Fedorov's itinerary guaranteed him a place in the national memory of Russia and Ukraine. In both countries he became known as a pioneer of printing (in Belarusian national discourse this place is reserved for Francysk Skaryna). This reputation explains why anniversaries of Ivan Fedorov's editions are usually celebrated as national cultural events. Such national celebrations focus on Ivan Fedorov's editions printed in the territories of respective countries and marginalize other books that he published elsewhere.

A national perspective inevitably gives an anachronistic, fragmented and incomplete picture of early Cyrillic printing. Ivan Fedorov's activities were professional and confessional, not national. This is why the project strived to overcome the limits of national views by focusing on Ivan Fedorov's editions published in such different places as Moscow and L'viv. Like other early modern printers, Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets were in constant motion. The history

³ To access the edition, see <http://explore.bl.uk>, search for Primer 1574, choose "I want this" and "Digital item." The impact of the project also included updates for the public catalogues of the British Library and Cambridge University Library.

of their work is the history of the printers and their books transgressing political and ethno-cultural boundaries.

Hence the theme of a journey in the title of this collection. Exile and wandering are prominent topics in arguably the most personal text in Ivan Fedorov's editions, the colophon of the 1574 *Apostol*. A common subject in world culture, a journey motif can have different meanings. The most obvious is of course physical movement in space, from one locality to another. Jeremy Adelman reminds us that global history, which cheers cosmopolitans and border-crossing, should not ignore the power of place.⁴ The printers, who called themselves Ivan Fedorov from Moscow and Petr Mstislavets (of Mstislau/Mstislavl'), constructed their identities around localities, not nations or ethnic groups. They also indicated local place names in their editions. Papers in the present collection thus approach early Cyrillic printing both from global and local (one may say "glocal") perspectives. A journey can also be seen as professional development, a spiritual experience, a form of communication with other people or imagined travel within memory. This is why it is appropriate to speak about many different journeys of Ivan Fedorov and his books in space and time. Among the themes running through the volume are the work of Ivan Fedorov in different places, movement from one place to another, accommodation to new places and memories of previous localities, contacts and networks, the movement of printed books and texts, receptions of printing technology, and barriers in the transmission of printed material.

The collection opens with studies of textual, intellectual and historical factors that caused Ivan Fedorov to embark on a journey to printing. A deacon of the Kremlin church of St. Nicholas, Ivan Fedorov was obviously qualified to print devotional books, though his personal contribution to the texts of his editions remains a matter of controversy. In his paper Ralph Cleminson examines the text of the Acts and Epistles, which Ivan Fedorov reproduced four times, as separate editions in 1564 and 1574 and as part of the New Testament and the Bible,

⁴ Jeremy Adelman, "What Is Global History Now?" <https://aeon.co/essays/is-global-history-still-possible-or-has-it-had-its-moment> (accessed 5 March 2017).

respectively in 1580 and 1581. Cleminson is cautious about attributing the text of the 1564 *Apostol* to Ivan Fedorov because there is no evidence that the printer contributed to the revision of the text, even if he could have been able of doing that. Cleminson concludes that the editor of the 1564 text revised an earlier East Slavonic variant, with some revisions made on the basis of the Vulgate or a vernacular version derived from it. The editor therefore worked with Slavonic and West European texts, but nothing indicates that he consulted any Greek text. Cleminson's important observations suggest that Ivan Fedorov's self-identification as *typographus Graecus et Sclavonicus* should be interpreted as a reference to his professional ability to work with corresponding types rather than evidence of his involvement in editing Greek or Slavonic texts.

Natalia Bondar offers a broad and ambitious interpretation of the publishing activities of Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets. She argues that the printers had a publishing program aimed at printing books for schooling and devotional reading. The editions of Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets were intended for circulating outside the church, among school pupils and private persons. Bondar questions both the Russo-centric view that Russia disseminated the state-of-the-art technology of printing in Ukraine and Belarus and the views of those Ukrainian and Belarusian scholars who tend to downplay the contribution of Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets to early Cyrillic printing. According to Bondar, the printers should be credited for disseminating printed Cyrillic books across the huge territories of Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania, improving the technology of printing, and developing the graphic design, stylistics and structure of printed Cyrillic books.

Bondar puts the publishing activities of Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets in the context of early printing in Europe. Their mobile printing enterprise was highly reminiscent of the workshops of German and Italian printers who spread the printed book across Europe in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The publishing program of Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets was of a humanistic nature: their aspiration to enlighten the masses through introducing them to literacy and devotional reading was not dissimilar to the aims of such

Protestant movements as the French Huguenots, the Bohemian Hussites, the Polish Brethren and Protestant printing, like the Calvinist editions sponsored by Mikołaj Radziwiłł Czarny.

The high quality of Ivan Fedorov's and Petr Mstislavets' typographic work and design suggest that most of their books were carefully prepared for print in advance. However, there is little evidence about the work of the printers apart from their editions. According to Bondar, indirect evidence of the printers' involvement in the preparation of texts for publication can be found in the watermarks of their books. The watermarks of early printed Cyrillic books are yet to be properly studied, despite the existence of some excellent, primarily Ukrainian catalogues of filigranes. A leading specialist in the watermarks of early printed editions, Bondar attributes to the printers the internal structure of some early editions. The use of various batches of paper with different watermarks in the same edition may also indicate that the printers and their patrons bought paper on a matching contribution basis. For Bondar, Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets were world citizens, true Renaissance men, polymaths who excelled in textual work, metal processing, the design and production of metal printing type, book design and illustrations.

A.S. Usachev provides a local prospective on early printing in Moscow. Most scholars agree that so-called anonymous press operated in Moscow before Ivan Fedorov. That press published several liturgical books without indicating the place and exact date of those publications in the 1550s (Bondar, however, questions the Muscovite origin of these anonymous editions). The colophon of the *Apostol* printed by Ivan Fedorov in 1564 links the introduction of printing with concerns about the unification of liturgical books in Muscovy (such concerns were also voiced at the Stoglav church council in 1551) and the need to supply the newly annexed territory of Kazan with Orthodox books. These explanations for establishing press in Moscow have been generally accepted in the historiography. Usachev also agrees with the idea about standardizing church book as a reason for introducing printing in Moscow. However, he questions the above-mentioned assertion about Kazan. Usachev notes that the

Muscovite court sought to obtain experts in printing from abroad in the late 1540s, i.e. before the 1551 Stoglav and the conquest of Kazan in 1552. Usachev correlates these early attempts to organise printing with the loss of books during the 1547 fire of Moscow, subsequent extensive copying of hand-written books in the capital and the work of the above-mentioned anonymous press. Notations in the anonymous editions testify to their circulation in Moscow, while the number of printed books in Kazan was negligibly small. Usachev concludes that the 1547 fire of Moscow was a major catalyst for establishing the anonymous press in Moscow in the 1550s. At the same time, the colophon of the 1564 *Apostol* reflects later efforts to Christianize the population of Kazan after the establishment of the Kazan archbishopric in 1555.

Printers heavily relied on extensive networks of patrons, editors, contributors, illustrators, paper suppliers, readers and owners of printed books. During his journeys Ivan Fedorov had to recreate such networks every time he parted with familiar entourage and moved to a new place. The most important part of networking was securing patronage. Why did Ivan Fedorov and Petr Mstislavets leave their Muscovite patrons and entered into contacts with various patrons in Poland-Lithuania? The patronage of early Cyrillic printing has received very little attention from the scholars. Two contributions address this subject by examining the dynamics of Ivan Fedorov's contacts with his patrons.

My paper on the patronage of early printing in Muscovy examines the reasons for the printers' departure from Moscow in a larger context of Muscovite attitudes to press. Scholars too readily accepted tendentious sources, including Ivan Fedorov's colophons, which claim that his work in Moscow was suppressed by conservative clerics. In fact, the tsar's court and the Orthodox church interacted with printed material in a variety of ways. Formal and historical analysis of Ivan Fedorov's colophons indicates that there was no single view of printing among the Muscovite elite despite the centralization of printing in Moscow. Individual high-ranking patrons had different attitudes towards the press depending on their social status, different types of literacy and cultural priorities. By re-examining existing views about Ivan IV's literacy and his

library, I argue that the tsar funded the press because he benefitted from the patronage of printing as a ruler and as a believer: printed devotional books projected his image of royal protector of Orthodoxy and served as an instrument of personal salvation.

The printers' fortune depended primarily on their relations with clerical patrons, i.e. metropolitans, to whom Ivan Fedorov was administratively subordinated as a deacon. He printed his Muscovite editions under Metropolitan Afanasii. Unlike his predecessor Metropolitan Makarii, who was a patron of the anonymous press, Afanasii encouraged creative engagement with printed text. He was also interested in printing as a tool for consolidating his position on the metropolitan's see. Afanasii's cultural initiatives attracted different teams of printers, something which resulted in an oversupply of printing expertise on the limited market of printed books in Moscow in the mid-1560s. The declining quality of Ivan Fedorov's and Petr Mstislavets' editions resulted in Afanasii terminating his relations with the printers. They had no option but to leave for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In the colophons of his Muscovite and Ruthenian editions published after the 1564 *Apostol*, Ivan Fedorov created self-serving accounts of early printing in Moscow.

V.I. Ul'ianovs'kyi studies another type of patronage in Cyrillic printing, that of a learned Ruthenian magnate. Ul'ianovs'kyi's paper examines the relationship between Ivan Fedorov and Prince Vasyl'-Kostiantyn Ostroz'kyi (of Ostroh) by focusing on the latter's cultural priorities and strategies. Ul'ianovs'kyi, who authored a biography of V.-K. Ostroz'kyi, notes that the magnate's financial investment in the press suggests that printing was of special significance to him. The patronage of Orthodox printing enabled V.-K. Ostroz'kyi to come across as successor to his father Kostiantyn Ivanovych, who occupied a prominent position in the Ruthenian Orthodox community. V.-K. Ostroz'kyi's cultural work focused on publishing the full Bible in Church Slavonic. Ul'ianovs'kyi puts this project in the context of other similar initiatives in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania aimed at producing full Bibles for various confessions, including Symon Budny's publications of the New Testament (1570, 1574) and the full Polish Bible

(1572) as well as the 1563 edition of the Calvinist Bible sponsored by Mikołaj Radziwiłł Czarny, then V.-K. Ostroz'kyi's patron at court.

At the same time, the local Orthodox church had neither economic resources nor political will to publish the full Orthodox Bible. Printing the full Bible was also beyond the capacities of other Orthodox presses operating in the Grand Duchy. This is why, according to Ul'ianovs'kyi, the focus of V.-K. Ostroz'kyi's Bible project was local. In other words, the Ostroh Bible was intended for the Orthodox in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, not for the entire Pax Orthodoxa. Ul'ianovs'kyi doubts that the idea of publishing the full Bible came from Ivan Fedorov or Prince A.M. Kurbskii (on the latter, see below). On the contrary, it was V.-K. Ostroz'kyi who played a leading part in the work of the Ostroh press. Apart from providing funding, the magnate also selected manuscripts for publication. Still, scholars may have assigned to V.-K. Ostroz'kyi's publishing activities more importance than he did himself, because as a magnate he was primarily concerned about glorifying his clan, augmenting his land property and exercising power politics.

K.Iu. Erusalimskii continues the theme of contacts among the Orthodox literati by looking at the intricate network of printers, learned Ruthenian Orthodox and cultured Muscovite emigrants in Poland-Lithuania. Erusalimskii's paper deals with books owned by the Muscovite emigrant Prince A.M. Kurbskii. This topic is important in the context of a larger problem of Kurbskii's engagement with book culture, because some scholars have argued that there is no contemporary evidence that Kurbskii owned any books. In his paper Erusalimskii provides a close analysis of contemporary sources about Kurbskii's books, first of all an official record about his stolen property in 1575, including an expensive *Apostol*. Erusalimskii discusses what *Apostol* this could have been. Possible options include one of Ivan Fedorov's printed editions or their hand-written copies; the Vilnius edition of Francysk Skaryna (1525) or a hand-written *Apostol* with commentaries which may have been compiled in Kurbskii's circle. Bound by friendship and kinship, mutual support, and interest in devotional literature, members of Kurbskii's circle exchanged hand-written and printed books.

Whatever *Apostol* was in Kurbskii's possession, the book exchange within his network of literati was apparently much more intensive than the rare surviving sources suggest.

Ivan Fedorov's dynamic and sometimes uneasy relations with patrons caused him to move between different centres of Orthodox culture. His mobility helped him secure printing jobs, finances, intellectual resources and spiritual support. However, Ivan Fedorov's activities did not result in a flood of printed books in Muscovy. The small number of titles printed in Muscovy too often prompts scholars to see the history of early Cyrillic printing as nothing more than a failure to engage the progressive technology. Alexander Filyushkin and Simon Franklin go beyond this simplistic model by taking a closer look at the complex attitude of cultured Muscovites to the printed book.

Filyushkin approaches this problem from the perspective of a communication revolution that took place in the West in the sixteenth century. That period saw a dramatic expansion in the readership of letters written by merchants, aristocracy and officials. Such letters, which were often copied and read publicly, became an essential source of economic and political news. Correspondence thus brought together senders, recipients and readers who formed information networks across Europe. The invention of press intensified this information exchange that resulted in the growing number of leaflets and newspapers and the increasing diversity of printed editions published in the West. It was communication that held Europe together despite political and religious divides. The communication revolution stimulated people's awareness of the other and therefore contributed to political pluralism and democracy.

At the same time, Muscovite epistles reveal very little interest in political news. According to Filyushkin, contrary to Western political pluralism, the Muscovite political system was of a monolithic character. Russian society was bound by the government and the church. The ruling circles were the main source of information consumed by society. Information generated within society or received from abroad was deemed insignificant. Correspondingly, printing

served the needs of the church and the state rather than disseminated news or stimulated information exchange. This explains why there was nothing like printed *Flugschriften* or newspapers in Russia all the way through the eighteenth century. The closest Muscovite thing to this type of media, manuscript Russian digests (*vesti-kuranty*) of Western newspapers were intended exclusively for the tsar and court elite, whereas the main consumers of Western *avvisi* (hand-written newsletters) were merchants and townspeople. The main reason for different perceptions of printed media in Europe and Muscovy was not alleged technological backwardness, but the lack of public demand for information in Russia.

Muscovite responses to printing are also the subject of Simon Franklin's paper. He notes that these responses were usually asymmetrical in one way or another. One type of asymmetry between Muscovite and Western engagements with the technology of print was different pace in the dissemination of printed matters in Europe and in Muscovy as discussed by Filyushkin. But there were other types too. Among them is the mismatch between local printing, which started in the 1550s, and Muscovy's awareness of the technology of printing, which goes back as far as the Gennadii Bible of 1499, parts of which were translated from printed Latin books. Muscovite contacts with the technology of printing included not only import of printed materials, but also direct contact with people who were involved in printing in Western Europe, for example, Bartholomaeus Ghotan and Maksim Grek. The latter even provided an account of printing in Venice to his Muscovite friend. However, neither the presence of printed books in Muscovy nor information about printing in the West generated any discussion of the technology itself among Muscovites before the middle of the seventeenth century. The only sixteenth-century Muscovite (apart from printers themselves) to react to stories about Western printing was Kurbskii, who, as Erusalimskii argues, was exposed to the culture of printed books in Poland-Lithuania.

The third type of asymmetry involved reverse technology transfer: according to Franklin, "the stimulus or input was West European and printed, but the local product or output reverted to manuscript." Franklin focuses on technological

reversal in three areas: medical knowledge, newspapers and biblical illustrations. In all these spheres Muscovites recycled Western print-based information (both textual and visual) into a manuscript form: Western physicians at the tsar's service prepared handwritten recipes, reports and handbooks of pharmacological advice on the basis of printed Latin books; the above-mentioned *vesti-kuranty* contained manuscript summaries of printed Western newspapers; biblical illustrations from printed Western picture-Bibles widely circulated in Muscovy in the form of images or manuscripts. Muscovites, however, failed to imitate the genre of albums of printed biblical illustrations. Franklin explains the lack of such a genre in Muscovite printing in terms of cultural filters operating in Muscovite culture: for a long time, there was no genre of a full printed Bible in Muscovy, hence no need in full albums of printed biblical images. He concludes that Muscovite engagement with print was not similar to the journey of the printed book in the West. Rather, it was a journey in a different direction.

The travels of printed books have also attracted Ekaterina Rogatchevskaia's attention. Her paper examines the reception of Ivan Fedorov's editions by collectors and librarians. Rogatchevskaia's contribution focuses on the provenance of the 1564 *Apostol* and the 1574 Primer from the holdings of the British Library. She puts this subject in a broader theoretical framework of provenance research by discussing how the cultural status of the former owner of a collection interplays with the collection's integrity, usability and uniqueness. It is against this background that Rogatchevskaia discusses Sotheby's 1975 auction in Monaco, where the British Library acquired over 70 rare Russian books and manuscripts, including Ivan Fedorov's *Apostol* (1564), previously owned by the famous Russian ballet impresario and art critic Serge Diaghilev (1872-1929).

A key figure in the Russian art world, Diaghilev had good connections with the Imperial family. He capitalized on the Russian government's aspiration to promote a positive image of the country abroad, especially in France, as Russia heavily relied on French loans. With the support of Imperial subsidies, Diaghilev organized in Paris a series of high-profile cultural events which introduced Russian art, music and opera to the Western audience starting from 1906. After Nicholas II suddenly stopped funding

Diaghilev's projects in 1909, he gathered a ballet company which later became known as the Ballets Russes. The company was itinerant, visiting in the following 20 years of its existence Europe, the USA, Canada and South America. Diaghilev himself turned into a wanderer who was moving back and forth between Paris and St. Petersburg before leaving his homeland for good in 1914.⁵ Accidentally, Ivan Fedorov's and Serge Diaghilev's cultural initiatives had much in common. They took off with the support of the Russian tsar's funding, which, however, quickly evaporated. Both entrepreneurs had no choice but to leave Russia embarking on a constant journey in search for new patrons and contracts.

As Rogatchevskaia notes, Diaghilev's nomadic lifestyle also stimulated his interest in book collecting. He started assembling his collection in the mid-1920s when he realized that he stood no chance of returning to Soviet Russia and began identifying himself with the Russian émigré community. Rogatchevskaia questions the assertion that book collecting is always defined by national boundaries, but acknowledges that bibliophiles usually focus their interest on their national book culture. In this respect it is typical that in the mid-1920s Russian emigrants saw Russian book-related activities as an important part of their cultural and historical mission. In her paper Rogatchevskaia traces the history of Ivan Fedorov's editions collected by Diaghilev and their subsequent acquisition by various individuals and institutions through a network of international book dealers and antiquarians. A re-examination of the 1564 *Apostol* from Diaghilev's collection has revealed new facts relating to the circulation of that copy in Muscovy (see my Coda).

* * *

Contributors to the volume question several established assumptions about early Cyrillic printing. One is technological determinism which assumes that the introduction of new printing technology automatically led to a cultural revolution. According to this view, societies that did not embrace the Western model of engagement with print were technologically backward, as evidenced by the small number of early editions printed in Cyrillic in comparison with the output of Western

⁵ This account of Diaghilev is based on Jane Pritchard, ed., *Diaghilev and the Golden Age of the Ballets Russes, 1909-1929* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010).

presses. Several papers in the volume demonstrate that the idea of technological backwardness is of little use for a student of early printing. Neither the chronological gap between Guttenberg and Ivan Fedorov nor the small number of Cyrillic titles printed before the eighteenth centuries explain the dynamics of early Cyrillic printing. Technology was only one aspect of early printing which also heavily depended on local cultural, religious and political traditions. In Muscovy, such peculiarities stimulated the selective perception of Western printed material and altered its original functions.

Still, different attitudes to press did not prevent the circulation of printed matters. Printing was a dynamic activity that was never confined to national boundaries. The networks of artisans, patrons and consumers facilitated the transfer of printing technology, expertise, texts and people across political borders. Institutional and private patronage in early Cyrillic printing worked very similarly to the mechanisms of patronage in other Eurasian societies.

Despite common themes outlined above, the present collection is anything but a choral symphony. No unanimity can be expected from papers covering such complex and diverse regions as Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania. Different papers employ different nomenclatures for describing various ethnic and cultural groups among local population, though imperial terms like Western Russian were deliberately avoided. There is more standardization in the use of multilingual place names, which appear in a form that reflects their present national jurisdiction, followed when necessary by forms in other languages in brackets. As for interpretations, the reader of the collection will find different opinions about Ivan Fedorov's contribution to the text of his editions, his colophons as a historical source, the printer's relationship with his patrons in Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania. Contributors also have different views about who initiated the publication of the Ostroh Bible and other editions sponsored by Ruthenian magnates. There is also a range of opinions about the impact of Muscovite institutions on the patronage and perception of printing. Thus, no contributor should be held responsible for opinions expressed in other parts of the collection, including this introduction.

This project was conceived as collaboration between British, Russian and Ukrainian scholars in a study of connections, influences and perceptions in early Cyrillic printing in 2013. In subsequent years the themes of mutual contacts and exchange became more relevant than ever for all the wrong reasons, including Putin's war against Ukraine and the triumph of xenophobia with Brexit in the UK and with the Trump regime in the USA. Ivan Fedorov's editions, which were printed in Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania despite ongoing war between the two countries, remind us of the endurance of cultural connections. His books have survived centuries of turmoil thanks to networks of readers, scholars, antiquarians, collectors and librarians. The journey of Ivan Fedorov continues.