It has been agreed that the Spring 2001 SEEMSG Meeting should be combined with the conference to be held in Cambridge on Saturday 28 April and Sunday 29 April 2001. The conference is entitled:

'Continuity and Change in Orthodox Christendom, c. 1204-1821: Identities in the Byzantine Commonwealth and After'

The papers of most direct interest to members of SEEMSG will be given on Saturday 28 April, but details of the Sunday papers are also listed below.

**PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME**

**SATURDAY 28 APRIL**

11.00 am  
REGISTRATION AND COFFEE  
Inner Parlour, Pembroke  
*(there is no registration fee)*

11.30 am  
Session one: Chair – Dr Simon Franklin *(Cambridge)*

Professor John Fine  
*(Michigan)*

‘Perceptions and identities in medieval Serbia and Bulgaria’

Dr Peter Lock  
*(College of Ripon and York St John, Leeds University)*

‘East meets West in late medieval Byzantium: a clash of identities’

12.45 pm  
LUNCH *(The Old Library, Pembroke)*

2.00 pm  
Session two: Chair – Dr David Holton *(Cambridge)*

Professor Michael Angold  
*(Edinburgh)*

‘1453 and the Orthodox identity’

Ms Gill Page  
*(College of Ripon and York St John, Leeds University)*

‘Formulations of group identity in medieval Greece, 1204-1350’

Professor Francis Thomson  
*(Antwerp)*

‘The Byzantine legacy in Ruthenia (Ukraine and Belorussia): Continuity and Collapse (15th to 17th centuries)’
PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME

SATURDAY 28 APRIL (continued)

4.00 pm  TEA (Inner Parlour, Pembroke)

4.30 pm  
Session three: Chair – Professor David Abulafia (Cambridge)

Dr Jana Howlett (Cambridge)  ‘Myths of Moscow’s Byzantine inheritance’

Professor Paschalis Kitromilides (Athens)  ‘Orthodox identities in a world of Ottoman power, c. 1650-1750’

7.00 pm  DRINKS

SUNDAY 29 APRIL

9.30 am  COFFEE (available throughout the morning)

10.00 am  
Session four: Chair – Professor Mark Mazower (Birkbeck College, London)

Professor Anthony Bryer (Birmingham)  ‘Lives and afterlives of two martyrs for Albania’

Dr Dimitris Livianios (Cambridge)  ‘Silent voices, eloquent silences: the Balkan peoples in the Greek historical imagination, 1602-1830’

Professor Richard Clogg (Oxford)  ‘Antiquity and Orthodoxy in the Greek World c. 1750-1821’

Convenors

Dr Dimitris Livianios (Cambridge)  DL212@cus.cam.ac.uk
Dr Catherine Holmes (Cambridge)  cjh37@hermes.cam.ac.uk

With the support of

Faculties of History and Modern and Medieval Languages
Skilliter Centre for Ottoman Studies
The Institute of Orthodox Christian Studies

(Current) sponsors

The A.G. Leventis Foundation, London
The Hellenic Foundation, London
The George Macaulay Trevelyan Fund, Cambridge
Conference Outline

The main aim of the conference is to assess and evaluate the role of Orthodox Christianity in the formation of collective identities in the Balkans and Russia in the period between the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusaders in 1204 and the Greek War of Independence in 1821. The conference will bring together a group of internationally renowned scholars, each working in different linguistic traditions and academic disciplines, to discuss questions of ethnicity, regionalism and religious affiliation in eastern Europe during the late Byzantine and Ottoman periods.

In many ways this conference also represents a celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the publication of The Byzantine Commonwealth, Professor Dimitri Obolensky’s compelling vision of a religious and cultural community which bound ‘Byzantium and the peoples of Eastern Europe’. Since Professor Obolensky produced his classic work in 1971, political conditions in eastern Europe have changed profoundly. As the relationship between religion and nationalism in eastern Europe becomes ever more complex, it is important to analyse the role of Christian belief and practices to personal and group identities in earlier periods of this regions’ history.

LUNCH

A buffet lunch will be available for about £8.00 per person, payable on the day. If you wish to have lunch, please send this slip to Dr Catherine Holmes by Saturday 31 March at the latest.

Please note that we can only cater for those who actually reply

To: Dr Catherine Holmes, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge CB2 1TA (or e-mail cjh37@hermes.cam.uk)

☐ I would like to have lunch on Saturday 28 April.

☐ I shall be bringing ______ guest(s) and would also like to book lunch for them.

☐ Special dietary requirements: ________________________________

NAME:

_________________________________________________________

ADDRESS:

_________________________________________________________
The following papers were presented:

**Ekaterina Mishina**  
*Institute of Russian Language of the Russian Academy of Sciences*

‘Peculiarities of the use of the verbal Aspect and the Tenses in Old East Slavonic texts’

One interesting side of the general problem of the relation between Tense and Aspect can be studied by examining cases where languages use one tense in place of another, for instance in the Historical Present. The so-called Historical Present (or Narrative Present) is the use of the Present Tense to refer to a past situation. This usage is found in many languages and in each language it has its own specific features. This paper is devoted to the peculiarities of the use of the Historical Present (HP) in Old East Slavonic narrative texts, in comparison with the Modern Russian language.

First of all, it is well known that in Modern literary Russian normally only the Imperfective Aspect is allowed in the HP, whereas usage of the Perfective Aspect is extremely restricted. The Perfective HP occurs only in a few expressive turns of speech with particles such as vдруг, как (“suddenly, all of a sudden”) and expresses a single unexpected action. In contrast to Modern literary Russian, in Old East Slavonic texts of the early period (XI-XV cent.) the HP of both Aspects can be found. This resembles the situation in some Modern Slavonic languages (such as Czech, Serbo-Croat, Slovenian and Slovak) which have aspectual differentiation in the HP. In these languages the Perfective HP is used regularly and sometimes more frequently than the Imperfective HP.

Furthermore, the conspicuous feature that distinguishes the functioning of the HP in Old Russian texts from Modern literary Russian is the rapid alternation between the Present and the Past tenses within one scene or episode, particularly, the use of a single Present Tense form, surrounded by Past Tenses. This alternation is completely atypical for Modern literary Russian, in which there is a tendency for verbs in the same tense to cluster together. In other words, the HP occurs in sustained sequences rather than alternating with the past. Moreover it is highly unusual for Modern literary Russian to use a single HP form surrounded by Past tense forms.

It seems that we can explain the alternation of different tenses, observed in Old East Slavonic texts, by the specific structure of Old Russian narrative, which was organised very similarly to spontaneous conversational narrative. The narration, organised as oral storytelling, is based more or less on the principle of association, when sentences follow the spontaneous train of thought. This apparently maintains the rapid switching of tense forms. The narrator can rapidly switch the point of reference in time from past to present and vice versa. It is significant that in some Modern North Russian dialects, in contrast to Modern Russian literary language, the similar rapid alternation between the HP and the Past Tense appears in oral storytelling. It is also worth noting that the unexpected variation of past and present tenses has been found in ancient and medieval texts in many other languages. Thus, the rapid alternation between the Past Tense and the HP brings together Modern oral conversational narrative and Old written narrative (not only Old Russian), and this can be called “natural” or “not literary crafted narrative”.

1. **Chairman’s Report**

Evgeny Vodolazkin has notified the Chairman of a group in the Pushkinskiy Dom that is organising a sbornik in commemoration of the late D.S. Likhachev. Two members of SEEMSG (Lindsey Hughes and Robin Millner-Gulland) had been approached to contribute. It was agreed that the Chairman should send a brief statement on behalf of SEEMSG for inclusion in the tabula gratulatoria.

The Chairman also brought to the attention of SEEMSG members the following publication, which may be of interest: ‘Medieval Slavic Manuscripts and SGML: problems and perspectives’ ed. Anisava Miltenova and David Birnbaum, Sofia: Marin Drinov, 2000 (ISBN 954-430-740-0).

2. **Secretary/Treasurer’s Report**

The deaths of two distinguished scholars were noted with regret:

† Dr Alexis Vlasto (July 2000)
† Sir Steven Runciman (November 2000)

The meeting viewed with concern the prospect of Byzantinoslavica ceasing publication. The Secretary undertook to try to clarify matters. It has since been confirmed that unfortunately vol. 60 (1999 Part 2) will be the last volume to be published under the highly successful editorship of Dr Vladimir Vavrinek. Dr Vavrinek has been unable to find a suitable successor based in Prague.

3. **Membership and Subscriptions**

E-mail address list

We now have 32 names of members on the e-mail address list and would welcome addresses of anyone who is not already receiving notifications electronically and wishes to do so.

However, only 8 members said that they were willing to receive the Programme/Newsletter exclusively by e-mail.

Standing orders

It was reaffirmed that it would be far more convenient if all UK-based members could arrange for payment by Standing Order, and those who had not already done so were urged to complete the slip provided with the Meeting Agenda.
Non-UK-based members

It was agreed that in future, non-UK based members should be offered life membership, instead of paying the SEEMSG annual subscription.

If they were willing to receiving the Programme/Newsletter exclusively by e-mail, the life membership rate would be £25.00.

If they wished to continue to receive the Programme/Newsletter by traditional post, the life membership rate would be £45.00.

It was agreed that a form to this effect would be included with the next mailing to all overseas members.

Current Account Balance

The balance on the Group’s bank account with the Clydesdale Bank on 9 August 2000 was £1,047.48. However, there remained to be deducted the following payments:

- £160 (for 4 postal expenses of mailshots in 1999 and early 2000 at £40 per time)
- £100 (speaker’s accommodation)
- £260

This would leave a balance of some £787.48.

4. Date and Place of Next Meeting

It was agreed that Francis Thomson’s suggestion of linking the date of the next meeting to a conference being organized in Cambridge on Saturday 28 April 2001 should be adopted.

Arrangements have since been made by the Secretary and details will be found in the accompanying programme.

5. Election of Officers

The Chairman (Ralph Cleminson) stated that he was ready to continue in post for the following year and was duly re-elected nemine contra. The Secretary and Treasurer (Jonathan Shepard) was also re-elected, but indicated that he would stand down in November 2001; a successor would need to be found forthwith, if continuity was to be maintained.


Gratitude was expressed for the grant of £250 made available by BASEES ‘to support postgraduate attendance at the Group’s meetings and to cover some of the costs of a speaker or speakers from Eastern Europe/Russia’.

Any postgraduates attending who could provide the Secretary with documentation of status and their travel costs would be eligible for financial support. The Secretary also solicited suggestions for Eastern European or Russian-based scholars who might speak at future meetings.

The Secretary also reported that BASEES will in future impose conditions on its grants to SEEMSG. BASEES will expect SEEMSG to put on a panel at their Annual Conference at least in alternate years.
In 2001 the BASEES Conference clashes with the Byzantine Spring Symposium in Oxford (March 30–April 2) and David Shepherd of BASEES has therefore indicated that this year the conditions will be waived.

For 2002, Professor Lindsey Hughes and Dr Simon Franklin indicated their willingness to organise a SEEMSG Panel at the BASEES Annual Conference to be held in early April that year.

7. A.O.B.

The Chairman reported that there have been problems in the distribution of Polata k'ningopis'naja. He therefore asked all SEEMSG members who are subscribers to this journal to inform him (ralph.clemison@port.ac.uk) which recent issues they have received; this information will be useful even if subscribers believe that they have received all issues. The Chairman will then inform the editor and it is hoped that arrangements can be made for any issues remaining in the warehouse to be sent out.

---

OVERSEAS MEMBERS' SUBSCRIPTION

It was maintained at the last A.G.M. that annual renewal of subscriptions to SEEMSG was awkward for most non UK-based members.

It was therefore suggested that in future overseas-based members should be offered life membership of the Group and it was agreed that it should be offered at the following rates:

- £25.00 (sterling) for all members willing to receive the Newsletter/Programme exclusively via e-mail, or
- £45.00 (sterling) for members who wish to continue to receive the paper versions of the Newsletter/Programme.

If you are not based in the UK, could you please notify the Secretary how you would like to pay your membership of SEEMSG, using the form below. Please also arrange for payments to be made in sterling by Foreign Draft directly to the Group’s bank account:

The Slavonic and East European Medieval Studies Group (SEEMSG)
Clydesdale Bank, Hillhead Branch, 326 Byres Rd., Glasgow G12 8AN
Sort Code: 82-64-08, Account Number: 70496803

To: Dr Jonathan Shepard, Secretary SEEMSG, 43 Nelson Street, Oxford OX2 6BE (or e-mail nshepard@easynet.co.uk)

☐ I wish to take out electronic life membership of SEEMSG at a cost of £25.00
☐ I wish to take out life membership of SEEMSG at a cost of £45.00
☐ I wish to take out life membership when my existing block payment expires in
☐ I wish to continue to pay an annual subscription of £3.00

Name/Signature
The packet which I’ve given you contains:

- Advert. & further particulars for Russian Instructorship
- Claim forms for your fee & expenses
- Draft exam. papers on History of Church Slavonic, History of Bulgarian (passages for translation still to be finally settled), Cyrillic Palaeography (examples to follow). Might you have time to discuss them after the class on Monday afternoon (by when I hope to have the passages for translation from Modern Bulgarian)?

I think it’s a mistake to summarize a large part of one of your books in 45 minutes.

"Bugs of course is used hyperbolically of the centipedes."
Angela Marcantonio
University of Rome


I am a linguist, particularly interested in the Uralic language family. I am one of the ‘heretics’ or ‘revolutionaries’, that is, one of those scholars who do not believe in the thesis that the Uralic languages form a consistent group of genetically related languages. In fact, the Uralic theory is founded on an interlocking network of self-consistent linguistic and historical reconstructions. Linguists assume that the existence of this family is proven historically, even though they have failed to reconstruct any of the major nodes of the conventional family tree. Historians assume that it is proven linguistically, and re-interpret their data accordingly.

The purpose of my talk is to illustrate one of these interlocking reconstructions and interpretations upon which the theory is based: the interpretation, or better, the re-interpretation of the Hungarians’ self-denomination: ‘magyar’ and a related re-interpretation of the relevant historical sources. Many proper names found in the Uralic languages, including ‘magyar’, contradict the Uralic theory. In fact, for example, by the term ‘magyar’ the historical records (De Administrando Imperio of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the Arabic sources of the 10th Century AD) clearly and consistently refer to Turkic tribes. However, since linguists claim that the Hungarian language and people originate not from the Turkic, but from the Uralic, group of languages, historians have to re-interpret the records in order to harmonize them with the linguistic paradigm. In turn, linguists disregard the clear, ‘regular’ Turkic etymological connection of the term ‘magyar’ attested in the records and provide for it an ad hoc etymology, in order to connect this proper name to another ‘Uralic’ proper name. The proper name in question is ‘Mansi’, the self-denomination of the Voguls, who are (also) claimed to belong to the Uralic family. Although linguists and dictionaries recognise that the etymological connection magyar-Mansi is ‘problematic’, they nevertheless accept it on the grounds that such a connection is ‘supported’ by the historical records.
Martin Dimnik
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto

'The Dynasty of Chernigov: Observations'

Historians have misrepresented the political significance of the dynasty of Chernigov by over-emphasizing the importance of Vladimir Monomakh's descendants. Chronicle evidence shows that the princes of Chernigov, in the main the descendants of Oleg Svyatoslavich or the Ol'govichi, should not be relegated to a place of minor importance. During the second half of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century they were not only successful rivals of the Monomashichia but also their only rivals for control of Kiev and supremacy in Rus'.

In 1139, Vsevolod Ol'govich the prince of Chernigov seized Kiev from the Monomashichia and assumed supreme power. Following the death of his brother Igor', the fortunes of the Ol'govichi plummeted as they fought for survival against their cousins the Davidovich. During the rivalry, however, the Davidovich ruled Kiev for only a short period. Following their demise in the early 1160s, the Ol'govichi attained supremacy under the leadership of Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich (d. 1194). His fourteen-year reign in Kiev lasted even longer than that of Vladimir Monomakh. His son Vsevolod Chernmyy (d. 1212) occupied Kiev for only four years, but his authority was supreme and for a while he also controlled Galicia, something that no Monomashich prince of Kiev had achieved. Mikhail, the last senior prince of the dynasty, had even wider-reaching influence. He became prince of Novgorod and of Galich, albeit at different times and for short periods of time. He was also the last prince to rule Kiev under the traditional system of genealogical seniority. No rival prince deposed him. The invincible Tatars executed that deed. In the light of this evidence it is wrong to argue that the dynasty of Chernigov was merely of minor significance in the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century. On the contrary, it was one of the most important dynasties in the history of Rus'.

Simon Franklin
University of Cambridge

The 'Novgorod Waxed Tablet' – an update

Dr Franklin reported the discovery during excavations in Novgorod in July 2000 of a Waxed Tablet. Examination of the Tablet and the text(s) inscribed on it is continuing under the direction of Professor V. Ianin. The Tablet is datable by dendrochronology to the early 11th century.