Adrian Selin,Kuzma Kukushkin, Ivan Sablin,
Elena Kocheryagina

REGIMES OF THE RUSSIAN–SWEDISH BORDER IN THE NOVGOROD LANDS

Adrian Selin[1], Kuzma Kukushkin[2],
Ivan Sablin[3], Elena Kocheryagina[4]

REGIMES OF THE RUSSIAN–SWEDISH BORDER IN THE NOVGOROD LANDS[5]

The working paper analysed the infrastructure of the Russian-Swedish border from a transcultural perspective. The history of the border was split into three periods following major changes in political border regimes. The first period covered the history of the border between Sweden and the Novgorod Republic after its formal delimitation in 1323. The annexation of the Novgorod Lands to the Grand Duchy of Moscow in 1478 marked the beginning of the second period. The third period, which is discussed in detail, covered the history of border infrastructure between the transition of large part of the Novgorod Lands to Sweden in 1617 and 1700. Departing from the debate whether the border was a line or a zone and overcoming state-centred approaches, the working paper demonstrated that the existence of several parallel border regimes during different periods enabled the simultaneous existence of the border as a line and a zone pertaining to different social interactions and subject to manipulation by authorities. The consolidation of the border did not follow the Treaty of Stolbovo (1617), but owed to local demands and an accidental event of an epidemic in 1629–1630. Following the temporary consolidation of the border, the state established firm border control used for duty collection.

Keywords: Russia, Sweden, Novgorod, border, transcultural

JEL Classification: Z

[1]National Research University Higher School of Economic, St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Center for Historical Research, Senior Research Fellow; E-mail: aselin@hse.ru.

[2] National Research University Higher School of Economic, St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Center for Historical Research, Research Assistant; E-mail: kuz.kukushkin@yandex.ru.

[3] National Research University Higher School of Economic, St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Center for Historical Research, Senior Research Fellow; E-mail: isablin@hse.ru.

[4] National Research University Higher School of Economic, St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Center for Historical Research, Research Assistant; E-mail: kocheriagina@gmail.com.

Introduction

Contemporary scholarship agrees that there are material borders and symbolic borders, those between various social groups.[6] The symbolic borders determine the development of the material ones. As James Anderson and Liam O'dowd put it, 'As a general response to peripherality, borders tend to generate questionable arbitrage activities, and their significance ultimately derives from territoriality as a general organizing principle of political and social life, one which changes over time.'[7]

Between 1323 and 1700 symbolic borders between Sweden and the Russian lands expanded and changed transforming the material transboundary infrastructure. The factors of this transformation differed across various social and cultural groups as well as representatives of different lands, the independent Russian lands, Livonian landowners, the Hanseatic cities, and the representatives of the Swedish King. The way the border was understood by one category of population, for instance, by the Novgorod aristocracy, could be different from that of others, like the contemporary Novgorod peasants or the representatives of the Grand Duchy of Moscow.

These differences formed the complex, multi-layered, and constantly changing material landscape of the borderland. Heinz Ellersieck suggested looking at the Russian–Swedish border as 'a complex of contacts and interactions between peoples and states.'[8] Despite the dynamic approach to the border, his argument remained within the paradigm of 'methodological nationalism,'[9] as Ellersieck personified Sweden and Russia and had the two states as the starting point of analysis. Furthermore, the evolution of the material landscape in the Baltic region is sometimes reduced to the transition from the border as a 'zone' of interaction to a 'line' of the territorial boundary of a nation state,[10] but such approaches overlook the complexity of border interactions and their various interpretations.

The goal of this article is to overcome state-centred perspectives and look at the border from the Novgorod Lands, the independent Novgorod Republic which was annexed to the Grand Duchy of Moscow in 1478, and include a nuanced analysis of local border

---

[6] Kimmo Katajala and Maria Lähteenmäki, *Imagined, Negotiated, Remembered: Constructing European Borders and Borderlands* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2012), 7–10.

[7] James Anderson and Liam O'dowd, "Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance," *Regional Studies* 33, no. 7 (1999): 593–604.

[8] Heinz Ellersieck, "The Swedish-Russian Frontier in the Seventeenth Century," *Journal of Baltic Studies* 5, no. 3 (1974): 188.

[9] Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, "Methodological Nationalism and beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences," *Global Networks* 2, no. 4 (2002): 301–34.

[10] M. B. Bessudnova, *Russko-livonskie otnosheniia nakanune novogo vremeni: Istoki konflikta, Doctoral Thesis* (Lipetsk: Lipetskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii universitet, 2015).

infrastructure and local views of the border into the discussion. The main argument of this article is that the development of border infrastructure was not determined by the transition from a 'zone' to a 'line' or vice versa, nor was it determined by the interests of the two states, but was dependent on many features, including the contemporary political, economic, and social situation locally, that is, on the symbolic borders. The suggestion is to look at the problem of boundary construction in the context of border infrastructure and the way it was used by state actors and locals. A transcultural perspective implies paying attention to entanglements and various forms of connections which produce them as well as to disentanglements, the attempts of the participants of power relations to limit the connections.[11]

The transboundary interactions between the Tsardom of Russia and Sweden in the seventeenth century occurred in the area of border management, defence and fortification of territories, trade, development of roads and other communications, settling the matters of fugitives and captives, and other cultural and religious issues. All these elements of the infrastructure emerged not at once but gradually over more than three hundred years. There was no zone–line development, nor was the border an undefined frontier. There were several border regimes which existed simultaneously and depended on the border infrastructure and the ways it was used by interested parties. The regimes and the infrastructure pertained to numerous local actors as well as the representatives of the Swedish kings and the Russian princes and tsars. The local demands to control the border and the transcultural event of an epidemic contributed to the consolidation of border control utilized by the state for fiscal purposes.

Since the thirteenth century Sweden, Novgorod, and Pskov gradually expanded their spheres of influence embracing the territories beyond their direct administration which became subject to tribute. The colonization of Karelia and Finland by Novgorod was not as intense as the Swedish colonization. The Novgorod tribute collectors reached, as some researchers suggested, the Torne River[12] running between present-day Finland and Sweden and the modern city of Kemi in present-day Finland in the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century. The crusade of Earl Birger to Finland, the subjugation of local groups, and the establishment of two major Swedish forts, Åbo and Viborg (Vyborg), in the late thirteenth century laid the basis for the first official demarcation between the Novgorodians

[11] Ivan Sablin, "Buryat, Mongol and Buddhist: Multiple Identities and Disentanglement Projects in the Baikal Region, 1917–1919," *Comparativ: Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung* 23, no. 3 (2013): 17–36.

[12] Jarl Gallen and John Lind, *Noteborgsfreden och Finlands Medeltida Ostgrans* (Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursallskapet i Finland, 1991), 19–38.

and the Swedes in the region.[13] The Novgorodian First Chronicle also noted the attempts of the Swedish detachments to establish a "fortress over the Neva River at the mouth of the Okhta River […] under the name of the Crown of the Land [Landskrona]" at the turn of the fourteenth century.[14]

All studies which addressed the early Novgorod-Swedish border were based on the texts of peace agreements, the earliest of which was made in 1323 in Oreshek, the fortress just built by the Novgorodians at the source of the Neva River. This agreement set the first official division of territory between the Swedes and the Novgorodians. Although the treaty between Novgorod and Norway of 1326 mentioned an earlier "border act" dated to the middle of the thirteenth century, J. H. Lind convincingly argued that this was a local or a unilateral Norwegian act making the Oreshek Treaty the first official document in the history of Novgorod which delimited and demarcated the territorial boundaries of its Lands along watercourses[15] or established "*rozvod* and *mezha*," to use the language of its version included in the Novgorodian acts.[16]

The representation of Novgorod through the Muscovite Prince Yuri Danilovich, whose title of the Grand Prince of Vladimir was revoked in 1322 by Khan Uzbeg of the Golden Horde, contributed to the political transculturality of the border between the Kingdom of Sweden on the one side and the Republic of Novgorod, the conglomerate of Russian lands, and the tributaries of the Golden Horde on the other. Even though Yuri Danilovich was the Prince of Novgorod at the time of the treaty, in the text he was referred to as the Grand Prince and called the Swedish King Magnus a "brother."[17]

The existence of three different versions of the Oreshek Treaty left the location of the border open to debate. The border definitely ran "from the sea [along] the Sestra River," divided the modern Karelian Isthmus, and went on through the basins of the Vuoksi and the Saimaa. It remains unclear where it went from there, whether it ended in the Gulf of Bothnia or in the Arctic Ocean. The treaty also reserved the rights of Novgorod for using hunting and fishing grounds and established free trade in the shared Karelian borderland, which belonged "neither to you nor to us" according to the Novgorod version of the treaty.[18] According to the

[13] I. P. Shaskol'skii, "Bor'ba shvedskikh krestonostsev protiv finliandii XII—XIV veka," *Istoricheskii zhurnal*, no. 4–5 (1940): 102–12.

[14] A. N. Nasonov, ed., *Novgorodskaia Pervaia letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov* (Moscow: Izd-vo Akad. nauk SSSR, 1950), 91.

[15] J. H. Lind, "'Razgranichitel'naia gramota' i novgorodsko-norvezhskie dogovory 1251 i 1326 gg.," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 6 (16) (1997): 135–43.

[16] S. N. Valk, *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* (Moscow: Izd-vo Akad. nauk SSSR, 1949), 68.

[17] I. P. Shaskol'skii, *Bor'ba Rusi za sokhranenie vykhoda k Baltiiskomu moriu v XIV v.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1987), 110.

[18] Valk, *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*, 68.

treaty, Karelia remained a *de jure* neutral territory where both sides could collect tributes and where the construction of new fortifications was banned.[19] The Swedes nevertheless founded the fortress of Olofsborg (Savonlinna) in Southern Savolax in 1475. The troops of Grand Prince Ivan III were unsuccessful in their attempts to besiege and capture the fortress.[20]

Apart from the construction of Olofsborg, the *status quo* in Karelia persisted for over two hundred years. The Livonian War fostered new border negotiations in the 1560s. The truce between Sweden and Russia singed in Yuryev (Dorpat) in 1564 became especially important for delimitation, as it mentioned the belonging of towns and their districts instead of describing a border line.[21] Unlike the Oreshek Treaty, this document and the two truces of Plussa (1583 and 1585) relied on the district boundaries settled by internal documents, which made "domestic" administrative divisions relevant for "foreign" relations and allowed Russia to retain access to the Baltic Sea despite the loss of adjacent districts.[22] The issue of demarcation in the northern areas arose sharply in the late sixteenth century due to the establishment of new outposts of the Russian State in the White Sea basin. The development of the Solovetsky Monastery and the Port of Archangel made the clashes in the region more intense. After the Livonian War ended in 1583, the territory of present-day Estonia became almost completely controlled by the Swedish King. The armed struggle between the Moscow Tsar and the Swedish King led first to the loss of the old Novgorod Lands, Yam (present-day Kingisepp), Koporye, and Ivangorod, and the signing of the two truces of Plussa, and then the successful actions of the Russian troops in the 1590s led to these lands being retaken which was reaffirmed by the treaty between Russia and Sweden signed in Tyavzino (Teusina) in 1595.[23]

Even though Russia did not ratify the treaty, its political significance was high. The treaty included demarcation of a 'new' section of the border between Russia and Sweden which ran along the Narva River and included the territories in northern Karelia and on the Kola Peninsula. The Treaty of Tyavzino left Korela (Kexholm) and its surroundings to the Russian Tsar,[24] but the new agreement signed in Viborg in 1609, during the Time of Troubles

---

[19] Shaskol'skii, *Bor'ba Rusi za sokhranenie vykhoda k Baltiiskomu moriu v XIV v.*, 121–47.

[20] Gallen and Lind, *Noteborgsfreden och Finlands Medeltida Ostgrans*, 91.

[21] Spisok zapisi, uchinennoi v Lifliandskom gorode Iur'eve mezhdu shvedskimi i rossiiskimi poslami o peremirii na sem' let i o ustupkakh v Shvedskuiu storonu nekotorykh lifliandskikh gorodov, September 1564 (Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA), f. 96, d. 2, l. 1–11 rev.).

[22] I. P. Shaskol'skii, "Byla li Rossiia posle Livonskoi voiny otrezana ot Baltiiskogo moria?," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 35 (1950): 294–303.

[23] I. P. Shaskol'skii, *Stolbovskii mir 1617 g. i torgovye otnosheniia Rossii so Shvedskim gosudarstvom* (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), 25–27.

[24] O. M Bodianskii, ed., *Chteniia v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei pri Moskovskom universitete*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1868).

in Russia, gave Korela to the Swedish King who was supposed to aid Tsar Vasiliy IV (Shuiskiy) in his struggle against the Polish-Lithuanian forces and those of False Dmitriy.[25]

The conclusion of the Treaty of Stolbovo between Russia and Sweden in 1617 was the next important step in the demarcation which secured the new border. According to the agreement, vast territories of Novgorod were transferred to Sweden. Russia lost inter alia its access to the Baltic Sea and the whole network of border fortresses in the Novgorod Lands.[26] The successful attempts by the government of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich to take back the Novgorod Lands and, partly, the territory of Livonia in the Russian-Swedish War of 1656–1658 led to the temporary annexation of some towns to Russia, such as Kukonos (Kokenhausen), Syrensk (Nyslott), Yuryev, Borisoglebsk (Dünaburg), Yam, and Rezhitsa (Rositten). Trying to avoid a new war, the Government of Alexei Mikhailovich, however, concluded the Treaty of Cardis with Sweden already in 1661 and lost its control of all acquired lands returning to the borders set by the Treaty of Stolbovo.[27] The new border arrangement remained until Russia conquered these and other territories during the Great Northern War (1700–1721).

The development of the border infrastructure between 1323 and 1700 can be divided into three periods, before the conquest of Novgorod in 1478, before the Treaty of Stolbovo in 1617, and after it. Due to the uneven availability of sources, it was possible to discuss local responses and demands for border protection in detail only for the third period, providing a brief outline of border protection, trade, and communication for all three.

The first period, 1323–1478

The protection of the north-western borders of the disunited Russian lands represented by the Novgorod and since 1384 the Pskov Republics during the first period can hardly be imagined without a complex system of fortifications. Traditionally, a fortification surrounded by a wall was called a 'town' (*gorod*). The towns defended not only their own territory, but also their surroundings and other settlements, and protected the border. The development of the Novgorod fortresses during the 'appanage' period, conventionally since the thirteenth and fourteenth century, was thoroughly investigated by A. N. Kirpichnikov. After the boundaries between the Novgorod Lands and Sweden in the Karelian Isthmus and those between

[25] I. I. Grigorovich, *Akty istoricheskie, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoi komissiei*, vol. 2: 1598-1613 (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia II Otdeleniia Sobstvennoi E. I. V. Kantseliarii, 1841), 185, 191.

[26] Shaskol'skii, *Stolbovskii mir 1617 g. i torgovye otnosheniia Rossii so Shvedskim gosudarstvom*, 80–83.

[27] I. E. Kobzareva, *Rossiia i Shchvetsiia: Problema razgranicheniia spornykh territorii v Pribaltike, formirovanie territorii Rossiiskogo gosudarstva XVI – nachalo XX v.* (Moscow: Universitet Dmitriia Pozharskogo, 2015).

Novgorod and the Livonian Lands along the Narva River were set in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, the active construction of a network of border fortresses for the defence of Veliky Novgorod (Novgorod the Great) – Ladoga, Oreshek, Koporye, and Korela – commenced. The defence system took its final shape with the construction of the Town of Yam in the fourteenth century.[28]

In 1323 it was the communication lines which contributed to the shape of the boundary running across the main river and lake systems on the territory of Karelia. Rivers and lakes were the main highways which the Karelians traditionally used for internal communication as well as for seasonal works at the Gulf of Bothnia. Due to the complexity of communication lines, it was impossible to draw the border as a single line to the north of the settled areas. J. H. Lind explained that the border was formed in 1323 by separating three districts (*pogost*) from Novgorod. After Novgorod was annexed to Moscow in the late fifteenth century the inner boundaries between the newly established territorial districts (*piatina*) were drawn along the major rivers and waterways. As a result of this division some old *pogosts* were split: a part of a *pogost* could be situated in one *piatina*, while other lands belonging to it across a river were part of another *piatina*. Most *pogosts* were hence organized around rivers. It is therefore unlikely that the border ran along the major waterways.[29] Kimmo Katajala underlined the importance of these routes and the fact that the border established by the Treaty of Oreshek concerned only the key points of the water 'transit'.[30] Hence, from early on the border was imagined as a line where it could be defined as such and a zone where it could not.

The Novgorod elites were certainly interested in the development of trade – free trade on water and land was included into the text of the Treaty of Oreshek. It also featured a possibility for joint exploitation of hunting and fishing grounds in the territories adjacent to the border. The line, therefore, did not limit trade relations, but at the same time located them geographically becoming a line of connection and not that of separation. Apart from that, Veliky Novgorod maintained trade relations with the Hanseatic League before joining the Moscow State. Hanseatic merchant vessels came to Novgorod through the Neva River, Lake Ladoga, and the Volkhov River. By the time of the conquest of Novgorod in the 1470s, the

---

[28] A. N. Kirpichnikov, *Kamennye kreposti Novgorodskoi zemli* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1984), 3, 9, 11.
[29] J. H. Lind, "Russko-shvedskaia granitsa po Orekhovetskomu (Nôteborg-Pahkinalinna) miru i politicheskii status severa Fennoskandii," *Srednie Veka* 59 (1997): 96–115.
[30] K. Katajala, "Drawing Borders or Dividing Lands?: The Peace Treaty of 1323 between Sweden and Novgorod in a European Context," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 37, no. 1 (2012): 23–48.

city had a Hanseatic Kontor which was first plundered by the Moscow authorities and then ultimately closed in 1494.[31]

However, even after the city became part of the Grand Duchy of Moscow, trade with the Hanseatic League continued as evidenced by the charter to the Hanseatic merchants of 1478 and a treaty of 1487. N. A. Kazakova stressed that the closure of the Hanseatic trade post did not mean that the relations with the Hanseatic League were terminated. According to M. B. Bessudnova, Ivan III did not aim at destroying the Hanseatic trade with Novgorod; his persecution of the Hanseatic merchants was caused by the refusal of the authorities of the Holy Roman Empire to recognize the Grand Prince of Moscow as an equal diplomatic partner. The talks on finding a peaceful resolution to the conflict and restoration of trade continued. After signing of a treaty in 1514, the Russian-Hanseatic trade renewed (and up to 1558 the terms established by the agreement did not change significantly) and a German (*nemetskii*) trade post was opened in Novgorod.[32]

According to Kimmo Katajala, the border set by the Treaty of Oreshek in 1323 can hardly be considered a political line demarcating a territory, but it also cannot be called a zone of influence of various sovereigns. Katajala argued that the new boundary was a legal establishment of the edge of the Swedish and Novgorod defensive lines in Karelia, with the fortress of Viborg on the Swedish side and the fortress of Oreshek on the Novgorod side. Thus, one can speak of the Russian-Swedish border as a line of military containment and economic activities sustained by the border fortifications in the fourteenth century.[33] The development of military border infrastructure was a priority during this period.

The peculiarities of colonization and development of the border areas by representatives of different local groups and peoples is another important factor in the development of border infrastructure. Exploring the Third Crusade of the Swedes to Finland in 1293, I. P. Shaskol'skii noted the different approaches to colonization of new territories among the Novgorodians and the Swedes. The Swedes aimed at baptizing the conquered peoples, forming church property in the new territory, and distributing land between the colonialists. Åbo and Viborg were built in order to control these processes. The Novgorodians only sought to ensure the regular tribute payment by the Finnish Karelians.[34]

---

[31] N. A. Kazakova, *Russko-livonskie i russko-ganzeiskie otnosheniia, konets XIV–nachalo XVI v.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1975), 261.

[32] M. B. Bessudnova, "Velikii Novgorod kontsa XV v. mezhdu Livoniei i Moskvoi," *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta, Seriia 2, Istoriia*, no. 2 (2013): 3–9; Kazakova, *Russko-livonskie i russko-ganzeiskie otnosheniia, konets XIV–nachalo XVI v.*

[33] Katajala, "Drawing Borders or Dividing Lands?"

[34] Shaskol'skii, "Bor'ba shvedskikh krestonostsev protiv Finliandii XII—XIV veka."

Anti Selart, who studied the history of the Pskov-Livonian border in the fifteenth century (when Livonia still did not belong to either Sweden or Poland), came to similar conclusions. An important argument of the author was that the political boundary between Pskov and the Bishopric of Dorpat existed simultaneously with a border of independent economic development of territories by peasants, and the two had little in common.[35] Furthermore, this 'social' boundary was the main source of border conflicts. These arguments suggested that the elements of border infrastructure and their development were different for Novgorod and Pskov during their independence from the Grand Prince of Moscow and Sweden, as well as for the Livonian Lands annexed by Sweden in the second half of the sixteenth century contributing thereby to political and economic transculturality of the borderlands.

The second period, 1478–1617

After the conquest of Novgorod by the Moscow troops in 1478 the very approach to the development of territories changed. The protection of the border in military terms became especially important. Old fortresses were reconstructed and new ones were built. V. V. Kostochkin, another researcher of fortification in the northwest of the Russian lands, mentioned that in 1484 a decree of the Grand Prince of Moscow Ivan III initiated the reconstruction of the fortress in Veliky Novgorod.[36] In 1492 Italian architects built the Ivangorod Fortress on the Narva River across from Livonian Narva.[37]

The construction of new type of fortresses designed for defence against firearms was important. Fortresses in the northwest of Moscow Russia were actively developed at the end of the reign of Ivan IV the Terrible. An additional system of fortified settlements and monasteries in the former lands of Pskov was established due to the increasing strategic importance of this area. New fortresses of bastion type began to be built. A. I. Filiushkin noted that the overdue upgrade of the fortresses was associated with the initial success of the Pskov campaign of the Polish King Stefan Batory in 1581–1582.[38]

Roads and communication lines also remained an important part of border infrastructure. In his article on fortification of Novgorod's border on the Narva in the middle

---

[35] A. Selart, "Zur Sozialgeschichte der Ostgrenze Estlands im Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift für Ost–Mitteleuropas Forschung*, 1998, 520–43.

[36] V. V. Kostochkin, "Oboronitel'nye sistemy russkikh krepostei XIV — Nachala XVI vv.," *Sovetskaia arkheologiia*, no. 1 (1957): 133–142.

[37] M. I. Mil'chik, "Ital'ianskie mastera – stroiteli Ivangorodskoi kreposti," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik*, no. 5 (15) (1995): 184–202.

[38] A. I. Filjushkin, "The Livonian War in the Context of the 16th Century East European Wars," *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, no. 1 (15) (2014): 47–64.

of the fifteenth century, I. E. Kleinenberg argued that building a road connecting Ivangorod with another Russian fortress, Yamgorod (Yam) which was located to the east and deeper in the Novgorod Lands, was also a major aspect of defence.[39] The roads which led far from the border were also part of the border infrastructure, extending it as far as Moscow which hosted the potential reinforcements. I. Ia. Gurliand suggested that a system of post stations (*yam*) connecting Moscow and Novgorod existed already in 1489. A system of *yams* connecting Novgorod and Pskov was created in 1493; in 1490–1493 a system of *yams* connected Novgorod and Narva, which allowed for speaking of improved communications in the region.[40]

A. A. Selin dated the rapid development of highways in the Novgorod Land back to the sixteenth century, which was a result of the *yam* service development.[41] The most ancient road in the Novgorod Lands was the Pskov Road connecting Veliky Novgorod and Pskov. 'The mountain and water way from Novgorod' was mentioned in the 1474 agreement between Pskov and Dorpat.[42] Two major roads with *yams* were known since the early sixteenth century – the Oreshek Road connecting Veliky Novgorod and the Oreshek Fortress in the sources of the Neva River and the Ivangorod Road connecting Veliky Novgorod and Ivangorod on the border with the Livonian Lands. Since the middle of the sixteenth century the Korela Road connecting Veliky Novgorod with the Korela Fortress on the northern shore of Lake Ladoga was also known.[43] All mentioned roads served the needs of the state through the placement of *yams* which linked the border governors (*voivodes*) to Moscow. Hence, it was not only the military transportation but information exchange needed for the maintenance of Moscow authority which was important. When the Novgorod Lands were seized by the Swedes in 1611–1617, these roads were in active use. A system of small fortifications was, for instance, built along the Ivangorod road.[44]

The beginning of the sixteenth century was characterized by the conflict with the Hanseatic cities and the need to seek out and develop other areas of trade. Trade was carried

---

[39] I. E. Kleinenberg, "Meropriiatiia Russkogo gosudarstva po ukrepleniiu narvskoi granitsy v kontse XV veka," *Voenno-istoricheskii zhurnal*, no. 6 (1960): 125–27.

[40] I. Ia. Gurliand, *Iamskaia gon'ba v Moskovskom gosudarstve do kontsa XVII veka* (Yaroslavl: Tipografiia Gubernskogo pravleniia, 1900), 52–53.

[41] A. A. Selin, "Magistral'nye dorogi severo-zapada Novgorodskoi zemli v XVI-XVII vv.," in *Ocherki istoricheskoi geografii: Severo-zapad rossii: Slaviane i finny*, ed. A. S. Gerd and G. S. Lebedev (Saint Petersburg: Izd-vo Sankt-Peterb. un-ta, 2001), 86–99.

[42] A. V. Mikhailov, "K izucheniiu voloka v mezhdurech'e Cherekhi i Uzy," in *Arkheologiia i istoriia Pskova i Pskovskoi zemli* (Pskov: Pskovskii gosudarstvennyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii arkheologicheskii tsentr, 1995).

[43] "Gramota Tsaria i Velikogo Kniazia Ivana Vasil'evicha novgorodskim d'iakam F. Syrkovu i K. Dubrovskomu po delu syna boiarskogo Orekhovskogo uezda R. S. Belovo i korelianina Ia. Bardina (1555)," in *Dopolneniia k Aktam istoricheskim*, Vol. 1, No. 51, XII (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia II Otdeleniia Sobstvennoi E. I. V. Kantseliarii, 1846), 78–79.

[44] Selin, "Magistral'nye Dorogi severo-zapada Novgorodskoi zemli v XVI-XVII vv."

out with the mediation of the Livonian towns and Viborg. According to M. M. Shumilov, after a new treaty with the Hanseatic League was signed in 1514, trade relations were not renewed in the same volume. The traditional importance of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov persisted but Ivangorod on the Narva River became the main 'sea' port. After the Livonian War began in 1558 the town of Narva took over. Regular trade relations with different European countries, including the Netherlands and England, commenced in the 1520s–1560s. By the end of the sixteenth century the Moscow government got Livonian merchants, who could facilitate the increasingly important Russian foreign policy in Livonia, involved in service.[45] The border became a major source of economic cadre and a facilitator of European trade networks. This factor remained important even after Archangel overshadowed the Narva ports.[46]

The development of the manor (*pomest'e*) system and the distribution of land among privileged social estates in exchange for service in the 1480s–1490s was the key factor of land reform on the lands of Veliky Novgorod. Such distribution indicated that all the Novgorod Lands belonged to the Great Prince of Moscow. The need to survey the existing lands for distribution triggered the increasing interest in the issue of the boundaries of land parcels and their contiguity with the borders of foreign lands. After the annexation of Pskov and the Pskov Lands to the Grand Duchy of Moscow in 1510, the manor system was also established on those territories.[47] M. B. Bessudnova stated that already by the early sixteenth century the border was no longer a 'frontier' and became linear, attributing this fact to the new policy of the Moscow State.[48]

The system of border management also transformed. According to N. N. Ogloblin, in the early seventeenth century all borders of the Moscow State were in one way or another taken into account by the central government and local authorities. The greatest amount of information was connected to the 'Polish' (southern) border. However, the 'Swedish' and 'Lithuanian' borders were also subject of protection. The record books (*smetnaia kniga*) of Veliky Novgorod described how the border with Sweden was supposed to be protected, while the rank books (*razriadnaia kniga*) of Velikiye Luki described the system of 'guardhouses'

---

[45] R. G. Skrynnikov, *Tsar' Boris i Dmitrii Samozvanets* (Smolensk: Rusich, 1997), 200; M. M. Shumilov, *Torgovlia i tamozhennoe delo v Rossii: Stanovlenie, osnovnye etapy razvitiia (IX-XVII vv.)* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2006), 196–97, 202–3.

[46] Artur Attman, *The Struggle for Baltic Markets: Powers in Conflict 1558-1618* (Göteborg: Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhället, 1979).

[47] M. M. Bentsianov, "Formirovanie pomestnoi sistemy v Novgorodskoi zemle v Kontse XV v.," *Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki*, no. 1 (59) (2015): 37–49.

[48] Bessudnova, *Russko-livonskie otnosheniia nakanune Novogo vremeni: Istoki konflikta, Doctoral Thesis*, 59.

(*storozha*) on the border with the Pskov Lands. Border security was assigned to the Moscow *voivodes* of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov.[49]

All those who came to the border from abroad were interviewed by the authorities of the border towns. If they were foreigners, the information was sent to the Ambassadorial Prikaz in Moscow, the agency in charge of foreign affairs, after which the decision on admitting the foreigners was made.[50] The new practice was hence not only an instrument of control, but also a major source of information for the Moscow authorities. The *voivodes* who controlled this information also controlled the transboundary movement. Besides, the formation of an intelligence system in the neighbouring territories of Sweden, in Karelia and in Livonia, in the late sixteenth century extended the border infrastructure pertaining to information away from the imaginary line.

The border also operated as a 'filter' during the civil war between the Polish King Sigismund III and the Swedish Governor Duke Charles of Södermanland. Letting the Swedish troops pass from Viborg to Livonia during the escalation of the Polish-Swedish conflict in 1598–1599, the border *voivodes* and the Ambassadorial Prikaz directly affected the international political situation. Another important part of this 'filtering' was the fact that large Swedish detachments travelled along the roads and reached Russian fortresses in which they were forced to request a permission to continue from the Russian *voivodes*. Thus, one can speak of the 'filtration' of large military units, while small Swedish detachments could in theory secretly pass through the Russian territory, even though there is no data on the matter.[51]

Border outposts (*zastava*) and abatis lines[52] were established approximately in the fifteenth century. M. B. Bessudnova drew attention to the correspondence of Livonian territorial lords (*Landsherr*) which contained information that attacking the Pskov Lands in summer was problematic as it was not possible to go through the forest abatises and water obstacles and also was difficult to move with carts.[53]

O. A. Kurbatov argued that the construction of new fortifications on the border during the Time of Troubles (1598–1613) was connected to the adoption of construction methods of

---

[49] N. N. Ogloblin, ed., *Obozrenie istoriko-geograficheskikh materialov XVII i nachala XVIII vv., zakliuchaiushchikhsia v knigakh Razriadnogo prikaza* (Moscow: Tipografiia L. F. Snegireva, 1884), 141, 146–47.

[50] O. V. Skobelkin, "'Rassprosy' vyezzhikh inozemtsev v Posol'skom prikaze v 10–20–kh godakh XVII veka," *Vestnik BFU Im. I. Kanta*, no. 6 (2011): 122–127.

[51] K. V. Kukushkin, "K voprosu o vodnykh granitsakh Russkogo gosudarstva v Livonii, 1584-1605 gg.," *Vestnik NNGU Im. N. I. Lobachevskogo, Sotsial'nye Nauki*, no. 4 (2015): 55–63.

[52] These were the lines of cut down trees which were established in order to prevent passage through the forests. Some sections of the lines could have guards.

[53] M. B. Bessudnova, "Pervaia 'livonskaia' voina v kontekste livonskoi ordenskoi diplomatii kontsa 70-kh – nachala 80-kh gg. XV v.," *Edinorog: Materialy po voennoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy*, no. 3 (2014): 22.

systems of small fortresses from the military experts from the Netherlands and Sweden. This tactics was successfully used by Prince Mikhail Skopin-Shuiskii in the struggle with the forces of False Dmitrii II. Kurbatov dated the wave of construction of small fortresses to 1608–1609. During the Time of Troubles a large number of small fortresses and small stockaded towns (*ostrogs*) was built in the lands of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov, the main purpose of which was to maximize the capacity to contain the enemy's forces or to form a cover for own forces. Furthermore, this practice also quickly spread in *voivodes'* orders.[54]

The infrastructure of the Russian-Swedish border at the turn of the seventeenth century allowed the *voivodes* of border districts (*uezd*) of the Russian State to change the mode of functioning of the border in coordination with the Ambassadorial Prikaz, from the border as a zone of free enough communication to a fortified line hindering border crossing for certain categories of people in accordance with their status, ethnic origin, subjecthood, and purposes for crossing the border.

The third period, 1617–1700

Whereas during the previous periods the border infrastructure was actively developed, the period between 1617 and 1700 was relatively calm. As a result of the Treaty of Stolbovo, north-western territories of the Novgorod Lands were handed over to Sweden, including the entire network of large fortifications. With the transition of regional trade monopoly to the Swedes, the reduction of the activities of the Moscow government in the region up to the 1650s, and the subsequent preservation of the *status quo*, the border infrastructure developed mainly through the construction of new *ostrogs* and other fortifications.

The excerpts from the records of the *zastavas* on the 'German border' from the years 7174 (1665/66) and 7200–7201 (1691/92–1692/93), which were published by Ogloblin, contained descriptions of the *zastavas* and placement of the *zastava* heads. The record of 1665/66, for instance, listed the heads of seven *zastavas*; the text also provided brief information on location of the *zastavas*, the distances between them and Novgorod, and the number of guards. Two to ten Streltsy (in one case 22) armed mostly with firearms kept guard at the *zastavas*. Two *zastavas* (Tesovskaya and Lavuyskaya) were located in small *ostrogs* (*ostrozhek*), three were in border villages, and two were in tracts (*urochishche*). The

---

[54] O. A. Kurbatov, *Voennaia istoriia Russkoi smuty nachala XVII veka* (Moscow: Kvadriga, 2014), 226–27.

records of 1691/92–1692/93 showed that the geography of *zastavas* did not change since 1665/66.[55]

K. V. Shmelev provided historical and geographical overview of *zastavas* at the Russian-Swedish Border in the seventeenth century. Relying mainly on the published records of 1666, 1692, and 1699, he attempted to outline the *zastavas* on the Russian-Swedish border as a system, yet he did not analyze how the system of border protection developed. K. V. Shmelev made a valuable contribution by enriching the study of geography of the *zastavas* with archaeological data by compiling all information on the remains of *zastavas* in contemporary landscape which was available in 2004.[56]

During the period after the conclusion of Treaty of Stolbovo some of the highways were in decline, while others were preserved. The value of these roads for the state declined, but the number of merchants who could travel along the roads increased. In the meantime, the importance of waterways increased. With the introduction of the Sobornoye Ulozheniye legislation code in 1649 the responsibility for road maintenance shifted to the lords of manor and landowners. Existing charges for river and land transportation were retained in order to reimburse landowners for the maintenance of roads. The borderland still featured a developed network of roads.[57]

Under the Treaty of Stolbovo trade was traditionally carried out with the mediation of merchants from Livonian cities. At the same time, Russia's territorial losses in Ingria led to the fact that all trade was conducted through Swedish territory. According to I. P. Shaskol'skii, it is hardly possible to talk about the complete collapse of trade in the Baltic region, but also one cannot say that trading infrastructure remained on the same level as before 1617.[58]

The demarcation of the Russian-Swedish border in 1618–1621 did not entail an immediate creation of something like a regular border service. During the first years after the conclusion of the Treaty of Stolbovo it was the small *ostrog*s which were the only border control points. Tesovsky is the first among such small *ostrog*s with the function of border control. It was mentioned already in 1617.[59] In early December 1620 the Novgorodian Vasilii

---

[55] Ogloblin, *Obozrenie istoriko-geograficheskikh materialov XVII i nachala XVIII vv., zakliuchaiushchikhsia v knigakh Razriadnogo prikaza.*

[56] K. V. Shmelev, "Zastavy i garnizony 'sveiskogo rubezha' v seredine XVII veka," *Novyi chasovoi*, no. 15–16 (2004): 7–22.

[57] Selin, "Magistral'nye dorogi severo-zapada Novgorodskoi zemli v XVI-XVII vv."

[58] I. P. Shaskol'skii, "Torgovlia Rossii s Pribaltikoi i Zapadnoi Evropoi v XVII v.," in *Tez. dokl. i soobshch. Konf. po istorii ekonomicheskikh sviazei Pribaltiki s Rossiei* (Riga, 1968), 13–15.

[59] G. Sabler, ed., "Otnoshenie podpisavshikh s russkoi storony na Stolbovskom dogovore komissarov k shvedskomu fel'dmarshalu baronu Karlu Giullengel'mu, Novgorod, 23 Maia 1617 g.," in *Sobranie russkikh pamiatnikov, izvlechennykh iz semeinogo arkhiva grafov Delagardi* (Yuryev: Tipografiia K. Matisena, 1896), 57–63.

Voronin accompanied the Swedish messenger Bengt ('Pentheus') Matsson, who returned from Moscow, to the Zaretsky Ostrog, the first fortified settlement on the Swedish side. It was this small *ostrog* which was the point from which, apparently according to the instructions of the local authorities, the carts from the Moscow side could move legally and the point from which they were turned around.[60]

The brief overview showed that the border infrastructure developed mainly through the improvement of border protection system, as many other elements did not change significantly (traditional system of border management), or experienced a relative decline (roads and communications, trade restrictions). The evolution of the border protection system by the middle of the seventeenth century led to the establishment of a complex system of fortifications and even the closure of the border.

Local demand for border protection, 1617–1630

The border line caused disputes between local landowners and husbandmen. As the economic life recovered in the 1620–1630s there was an increasing interest in the unoccupied lands which were excluded from the economy but were still suitable for agricultural use. As a rule, conflicts arose after the destruction of landmarks and the ensuing land seizures.

In March 1647 the Novgorodian lords of manor Fedor Nashchokin and Osip Nosakin filed a petition to the Novgorod voivode office (*s'ezzhaia izba*) that the Swedes occupied the land of Fedor Nashchokin on the Russian side of the border. Already on March 25, 1647, this petition was in the Ambassadorial Prikaz in Moscow. Its clerks sent an order to *Voivode* Prince S. A. Urusov and clerk L. Talyzin to investigate the case. The Novgorod authorities sent the nobleman Ivan Kolobov to the border where he gathered the local old settlers on the Russian side and found out that the Swedes occupied forest and agricultural lands there. The Swedes, according to the peasants, not only captured these 4–5 square kilometres, but also dug new landmark pits, put other boundary marks, and destroyed the old border signs. Kolobov ordered that local peasants ploughed the occupied lands anew. On April 29 the report on this was in Moscow, and on July 31 the clerks of the Ambassadorial Prikaz sent an order to Novgorod not to destroy the boundary signs constructed by the Swedes for the sake of 'exposure.' *Voivode* Prince S. A. Urusov had to write to the governors of Swedish towns (Nöteborg in this case) about the incident and express claims.[61]

---

[60] Otpiska novgorodskogo voevody kn. D. I. Mezetskogo v Posol'skii prikaz ob otpuske v Shvetsiiu gontsa Panteleia Matveeva, 4 dekabria 1620 g. (Archive of the Saint Petersburg Institute of History (Arkhiv SPbII), f. 109, d. 300).

[61] Delo o spornykh zemliakh Novgorodskogo uezda s Ingermanlandiei, mart–iiul' 1647 g., Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA), f. 96, d. 5, l. 414–420.

A similar incident occurred about the same time in another part of the borderland. The head of the Tesovskaya *zastava* Ivan Baranov told the Novgorod authorities that Grigorii Chertov, a lord of manor from the border area, noticed a felled poplar 'with signs' on 'the sovereign's side along the Swedish border on the heath on the Lipenka.' Having received Chertov's news, the head sent 'the old settlers of the Tesov village Vakhrushko Melent'ev and Ostratko Titov' to examine the place. It turned out that 'the German people' deliberately destroyed the landmark poplar and began to mow the hay in the disputed heath. The Novgorod authorities sent the nobleman Prince B. I. Putyatin for investigation. His results confirmed Chertov's message. Only then the Novgorod authorities notified the Ambassadorial Prikaz about the incident. The old settlers also mentioned that the disputed heath was in the manor of the Novgorodian Ivan Stepanov, the son of Zabelin 'before the German devastation'; later it appeared in the 'empty lands.' Grigorii Chertov's peasants testified that the residents of Ingria began to plow the heath about nine years before and that for the five preceding years had been mowing the hay.[62]

Numerous tensions occurred over the whole seventeenth century when the economic interests of the neighbors collided along the border. This resulted in articulated social demand for the protection of the border. Land use tensions were not the only concern for local dwellers and authorities. The transculturality of diseases also stimulated the local interest in border protection.

The rumour that a 'plague,' an infection which could lead to epidemics and mass mortality, spread on the Swedish territory caused a serious change in the border regime in 1629–1630. This rumour first appeared in the fall of 1629. Even though it was not supported by other rumours the border was closed. From September to early December 1629 an epidemic indeed raged in Narva and Ivangorod.[63] At the time, when the rumour of the epidemic reached the border areas of the Moscow State and the government took urgent measures, the Novgorod authorities instructed the *zastava* heads to send only trusted peasant 'for news' and only to the territories which were close to the border.[64]

On September 28, 1629, Avdot'itsa, a peasant girl from the village of Korino of the Staropolskaya Hundred, who visited the Swedish side came to the bailiff (*prikazchik*). During

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] These rumors were likely to be the aftermath of the bubonic plague epidemic which spread in South and Central Europe since the spring of 1629 (Zh. Deliumo, Uzhasy Na Zapade (Moskva: Golos, 1994), 85; V. V. Samarkin, Istoricheskaia Geografiia Zapadnoi Evropy V Srednie Veka (Mosvow: Vysshaia shkola, 1976), 195).

[64] Pamiat' novgorodskogo voevody kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami golove Tesovskoi zastavy P. S. Obol'ianinovu ob okhrane granitsy, o provedyvanii vestei pro morovoe povetrie za rubezhom i o dache 3 chelovek s saniami strel'tsam, posylaemykh na dal'nie ot Tesova zastavy, 9 dekabria 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 419).

an interrogation she testified that a 'plague' began in Narva and the Narva District and that the bridge between Narva and Ivangorod was dismantled for safety. This news was confirmed by the townsman Artiushka Grigor'ev who returned from Reval on the same day.[65] The Novgorod authorities did not admit merchants into the state and deported them. After that they told the Pskov *voivodes* to set *zastavas* on the boundary with the Ivangorod District of Ingria.[66]

The Novgorod authorities took decisive steps to consolidate the border. All highways, land and water, were blocked by small *ostrog*s and *zastavas*. Sections of the border in the Novgorod District were assigned to different *zastava* heads who were responsible for small *storozhas* on country roads and trails. The westernmost portion was guarded by Ivan Zakhar'evich Baranov, who was in charge of three boyar sons sent to 'supervise the *storozhas*' from Somersky Ostrog to Tesovo and from the same *ostrog* to the Pskov District in the other direction (from October 4 he was replaced by I. Shipilov). The next section was centred on the Tesovsky Ostrog, commanded by the head P. S. Obolianinov. Five boyar sons and 20 Streltsy assisted him. He also had to set up *zastavas* and *storozhas* to the west, up to the Somerskaya Volost (small district), and to the east, up to the Tigodskaya *Zastava*. Andrei Putilov served as the head of the latter with three boyar sons and ten Streltsy. In the west, this section converged with the area of responsibility of the Tesovsky Ostrog and with the Lavuyskaya *Zastava* in the north. The latter was headed by Vasilii Neelov. He was instructed to take two Ladoga boyar sons and archers and ten Streltsy and Cossacks and to guard the area from the zone of the Tigodskaya *zastava* to the mouth of the Volkhov. There was a *zastava* under D. S. Pushchin who also had two boyar sons and ten Streltsy and Cossacks from Ladoga at the mouth of the Volkhov.[67]

The guarded boundary line ended there in the fall of 1629 and was extended to the east only in the spring of 1630. The Ladoga *Voivode* V. F. Nepliuev was instructed to provide Vasilii Neelov and Dmitrii Pushchin appointed to the Lavuya and the mouth of the Volkhov respectively with the Streltsy and Cossacks (ten people for each *zastava*). The *voivode* was instructed not to admit Russian and 'German' merchants traveling from Sweden with goods, not to accommodate them in Ladoga, and to send townsmen across the border as scouts.[68]

---

[65] Nakaznaia pamiat' ot novgorodskikh voevod kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami D. S. Pushchinu o sluzhbe na zastave na Volkhovskom ust'e, oktiabr' 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 882).

[66] Otpiska novgorodskikh voevod kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami pskovskim voevodam kn. D. P. Pozharskomu s tovarishchami s soobshcheniem izvestii o morovom povetrii v Narve, 24 oktiabria 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 757).

[67] Rospis' detei boiarskikh, poslannykh na zastavy vdol' russko-shvedskoi granitsy, Oktiabr' 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 763).

[68] Gramota novgorodskogo voevody kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami ladozhskomu voevode V, f. Nepliuevu ob okhrane granits v sviazi s morovym povetriem v Shvetsii, 3 oktiabria 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 443).

Apart from that *zastava* heads and *voivodes* had to send peasants abroad for gathering news. On October 26, 1629, for instance, the Somersky *zastava* head I. I. Shipilov received the order from the Novgorod authorities on establishing *zastavas* in all places of possible border crossing 'firmly against the plague' and to send abroad the 'best' peasants as scouts. Shipilov mobilized thirty people for guarding the *zastavas*.[69] In late November 1629, having received numerous news that the epidemic came to an end, the Novgorod authorities ordered to mitigate the regime of border crossing for the first time.[70] The Novgorodians who were detained on entry to the Moscow State wrote in a petition to Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich, 'And now, sovereign, by your sovereign decree it is ordered to remove guards from the *zastavas* and to allow passage to the German Land and from the German Land to Russia'.[71]

On January 6, 1630, the Novgorod *voivodes* reported to Moscow that according to numerous reports from the *zastavas* received between December 26 and January 6 the epidemic abroad was over; that rather many people gathered between the Swedish Zaretsky Ostrog and the Russian border expecting admittance to the Moscow State; and also that a messenger from Narva who was sent to give notice about a near arrival of a Swedish embassy left the *ostrog* after not being admitted. The report also mentioned the salt which was bought by the locals from the ships coming from Lübeck as the reason for the epidemic in Ivangorod.[72] On January 9, 1630, a letter came from the Ambassadorial Prikaz to Novgorod ordering to remove the *zastavas* and send news to Narva that the merchants of both sides were again allowed to travel freely for commercial purposes. The Novgorod authorities sent Bogdan Turov to Narva with this news, but did not completely abandon precautions. Turov was ordered to check again whether the epidemic ended in Ingria.[73]

In February 1630 the fear of the epidemic, however, returned to Novgorod. The Strelets Petrushka Grigor'ev reported that a plague started in the Shelonskaya Piatina in the manor of Moisei Skobel'tsyn. The authorities started an investigation sending Bogdan Turov and the Strelets to the Shelonskaya Piatina. The fear was so great that false statements during the

[69] Otpiska golovy Somerskoi zastavy I. I. Shipilova novgorodskomu voevode kn. D. M. Pozharskomu o vestiakh pro morovoe povetrie v gorodakh Ingermanlandii, 30 oktiabria 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 465).

[70] Rassprosnye rechi krest'ian Medvedskogo monastyria na Lavuiskoi zastave, prishedshikh iz-za rubezha o morovom povetrii v prigranichnykh uezdakh Ingermanlandii, 20 noiabria 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 437); Otpiska golovy zastavy na Volkhovskom ust'e D. S. Pushchina novgorodskomu voevode kn. D. M. Pozharskomu s tovarishchami s izvestiiami o morovom povetrii za rubezhom i s soobshcheniem o zaderzhanii na Volkhovskom ust'e pribyvshikh iz Shvetsii novgorodtsev O. Bogomolova i S. Glazkova, 22 noiabria 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 427).

[71] Chelobitnaia tsariu Mikhailu Fedorovichu novgorodskikh posadskikh torgovykh liudei s pros'boi propustit' ikh v Novgorod s Volkhovskogo ust'ia, ianvar' 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 487).

[72] Otpiska novgorodskikh voevod kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami v Posol'skii prikaz s soobshcheniem o morovom povetrii v Ingermanlandii i o zaderzhke shvedskogo gontsa na granitse, 6 ianvaria 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 821).

[73] Otpiska novgorodskikh voevod kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami v Posol'skii prikaz s soobshcheniem ob okonchanii morovogo povetriia v Ingermanlandii i o priniatykh merakh dlia ego preduprezhdeniia na russkoi storone, 18 ianvaria 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 499).

investigation were to be punished by death. If Bogdan Turov would find out that an epidemic had indeed started, the villages were supposed to be sealed off, 'the forest around those villages' was 'to be cut,' and 'firm guard' was to be set for not 'admitting any man from those villages.'[74] The Novgorod authorities took the usual measures reinforcing the *zastavas* and banning movement across the border, while the whole line of the 'Novgorod' border with Sweden was divided into zones of responsibility between different *zastava* heads.[75]

In late September 1630 the news of the epidemic were brought to the Tesovskaya *Zastava* by several merchants returning to the Moscow State from Sweden. One of them, born in Toropets, recounted that he went to trade in Reval from Novgorod and that he lived in Reval for over ten weeks. On the way back he visited Narva, Ivangorod, and Yam. In Reval and its district, as well as in Narva, nothing was heard of the epidemic; nothing was also heard about the Swedish towns across the sea.[76] It was the last news of the 'plague' received in the Novgorod Land.

Border regulation, 1630–1700

The epidemic, an accidental circumstance, triggered the institutionalization of border control in the northwest of the Moscow State. After 1630 it became regular and everybody who crossed the border was thoroughly inspected, regardless of an epidemic threat. The establishment of the *zastavas* in the winter of 1629–1630 complicated and formalized border crossing. During the same period the Swedish side also began to monitor the correctness of the border crossing. When the *zastava* heads were instructed to send the 'best' peasants abroad up to Ivangorod in early 1630 they encountered difficulties. The Tesovo *Zastava* head reported to Novgorod that the peasants told him 'before and then' that they could not 'go abroad without the sovereign's' travel letters.[77]

An order to one of the *zastava* heads in the critical moment of panic associated with the 'plague' in Ingria stated that neither Russians nor foreigners were allowed to pass through the border, including those who had travel documents. All travellers were even banned from

---

[74] Pamiat' novgorodskogo voevody kn. D. M. Pozharskogo B. Turovu ob obyske pro morovoe povetrie v pomest'e Moiseia Skobel'tsyna i o bor'be s povetriem na Mshage i v okol'nykh pogostakh, 23 fevralia 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 508).

[75] Rospis' kazakov i strel'tsov, posylaemykh na zastavy vdol' shvedskoi granitsy, mai 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 544); Pamiat' novgorodskikh voevod kn. D. M. Pozharskogo s tovarishchami P. S. Obol'ianinovu o naznachenii na zastavu na Volkhovskoe ust'e v Medvedskii monastyr' v sviazi s novymi izvestiiami o morovom povetrii za rubezhom, mai 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 545); Spisok strel'tsov prikaza I. A. Ushakova, naznachennykh v posylku, mai 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 789); Spisok strel'tsov prikaza I. G. Baranova, naznachennykh v posylku, mai 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 792).

[76] Otpiska golovy Tesovskoi zastavy N. Ia. Tyrkova novgorodskim voevodam kn. D. M. Pozharskomu s tovarishchami s izlozheniem doprosnykh rechei torgovykh liudei, priekhavshikh v Tesovo iz Ingermanlandii, ranee 7 sentiabria 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 561).

[77] Otpiska golovy Tesovskoi zastavy P. S. Obol'ianinova novgorodskomu voevode kn. D. M. Pozharskomu s izvestiem o prekrashchenii morovogo povetriia v Narve i Ivangorode, 11 ianvaria 1630 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 486).

approaching the *zastavas*. They were supposed to be stopped nearby at a distance from which 'each other's voice' could be heard. From this distance they were to be asked questions. If they claimed that they had business in Novgorod or a message to someone this was not to have any effect; no letters were to be accepted from the travellers. Even official messengers were supposed to be kept on the Swedish side of the border.[78] By the middle of the seventeenth century border crossing without travel documents became a crime. The *zastava* heads were also prosecuted for pandering to illegal passages across the border, but they still occurred.[79]

The *zastavas* around Novgorod formed a stable system also during the Novgorod Uprising of 1650. The insurgent *Voivode* Prince F. A. Khilkov was accused in a petition of ill supplies of the guards at the *zastavas* and *storozhas*.[80] Apparently, during the Novgorod Uprising the Streltsy and Cossacks who guarded the border actively spread rumours. The Moscow authorities blamed the Novgorodians for excessive credulity, 'and now you heard from the Streltsy and Cossacks who serve at the *zastavas* that the Swedish Germans intended to take our treasury, money, and bread for hiring with that money treasury and bread the Germans of other lands.'[81] The inhabitants of the borderland, peasants, lords of manor, and the Streltsy and Cossacks serving at the *zastavas* were so focused on gathering rumours as intelligence that their willingness to spread (and create) the rumours of the impending military danger was not surprising.

After the suppression of the uprising in Novgorod, there was a redistribution of military forces in the northwest in the context of the Pskov Uprising. All battle-worthy men of service had to participate in suppressing rebellious Pskov. The boyar Prince I. N. Khovanskii assigned 25 Streltsy to the border *zastavas*.[82] The rebellions consolidated the authorities' attempts to control the border.

---

[78] Pamiat' zastavnomu golove s zapretom propuskat' cherez granitsu vsekh, dazhe tekh, u kogo est' proezzhie gramoty. Bez nachala, dekabr' 1629 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 894).

[79] Otpiska pskovskikh voevod kn. A. Khilkova, I. Naumova i d'iaka P. Ovdokimova novgorodskomu voevode kn. G. P. Romodanovskomu i d'iakam M. I. Miloslavskomu i D. Semenovu s zaprosom o liubchanine A. Dikmane, 26 marta 1623 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 234).

[80] Chelobitnaia (vtoraia) ot imeni vsego Novgoroda s zhalobami na voevodu okol'nichego kn. F, A. Khilkova, mitropolita Nikona i novgorodskogo gostia S. Stoianova, 28 marta 1650 g. (G. M. Kovalenko, T. A. Lapteva, and T. B. Solov'eva, eds., *"Miatezhnoe Vremia": Sledstvennoe Delo O Novgorodskom Vosstanii 1650 Goda* (Saint Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriia, 2001).

[81] Gramota iz Posol'skogo prikaza v Novgorod strel'tsam, kazakam i posadskim liudiam (v otvet na chelobitnye ot Novgoroda) s obvineniiam v konflikte s datskim poslannikom i v zakhvate vlasti v gorode, s raz"iasneniem voprosov o russko-shvedskikh otnosheniiakh, s prizyvom povinit'sia i vydat' zachinshchikov vosstaniia, 17 aprelia 1650 g. (Kovalenko, Lapteva, and Solov'eva, *"Miatezhnoe Vremia"*).

[82] E. V. Gradoboinova, "Vooruzhennoe protivostoianie miatezhnogo Pskova i armii I. N. Khovanskogo v 1650 g.," *Vestnik MGU*, no. 3 (2011): 22–34; Otpiska boiarina kn. I. N. Khovanskogo v Posol'skii prikaz o raspredelenii strel'tsov mezhdu okhrannym otriadom v Novgorode i otriadom, idushchim na Pskov, 13–16 maia 1650 g. (Kovalenko, Lapteva, and Solov'eva, *"Miatezhnoe Vremia"*).

In 1652 the Novgorod authorities received a strict decree to admit to the Moscow State only those who had travel documents. A 'strict order' was to be set at the *zastavas*. According to the decree, the purpose was primarily fiscal, so that 'the merchant people coming from across the Swedish border to our side' did not secretly pass 'between towns and trade with anyone without visiting Veliky Novgorod or Ladoga and paying duties' to the customs.[83] Hence, the border regime which was established to hold transboundary spread of disease and information in check was utilized for the formation of a modern state in economic terms.

During the war of 1656–1658 the small *ostrogs* and other fortifications played an important role. Similar to the period of hostilities in 1609–1616, both sides actively used small field fortifications in defence and offence. The military actions were studied in detail on the materials of the Razryadny (Military) Prikaz, one of the state offices, by S. S. Gadziatskii already in the middle of the twentieth century. After the hostilities began in 1656, *voivodes* of the borderland were ordered to remove *zastavas* from the border and tenderly accept defectors.[84] The border was again turned into a zone in this respect.

Since the fall of 1658 active fighting stopped and the borders reimerged as fortified lines. Small *ostrogs* and *zastavas* were also reestablished both at the border with Ingria and Karelia. Having crossed the border in 1656, the Moscow military moved the small *ostrogs* to the 'Swedish side' in two places, on Lavuya and in Kondushi (in the 'Swedish' village Manshila). After the war, the local heads who knew about the support from the central authorities did not remove these fortifications; the clerks of the Ambassadorial Prikaz and the numerous representatives of the Russian embassies promised to the Swedes that they would remove the small *ostrogs* erected during the war, but they were actually dismantled only in the late 1662 – early 1663.[85]

By the summer of 1659 new rules for border crossing were established for the messengers from Sweden and other countries who came to Novgorod. The Novgorod authorities were supposed to interrogate each messenger: what letters they brought to the tsar, from whom and from where they were sent, and how they travelled to Novgorod. The messangers had to say if they passed through areas affected by epidemics and to report

---

[83] Tsarskaia gramota (iz Posol'skogo prikaza) novgorodskomu voevode b. kn. Iu. P. Buinosovu-Rostovskomu i d'iaku Isaku Kudrinu o pravilakh torgovli shvedskikh kuptsov, priezzhaiushchikh v Novgorod, 18 ianvaria 1652 g. (RGADA, f. 96. 1652, d. 4, pp. 21–24).

[84] S. S. Gadziatskii, "Bor'ba russkikh liudei Izhorskoi zemli v XVII veke protiv inozemnogo vladychestva," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 16 (1945): 14–57.

[85] Perepisnaia kniga raznykh del Novgorodskoi prikaznoi izby, 1661–1666 gg. (Arkhiv SPbII, Kol. 2, op. 1, d. 24, pp. 12–12 rev.). Perepisnaia kniga raznykh del Novgorodskoi prikaznoi izby, 1661–1666 gg. (Arkhiv SPbII, Kol. 2, op. 1, d. 24, pp. 12–13).

political news. The messangers were supposed to be allowed to proceed to Moscow only if they had letters to the tsar and only if they traveled through 'healthy places'. On June 16, 1659, the Novgorod authorities took note of these rules and gave appropriate instructions to the *zastava* heads.[86]

The contacts between Russian and Swedish representatives on the border were clearly regulated. The main provisions of an instruction given to a Swedish officer who was sent to the Lavuysky Small Ostrog may serve as an example. On approaching the border, the officer had to send a drummer forward who was obliged to report to the head of the *ostrog* about the mission.[87] The drummer had to ensure that the Swedish officer was personally brought to the head the *ostrog* and allowed to verbally express the purpose of his travel. He was strictly instructed not to shy away from the topic and not to say anything on his own. Then the officer had to obtain an oral response, firmly remember it, and explain in detail to the *Ståthållare* (governor) in Noteburg.[88]

Hence, the network of border *zastavas* and fortifications which existed in the seventeenth century laid the foundat,ion for border regulation. Strict restrictions on travel to Moscow Russia existed before, but only under the first Romanovs the movement across properly fortified borders became regulated. In her book Valerie Kivelson analyzed in detail that toughening of border crossing in the seventeenth century gave a Muscovite among other things access to membership in a political community, but at the same time shut the door to geographical and social mobility.[89] The observations showed that in the case of the Russian-Swedish border in Ingria the border was 'shut' after the panic caused by an epidemic of plague in Europe in 1629–1630, and reinforced by the uprisings in Novgorod and Pskov.

Conclusion

The infrastructure of the Russian-Swedish border in the period between 1323 and 1700 developed unevenly. Besides, there were multiple border infrastructures which produced parallel border regimes. Each border regime pertained to particular type of social relations

---

[86] Tsarskaia gramota (iz Posol'skogo prikaza) novgorodskomu voevode kn. G. S. Kurakinu o trebovanii s proezzhaiushchikh inostrannykh gontsov proezzhikh gramot i udostovereniia, chto s nimi net bol'nykh liudei. Bez nachala, 9 iiunia 1659 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 748).

[87] As B. V. Megorskii wrote on the hostilities of the Great Northern War, the drummer (as well as the trumpeter) had the status of a negotiator in the wars of the early modern period (the white flag was unknown to the wars of the seventeenth and the eighteenth century). Hence, sending the drummer to a border fortress was part of the shared European war custom of the period (B. V. Megorskii, "Sdacha krepostei: Obychai i opyt Severnoi voiny," *Vyborg v Severnoi voine: XIII Studencheskaia konferentsiia*, 2009, http://www.reenactor.ru/lofiversion/index.php/t25514.html).

[88] Instruktsiia namestnika Noteburga Val'tera fon der Palena poruchiku Larsu Krakovu, poslannomu v Lavuiskii ostrog, 22 sentiabria 1658 g. (Arkhiv SPbII, f. 109, d. 157).

[89] V. Kivel'son, Kartografii tsarstva: Zemlia i ee znacheniia v Rossii XVII veka. (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012), 27.

and interests of different local and occupational groups. Although military infrastructure developed throughout the three centuries, it was not always used to seal the border. Before the Treaty of Stolbovo, the border stimulated international trade by facilitating formation of transcultural trade networks which remained prominent even after the decline of the Narva ports. The analysed material showed that ensuring a 'linear' character of the border was not politically necessary over the sixteenth century.

During the transition of vast Novgorod territories to Sweden the quality of material border infrastructure diminished. This trend was connected to the decrease of Russia's strategic interest in the expansion of its territory in the northwest. The trade infrastructure, for instance, reduced because of the loss of such towns and fortresses as Ivangorod. The network of *yams* which were located on the roads which fell under Swedish control also suffered. At the same time, the system of border control improved. Following the experience of the Netherlands, the Moscow authorities developed a system of small *ostrogs* and *zastavas*, which took over the large defensive lines captured by Sweden in border control.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth century territories of shared ownership still existed on the border and the search and delivery of captives and fugitives was recognized as a regular practice of the borderland *voivodes*, that is the main objective was not the prevention of escapes but the return of the fugitives. At the same time, the early sixteenth century witnessed the increasing local demand for border control, which was supposed to preclude land seizures by neighbouring peasants. The interest of the Moscow authorities pertained to controlling information flows across the border and gathering duties. The interests of the local and the Moscow authorities coincided during the epidemic of 1629–1630, when the network of outposts was tested. After the epidemic the system of strict border control was not dismantled laying the foundation for modern interstate boundaries.

Ivan Sablin
National Research University Higher School of Economic, St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Center for Historical Research, Senior Research Fellow; E-mail: isablin@hse.ru.