Among the Novgorodians who firmly chose the Swedish party during and after the Swedish-Novgorodian alliance 1611–1617, Ivan Sval’, serf of the metropolitan steward I. Z. Lutochin and generally believed to have helped the Swedish forces to find and exploit a weak spot in the city defence (having himself been made a captive some time earlier), is probably best known to the general reader today. One reason for this is the fact that his actions were mentioned in Solov’ev’s History of Russia from the Earliest Times, but it can also arguably be linked to a certain proclivity in modern Russian societal discourse for explaining adversities as resulting from the acts of ‘traitors’. Yet, in careful scholarship, there has often remained some healthy scepticism as to Ivan’s rôle, since his name has been completely missing from known Swedish sources. However, newly discovered documents in Swedish archives throw new light on the situation and turn out to support the local Novgorodian tradition as apparently formed in 1611 or soon thereafter.

The only even roughly contemporary Russian source mentioning Sval’ in connection with the reduction of Novgorod is the so-called New Chronicer («Новый летописец»), which was composed in the 1620s or 1630s and was to enjoy considerable popularity in the seventeenth century. In the
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1 The research for this paper has been graciously supported by the Magn. Bergvall Foundation and the Lars Hierta Memorial Foundation, which is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

2 On Lutochin, who had, or had had, property on Čudinceva Street, see Селин А. А. Дьяк Семен Лутохин и его родственники, at: http://nwae.spbu.ru/pdf/314/p2.pdf. С. 7 (accessed on 20 April 2015).


4 Thus, we find an entry on Sval’in, for example, Караулянчик В. В. Кто предавал Россию. М., 2008. The man is probably also immortalised in the Russian word “шваль”, originally signifying ‘tailor’ but now exclusively carrying the pejorative meaning “riff-raff”, which, partly using Novgorodian 19th-century oral tradition, A. I. Semenov derives from the subject of our paper and his 1611 moment of glory (Семенов А. И. О новгородском происхождении современного значения слова “шваль”. ТОДРЛ. 1958. Т. XIV. С. 595–596; cf. О. Н. Трубачев’s note in: Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка. М., 1973. Т. IV. С. 417).
younger of the two main textual branches of the Chronicler, to which all published recensions belong we read: "Въ то же время бысть у НЪмець въ полону Иванъ человЪкъ Лутохина Ивашко Шваль и обьщася имъ, что ввести ихъ въ городъ. Во городѣ же въ тѣ поры по ствнамъ стража худа. Той же Ивашко приведе ихъ нощью въ городъ въ Чюдинцовыя ворота, и въ городъ внидоша, никто ихъ не видалъ". In the theologically and literally more developed long redaction of the Tale of the Siege of the Monastery of Tichvin by the Swedes in 1613 ("Сказание о осаде Тихвинского монастыря шведами в 1613 г.") written in 1658, we learn how an anonymous "злый рабъ", identifiable with the Chronicler’s Ивасъ Шваль’, "отбьгаетъ изъ града къ сему злод Живому Немецкому воеводу Якову Пунтовскоу въ полки, и обьщавается ему безъ кровопролитья брани отворить градныя врата, самъ же отъ него просить еже свободитися ему отъ господина своего и отъ его работнаго ига; и тако нощью приведъ ихъ къ Чюдинцовскимъ вратомъ, и подползъ подъ врата и отвори

5 Thus ПСРЛ. 1910. Т. XIV. 1-ая половина. СПб. С. 113–114. Cf. in the Obolenskij copy: "Прилучицся тогда у НЪмець въ полону Ивана Лутохина Ивашка Шваль, той обьщася НЪцовь ввести въ Новгород, и приведе ихъ нощью въ Чудиновскія ворота, и тайно введе нача начаси побивать стражей на ствнѣ и на вратахъ". These three recensions all belong to the Undol’skij redaction ("редакция Ундольского" – V. G. Vovina-Lebedeva’s term), whereas all copies belonging to the earlier Academic redaction ("Академическая редакция" – V. G. Vovina-Lebedeva’s term), which, generally, appears to retain many primary readings, remain unpublished. Cf. Вовина-Лебедева В. Г. Новый летописец: история текста. СПб., 2004. С. 39, 195 (stemma codicum). It should be pointed out that some of the data on Novgorod under the Swedes may, in Vovina-Lebedeva’s hypothesis (Ibidem. С. 312–315, 333–335, cf. 289–290), derive from Cyprian (Киприан), at the time archimandrite of the Monastery of the Transfiguration at Chutyn’, later metropolitan of Novgorod. On Cyprian’s development, in Zamjatin’s analysis, from being a supporter of the Swedish cause at his arrival at Novgorod in 1612 until late 1614, when he gradually turns into a central figure in the city’s pro-Muscovite party, see A. Odinokov’s electronical edition of Zamjatin’s doctoral dissertation: Замятин Г. А. Очерки по истории шведской интервенции в Московском государстве начала XVII века. Молотов, 1942 (Очерк II. Л. 41–42) at: http://www.proza.ru/2013/02/16/930 (accessed on 12 May 2015).

6 On which, see Енин Г. П. Сказание о осаде Тихвинского монастыря шведами в 1613 г. // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси. Вып. 3 (XVII в.). Ч. 3. СПб., 1998. С. 425–428.
ихъ; они же врази, вшедше во градъ».

Even in the *Annals* («Временник») traditionally ascribed to Ivan Timofeev and possibly predating the *New Chronicler* we learn how the Swede, «не о Бозе, но льстивне стену прелез, вшёл в мя [i.e. Новгород /А.Р.-М.]», in which words a scholar has, quite reasonably, identified an allusion to treason.

The problem with the exclusively Russian sources for Šval’s rôle in 1611 has remained, however; the more so since they appear to contradict the eyewitness testimony of M. Schaum from the storming of the city. As an explanation it has been suggested that the plan based on information from this Novgorodian serf was kept a secret from mercenaries such as Schaum, whereas his actions became known in the city after it was taken. Furthermore, a confirmation of sorts has been sought and found in the perceived fact that Šval’ received three quarters (четверти) of rye by the Swedes in September 1612, which might then have been a kind of renumeration for his treason. However, A. A. Selin has since pointed out that the receptor in question was the under-secretary (подьячий) Ivan Prokof’ev, not Ivan Šval’.

---

7 Quoted from the appendix to the *Third Novgorod Chronicle*: ПСРЛ. 1841. Т. III. С. 284–285. Ср. Семенов А. Н. О новгородском происхождении. С. 595–596; Седов П. В. Интриги Смутного времени, или Как холоп Шваль предал новгородцев // Военно-исторический журнал. 1996. № 2. С. 84–89, at С. 87. (For the miniatures depicting Šval’ in this episode, see Енин Г. П. Шведская оккупация Новгородской земли в русской книжной миниатюре // Чело. 2008. № 1 (41). С. 54–60, esp. С. 56). Welcome as any new data would have been, it must be remembered that accreting details in a late, tendentious work by no means necessarily add to our knowledge of what actually took place, and the *Tale* appears to make an attempt at creating a more clear-cut image of a traitor (cf., in particular: «бысть у Нiмець въ полону» vs «отбАгаетъ изъ града къ сему злодИвому Немецкому воевАду»). It is a curious fact that a family tradition makes the French interpreter (previously?) in Moscovite service, Bažen Ivanov / Benjamin Barohn, present himself to De la Gardie during the siege in a somewhat similar fashion to that of Šval’ in the *Tale*, having somehow escaped from the city (Pereswetoľ–Morath A. I. Straddling Cultural and Political Borders in Swedish Ingria. The Case of Benjamin Barohn (Bažen Ivanov) // Исторические биографии в контексте региональных и имперских границ Северной Европы: материалы Международного научного семинара. СПб., 2013. С. 64–68, at 64).

8 Временник Ивана Тимофеева. СПб., 2004. С. 78; the title translated thus by K. M. Cooke–Horujy.

9 Седов П. В. Интриги Смутного времени. С. 87.


and likewise it was the former who, in 1614, was beaten up by peasants as he was inspecting the harvest at Tėsovo. Selin suggests that the mere two actual mentions of Šval' in the Novgorod Occupation Archives at Stockholm, both in the second half of 1616, may indicate that he was not, as a rule, in Novgorod at all.

Ivan’s pro-Swedish position is confirmed when he is mentioned among the Novgorodians pledging fidelity to king Gustavus Adolphus, and not merely his younger brother, in 1615. In G. A. Zamjatin’s 1942 doctoral dissertation, we find in this context a curious remark to the effect that Šval’ was ennobled as a result of his pledge (“За присягу королю Ивашко Швал стал дворянином”) and a possible interpretation of so very unlikely a scenario is presented below. Whatever privileges Šval’ enjoyed, however, he was struck by severe misfortune when, in September 1616, or shortly thereafter, he was judged negligent in connection with a major horse theft where his servant was culpable, and condemned to pay an indemnity to M. A. Peresvetov, who had lost two horses in the event.

(We note in this connection that the former...
serf Ivaško now has his own servants.) To what further extent this had any effect on his career has remained unknown. In fact, only a single possible piece of information on Ivan’s life prior or posterior to the years 1611–16 has been identified, namely the mention of one Ivanko Šval’ in 1577, who might possibly be identified with the subject of this paper\(^{18}\). This would make the “traitor” of 1611 rather an elderly man as the Tale of the Siege of the Monastery of Tichvin sends him crawling under the city gate.

\(^{18}\) Селин А. А. Новгородское общество... С. 187–188.

\(^{19}\) Ibidem. С. 476.

Despite problems with the Russian sources, however, recently discovered documents in Swedish and German in Swedish archives allow us not only partly to confirm the rôle of Ivan Šval’ in the capture of Novgorod but also further to trace some aspects of Swedish attitudes towards him. The Swedish military accounts from the operations in Russia in 1609–17 contain a section in which Jacob De la Gardie with a stroke of the pen confirms the payment of several sums of money for which there are, in 1617, no receipts or vouchers. Even though, in this specific file, we mainly expect expenses from the years 1615–17, there are several posts in the section that pertain to an earlier period. Thus, we find an undated disbursement to do with Stepan Tatiščev’s embassy to Novgorod, which is known to have taken place in May 1612\(^{19}\) (this is the entry immediately following the one to be discussed below, but chronology has not been a main concern for the compiler of the list), but also, e.g., expenses for two series of wages from the timespans December 1611 – January 1613 and October 1611 – 8 May 1613. Among the expenses thus signed by De la Gardie, we recently identified an undated entry, specifying the substantial payment of 17.5 barrels of rye (probably ca. 2.5 cubic meters) and 7.5 barrels of oats «Till Iwan Szwaal som wnderwijste wart folck leghenheeterne at komma till Nougårth» (i.e. «For Ivan Šval’ who instructed
our troops on how to reach Novgorod). The vagueness of the wording and the brevity of the entry render a more exact translation impossible or at least undesirable; the Swedish «leghenheeterne» may signify both the geographical facts on the ground and more general circumstances, possibilities and contingencies. The vagueness in combination with the silence of Swedish narrative sources unfortunately still prevent us from gauging precisely how crucial was the rôle of Šval’ in the reduction of the city. The Swedish entry, which was for internal accounting use and would not have had to embellish the skill and prowess of the Swedes during the storming by way of downplaying any rôle of Šval’s, meshes reasonably well with the earliest Russian source («обвякся иль, что ввести ихъ въ городъ ... приведе ихъ нощ1ю въ городъ въ Чюдиновсюя ворота, и въ городъ внидоша», where we particularly note the juxtaposition of «he led» and «they entered»), no matter their complete mutual independence. (We should note here once again that the New Chronicle is preferable as a source to the later Tale, whose details smack with apocrypha.) The silence on Šval’ in other Swedish sources on the siege and capture might mean that he was not thought to have been indispensable. Nonetheless, as we shall see soon, nor was he hid away or his services unrewarded.

Regardless of what Zamjatin’s source may have said, the humble Ivan Šval’, who may have started out as a tailor, never became – and never could have become – a Swedish nobleman, the more so without there being a documentary trace in Swedish archives. His Novgorod contemporaries may, however, have noticed that for a short while he did become a landholder, a pomeščik of sorts. Among the Novgorodians – broadly defined – who during these years received such land in Ingria as was to be confirmed in 1617 or later, we find not only nobles (the so-called bayors, ryssebajorere), Tatar servitors, and zemcy or «half bayors» (halfbaijorer, полубояре), but also meaner officials, under-secretaries and scribes, some townsmen, and even

---

20 Desse effter:ne vthgifter åre effter H: N:dz Fältherrens Befalning på åthskillighe tidher leffwereradhe, och är inge quitentzier vpa etc. Bl. 5v. // RA. M1287:(1): Ang. arméns proviantering m.m.
Orthodox priests and monks. The allocation (förlåning) of Ingrian hamlets and villages – temporary ones from the field marshal («fältmarskalken»; Evert Horn af Kanckas, † 30 July 1615) or the commander-in-chief («fältherren»; Jacob De la Gardie), or (more) permanent ones from the king himself – became particularly common from ca. 1615, probably as a consequence of a growing understanding that this part of Novgorodia was very likely to become Swedish (cf., e.g., the revision of Ingria – with Gdovia and the Sumro pogost – of 1615, mainly aimed at analysing the state of various kinds of land and at identifying sources of income, which was carried out together with two Russian audit officers from among the future bayors, but also, it seems reasonable to assume, because several of the above-mentioned pledges to the king and actions ensuing from them needed to be rewarded.

In an undated list of allocations in Caporie (Копорье) łän from 1615, or possibly 1616, we learn that Ivan Svalin («Iuann Sualin») possesses a deed of allocation from De la Gardie for the villages «Buura» (Старая Бура; 4 obzas) and «Klesina» (Клясино; 11 obzas) in the Zamos’e pogost. Similarly, we find him as Ivan Svalev («Ifuan Swaloff») among the landholders of the Caporie łän in 1616, in a list specifying that his villages,

24 Pereswetoff-Morath A. I. ‘Otiosorum hominum receptacula’. Orthodox Religious Houses in Ingria, 1615–52 // Scando-Slavica. 2003. Vol. 49:1. P. 105–129; Пересветов-Мурат А. И. Тимофей Селивестров, поп Орехов // Инкери. Инкерин Лиiton julkaisu. 2008. № 4 (69). С. 7. In particular, the priests of Noteborg (Орехов) łän were guaranteed their lands by De la Gardie. As for townsmen, those two Ivanorod merchants who had helped convince their brethren to stay on the Swedish side in 1617, Z. Nasonov and A. Babin, were rewarded with small lands, but more was to come later on to a few wealthy Ivanorod merchants. Cf. also the allocations to the interpreters from the days of the alliance, F. V. Lugvenev (in Swedish always Lugmenoff) and Бацен Ivanov / Benjamin Barohn, both accorded (near-)bayor status (on the latter, see Pereswetoff-Morath A. I. Straddling Cultural and Political Borders).

25 Or, more properly, the allocation of Crown revenues from villages and hamlets. In general, the Swedish financial situation these years was bad indeed, and the allocation of revenues (förlåningar) one of few methods at hand for remunerating servants of the state (Roberts M. Gustavus Adolphus. A History of Sweden 1611–1632. 1953. Vol. 1. London, New York, Toronto. P. 122–124). It must, in addition, have seemed the most rational form of compensation for local mercenaries or servitors in a time of war, being at the same time, in Novgorod, analogous to the local system of temporary allocation of pomestja. In most of these particular Ingrian cases, however, we have no reason to believe that representatives of the Russian side of the alliance were involved, only commanders Horn af Kanckas or De la Gardie. In cases where the king himself ruled on the allocation or, the more often, confirmed allocations made by the commanders, this seems quite certain. Although Gustavus Adolphus signs allocations of land in Novgorod as early as January 1612 (Södergren G. Om Gustaf II Adolfs plan att bli rysk tsar. Wexjö, 1868. S. 13–14); mere weeks after his ascension, this is mainly done, before Stolbova, during his two spells on the war theatre in 1614 and 1615.


27 I intend to return to an analysis of the Ingrian allocations/enfeoffments of 1614–18.

«Bura» and «Clesina», have five peasants each. There are frequent notes in the margin, defining each landholder in a couple of words, and at times it is tempting to interpret these definitions as part of the reasons for his holding his lands. For Sval’ we read only: «hoos felthern» (with the commander-in-chief; i.e. De la Gardie). To all appearances, then, he has been doing Swedish service independent of his being employed in the city guard (on which, see above). However, when the boyar son Sum (Andrej [or Vasilij]30) Ivanov syn Chomutov, shortly after the treaty of Stolbovo was concluded, i.e. some time in the spring of 1617, asks for royal confirmation for the village of «Buria» in Caporie läns, which he has been granted by De la Gardie as a reward for six years’ of service to the commander, but also as compensation for estates east of the border lost with the treaty, it is specified that this very village has previously belonged to Ivan Sval’ («das dorff Buria, das Iwan Schwale gehabeth»).31 Incidentally, a 1618 survey of granted and revoked villages in Ingria, specifies that, besides Staraja Burja («Starja[B?]ja Bura», now 12 obžas) – the undefined Burja is, then, Staraja Burja, not Novaja32 – Chomutov has had Klesino, too, but this village – which, as we now know, also recently belonged to Sval’ – has been revoked by that time.33 The chronology is of some importance here for our understanding of Ivan’s destiny: the royal confirmation of Chomutov’s hereditary possession of Staraja Burja is granted in letters patent dated Stockholm, 27 November 1617.34 By this date, then, but apparently after 17 February 1617,35 Chomutov has been...
given Ivan’s village by De la Gardie and supplicated the king for confirmation; furthermore, this supplication has already been processed in Stockholm. The wording of these acts seems to exclude any such holding of these hamlets in common by Śwał and Chomutov as is possible in the case of the likewise meaner Novgorodian G. M. Sobakin and the bayor M. F. Klement’ev during the latter’s second spell of Swedish service.

It may then be concluded that Ivan’s possession of Ingrian pomest’ja, which may have been occasioned by his pledge of fielty to Gustavus Adolphus in 1615, but which may also have been influenced by the memory of his services in 1611, came to a very sudden end somewhere between an undefinable point in 1616 and February 1617 (and a date somewhat earlier than February 1617 is likely). The reasons for this are not known. He may have died in his bed (cf. above on his possibly mature age) or in the field, or he may have defected of his own volition and left his villages. The latter alternative does not seem likely, however. A new dynasty and a new era were coming to Novgorod, and we may suppose that Śwał was not overly loved in town, no matter the pertinent observations on a comparatively lenient view in post-1617 Muscovy of those who had served the Swedish cause. This would have made even a small Ingrian hamlet very alluring. If he had not died, it is probable that his misconduct in the autumn of 1616—perhaps other events of which we have no record—made an indelible stain on his reputation and led to the revocation of his recent grant. It is also probable that he would, by now, have appeared useless and had little to recommend himself to the king. (We remember that even earlier he appears to have been promoted only by De la Gardie, and the commander’s protection, too, is over now.) In the 1618 list, which probably reflects the situation in 1617, among supplicants not rewarded with confirmed allocations by the king, we do not find Ivan Śwał together with the monks of Our Saviour’s monastery of Jamgorod, G. K. Opalev (the brother, possibly half-brother, of V. S. Čebotaev, who will, however, with time succeed his brother-in-law Sum Chomutov as possessor of Staraja Bura and become ancestor of the Swedish Apolloffs),

Buri, das Jwan Schwale geheabethe. (Extract aus dem supplicationen der Reussischen vnderThanen. Paragraph 9 // RA. Diplomatica Moscovitica. Vol. 545 [my emphasis in bold] and the later margin note in a survey of crown villages in Caporie land in, arguably, late 1616 to the effect that Chomutov received Staraja Bura in 1617 (Beholdenn Schatt Lengde Im Caporischem gebiethe Ao 1616 vnd Ao 1617 // RA. Baltiska fogderäkenskaper. Vol. 183:7. My emphasis). When this survey was first compiled, Burya appeared among the crown villages. As a consequence, it may have been revoked from Śwał even some time before it was given over to Chomutov if it was not partitioned into several lots.

We do not have any information on the villages of Staraburja and Kljasino from the years 1611−15 and therefore cannot date the allocation of these hamlets to Śwał exactly. The generally most likely scenario for an allocation of this kind, however, is in 1615, or possibly 1614 or very early 1616. This is the more probable because no reference to Śwał has been identified in other pre−1615 Caporie accounts either.

37 We do not have any information on the villages of Staraburja and Kljasino from the years 1611−15 and therefore cannot date the allocation of these hamlets to Śwał exactly. The generally most likely scenario for an allocation of this kind, however, is in 1615, or possibly 1614 or very early 1616. This is the more probable because no reference to Śwał has been identified in other pre−1615 Caporie accounts either.

38 Селин А. А. Новгородское общество. С. 455–466.

and L. Šablykin, in-law of the bayors Aminev, and others\textsuperscript{40}. He does not seem to have made any attempt – at least no attempt which the authorities have taken seriously – at keeping any Ingrian property. Just as we watched him rise to fame, this silence now gives eloquent witness to his fall.

\textsuperscript{40} B. Rosen to A. Oxenstierna. 14 October, 1620. Bilaga A // RA. E696.