

The City after the Tragedy: The Life Strategies of Vitsyebsk Residents in the Aftermath of the Assassination of Josaphat Kuntsevych (1623–1641)¹

Dr. Dzianis Liseichykau

Independent researcher

E-mail: dzianisliseichykau1979@gmail.com

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4151-0007>

Summary. The article examines the situation of Vitsyebsk City's community in the first years following the murder of Josaphat Kuntsevych (1623–1641), Archbishop of Polatsk. The present study is aimed at investigating the events surrounding the murder from a different perspective, namely, that of the townspeople themselves, including the opponents and supporters of the Archbishop of Polatsk. Following the murder of Josaphat Kuntsevych on 12 November 1623, the rights previously held by the city of Vitsyebsk under the Magdeburg Law were revoked. For a period of two decades after the revocation, the jurisdiction of the *ziemski* court became responsible for all municipal affairs. Meanwhile, daily life in the city continued uninterrupted. Indeed, the relatives of those who had participated in the violent events of November 1623 remained resident in Vitsyebsk, compelled to adapt to the new conditions. The reverberations resulting from this high-profile event in 1623 marked themselves indelibly on the documentation of the judicial institutions of Vitsyebsk. These documents have been preserved to the present day and offer an exceptional opportunity to reconstruct the life strategies of the diverse social groups in the city during the initial two decades following the murder. The sequence of events which took place in Vitsyebsk is to be considered within the broader context of a series of European wars, including the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), a major European conflict in which religious factors played a key role.

Keywords: Vitsyebsk; Polatsk; Kyiv; everyday life; city self-government; Uniate Church; Orthodox Church.

1 This work was prepared within the framework of the research project 'Bazylianie prowincji litewskiej w latach 1617–1839' funded by the Narodowe Centrum Nauki nr. UMO-2020/39/B/HS3/01232 (104/21/G). I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Maksim Makarau, Dmitry Vinokhodov, Mikalai Volkau, Yauhien Hlinski, Dzmitry Matveichyk, Pavel Tatarnikau, and Volha Shylai for their assistance. This paper was also published in Ukrainian: Дз. Лісейчиків, 2024, с. 407–422.

The primary historical document pertaining to the events which transpired in November 1623 in Vitsyebsk is the official decree issued by the commissar investigating the case of the Archbishop Josaphat Kuntsevych's murder, which had occurred in Polatsk. This decree, bearing the date of 22 January 1624, has become well known within the scholarly community through multiple significant publications.² The earliest among these publications was compiled by the Basilian Ignatius Stebelsky in 1783; however, it was not released until 1867, coinciding with the canonisation of Josaphat Kuntsevych. The decree has existed in various versions, which is evident from substantial disparities and notable omissions in select sections. This considerably impacted the document's overall content. It is noteworthy that even the most comprehensive published version of the decree³ is derived from a transcript found in the records of the court of Orsha Grodzki, dating back to 22 June 1675. Furthermore, an original copy of the decree, created on 22 January 1624,⁴ has been preserved within the collection of the Office of the Metropolitan of the Greek Uniate Churches in Russia. This document is housed in the Russian State Historical Archives located in St. Petersburg. It is apparent that this particular copy was crafted contemporaneously with the issuance of the decree, presumably for the archives of Metropolitan Yosyf Veliamyn Rutsky of Kyiv, Galicia, and All Rus'.⁵

By decree of the Commissar Court, the office of the magistrate in Vitsyebsk was abolished, and the inhabitants of the city came under the direct jurisdiction of the Voivode. Between 1624 and 1633, Vitsyebsk had no autonomous government bodies, and all legal and economic matters were decided by the *ziemski* court. It is worth noting, contrary to the prevailing historiographical accounts, that the town hall building itself remained intact by order of the Commissar. In September 1638, the city records⁵ referred to a "white room which served as a venue for court proceedings under the Magdeburg Law". The confessional policy of the state underwent significant changes after the accession of Władysław IV to the throne of Poland and to the position of the Grand Duke of Lithuania in 1632. The administrative structures of the Orthodox Church within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth

2 I. Stebelski, 1867, s. 187–212; Витебская старина, 1883, с. 223–238; Историко-юридические материалы, вып. 30, с. 17–41.

3 Историко-юридические материалы, вып. 30, с. 17–41.

4 Российский государственный исторический архив (Russian State Historical Archive, hereinafter referred to as РГИА), ф. 823, оп. 1, д. 492, лл. 4–22.

5 М. Макараў et al., 2020, с. 36–37; М. Макараў, 2022, с. 152.

were formalised, as stipulated in the ‘*Points for the Pacification of the Inhabitants of the Rus’ People of Greek Religion*’⁶ promulgated by the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1632. On 7 October 1633, the rights of Vitsyebsk, as they had existed before the adoption of the Magdeburg Law, were restored. Finally, on 28 September 1641, the same Władysław IV reinstated the Magdeburg Law, or, more precisely, re-granted it to the city. Subsequently, the reinstated magistrate assumed responsibility for all legal and economic affairs within the city.

It has become imperative to delve into the day-to-day life of the city during this tumultuous period. Were all those responsible for the upheaval held to account? How did the perspective of the city’s inhabitants evolve in relation to the events of November 1623? What were the careers and personal fates of those individuals who belonged to the various factions involved in the conflicts of 1621–1623? These questions have been diligently pursued through a thorough examination of pertinent historical documents from the second quarter of the 17th century. These documents, taken from the records of the Vitsyebsk Ziemski Court, are currently housed in the National Historical Archives of Belarus in Minsk.⁷ In particular, a collection of eight documents covering the years from 1625 to 1636 has been meticulously transcribed; these manuscripts bear the signatures of prominent figures who were central to the November events. Among them are Naum Vovk, Simon Nesha, and Fedor Sukharuk, who served as the Burgomaster; as well as Filon Hrom, an influential councillor; Lev Hurka, a clerk at the ziemski court, and Emmanuel Cantakuzen, an attendant to the Archbishop. Four of these documents, which are characterised as testimonies or testaments, offer personal insights and serve as ego-documents.⁸

The background to the events of the 1620s which occurred in Vitsyebsk unfolds within a complex political landscape. Between 1609 and 1618, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was engaged in a protracted conflict with Moscow, which culminated in the signing of the Truce of Deulino. This agreement included the cession of cities such as Smolensk, Chernihiv, Dorogobuzh, Novhorod-Siversky, and others, to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Concurrently, the Ottoman Empire, in alliance with Moscow, began hostilities against the Polish-Lithuanian

6 “Статъи”, 1861.

7 Нацыянальны гістарычны архіў Беларусі (National Historical Archives of Belarus, hereinafter referred to as НГАБ), ф. 1751 (Віцебскі земскі суд).

8 Documents were published in: Святыі Йосафат Кунцэвіч, 2024, с. 423–454.

Commonwealth in 1620–1621. Meanwhile, there were dynastic wars taking place between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Kingdom of Sweden (1617–1618, 1621–1626, and 1626–1629). Sweden took advantage of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's involvement in conflicts with Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire, effectively aligning itself as their *de facto* ally. During these wars, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth ceded parts of Livonia and Courland. Within this geopolitical milieu, the authorities of the Rzeczpospolita expressed deep apprehension over the ordination of a new Orthodox metropolitan as well as several bishops in Kyiv in 1620 by the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes, who had given allegiance to the Turkish Sultan Osman II. This ecclesiastical act was intended to disrupt the fragile interfaith harmony within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and significantly weaken the opponents of the Ottoman Empire and Moscow. The Vitsyebk riots were instigated in 1621 when reports were circulating that the recently consecrated Orthodox Archbishop of Polatsk, Meletius Smotrytsky, was advocating acts of disobedience against the local Uniate Archbishop, Josaphat Kuntsevych. These riots must be seen in the broader context of the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), a major European conflict driven primarily by religious factors.

An analysis of the events which occurred in Vitsyebk in November 1623 within the context of simultaneous European dynastic, military, and religious conflicts provides a new perspective which enhances our understanding of these incidents. This approach allows for a more nuanced interpretation which goes beyond the oversimplified portrayal of a conflict between the Orthodox believer and the Uniate (or between the 'Rus' and the 'Polish' factions; or the 'schism' and the 'United Church'), as presented by some historians and historiographical traditions of the 19th and 20th centuries. It is of importance to examine the impact of the events of 12 November 1623 on the diverse demographic groups in Vitsyebk. This includes analysing the survival strategies developed by these groups during the tumultuous period from 1623 to 1641, which was marked by the restoration of Magdeburg rights to the city.

The first group of individuals from Vitsyebk for the period 1623 to 1641 we will discuss were the relatives of those who were executed after the November tragedy, foremost, the Burgomasters Naum Vovk and Simon Nesha. Their names rarely appear in historical records. A notable breakthrough came with the unearthing of the testimony of Mosia Vovk, the mother of the Burgomaster and *landwehr* (county official), Naum Vovk,⁹ within the annals of the Vitsyebk Ziemi Court; this doc-

9 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 12, арк. 84.

ument, dated January 1625, never received any attention since getting published in the late 19th century. The document contains Mosia Vovk's declaration that her sons, Naum and Lavrin Vovk, had not undergone any division of property. Of particular interest is her account of the November 1623 events, where she states: "my deceased son Naum Vovk was executed for the death of the venerable father, the Bishop of Polatsk". The Vovk family of Vitsyebk, which had been part of the urban patriciate¹⁰ since the end of the 16th century, lost its standing following the execution of Naum Vovk. An inventory (*inventarium*) for Vitsyebk from 7 September 1638 records that the family had very modest possessions in the city: in Uzhorski Posad, there was "the house of Afanasy Vovk, a burgher's, once [after the events of 1623? – D. L.] on noble rights, the ancient possession of some Lord Zhovnyarovski", and, above the Vitsba River, "the garden of Afanasi Vovk", as well as in Ruski Posad "the half-plot cottage of Lavrin Vovk; vacant".¹¹ A portion of Naum Vovk's estates was transferred directly to the ownership of the archbishops of Polatsk.¹²

It is noteworthy that, during the second half of the 1620s, the Archbishop's administration significantly expanded its holdings in the city at the expense of the citizens. The 1638-dated Vitsyebk inventory lists various properties belonging to the Archbishop, including "the house of Kurila Mishin, owned by the bishop's father", "the house of Jasko Shpak, formerly a townhouse and now owned by the bishop's father", "the house of Khrol, owned by the bishop", and "the house of Danilo Pronka under the hill and garden, formerly a townhouse and now owned by the bishop's father".¹³ In 1638, the Archbishop owned three houses on Velikaya Street in Uzhorski Posad, eleven houses in the alley near Prechistenskaya Church (Church of the Virgin Mary), ten houses near the bishop's yard, and four houses in Zaruchavski Posad above the Dvina River.¹⁴ The largest property, with 38 houses, was located in Uzhorski Posad near the Slizki brook.¹⁵ Thus, by 1638, the Polatsk archbishops had amassed property holdings totalling 70 houses in Vitsyebk. The city at that time had a total of 901 registered *plyats* (plots of land), including those which remained undeveloped.

10 For example, in 1598 Zanka Vovk was landwehr and sublandwehr of Vitsyebk, whereas his son, Matej Zankovich Vovk, was one of Vitsyebk's district officials (HГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 3, арк. 156–157). I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Maksim Makarau for sharing his own research on the personal composition of Vitsyebk City officials.

11 M. Makapaŭ et al., 2020, c. 37, 38, 50.

12 Ibid., c. 40.

13 Ibid., c. 39, 40, 42.

14 Ibid., c. 36, 37, 40, 45.

15 Ibid., c. 41.

It is possible that, as a result of carrying out several death sentences, the authorities adopted a more lenient attitude toward those suspected of involvement in the murder. A telling illustration of the prevailing atmosphere in those towns under the jurisdiction of the Polatsk Archeparchy is found in a resolution issued by the Polatsk Magistrate on 23 November 1643, about a year after the canonisation of Josaphat Kuntsevych. This document reads “Decree on the imprisonment of Khabriel Lakhodny (Gabriel Lakhodny) for having dared and presumed to speak a word against the holy ones of God. We ordered to imprison him for having dared and presumed to call the blessed and holy Father Josaphat ‘reverend’ instead of ‘blessed’, for those words showed a tendency toward rebellion. This imprisonment is to last three days, so that in the future not only he himself, but no one else would dare to speak such words”.¹⁶ The mere fact of expressing a sceptical or even insufficiently respectful attitude toward the person of the murdered archbishop could be reason for severe punishment. Unscrupulous opponents of the relatives of those punished used a similar lever of influence.

The unfortunate circumstances of the family of the Burgomaster Simon Nestorovich Nesha are highlighted in the historical records: a record of property transfer in the name of Simon’s widow, Arina, and his sons, Hryhory, Markian, and Piotr, dated January 1627, has been identified. What is remarkable in this document is the reflections of the family of the executed burgomaster on the events of November 1623.¹⁷

The royal commissars who condemned the Burgomaster Simon Nesha to death did not confiscate the main property of his family; however, a little more than three years after the execution, the widow and sons decided to transfer their properties in Dziundzino and Andronovo, located in Vitsyebk District, to the ownership of Father Wojciech Kazirowski, a Roman Catholic priest-commandant in Vitsyebk, citing loan-related reasons. This action could be seen as a conciliatory gesture towards the conventional ‘Latin’ faction of the city. It is plausible that the Latin clergy took advantage of the vulnerable position of the Nesha family and forced them to give up part of their property. In any case, the year 1638 inventory for Vitsyebk lists

16 *Археографическій сборникъ документовъ*, 1867, с. 359–360: *‘Всказанье до турмы Кгабриеля Лакгодного за то, ижъ смель и важиль се противко светыхъ Божыхъ слово вымовити. [...] Казалисмо осадить до турмы за то, ижъ онъ смель и важиль се благословенного и светого ойца Езофата назватъ велебнымъ, а не благословенымъ, бо тые слова его заносили се на бунтъ. А тое седенье в турме маеть выседеть презъ три дни, абы се напотомя не только онъ самъ, але никто инший таковыхъ словъ мовить не важиль’.*

17 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 13, арк. 258–259.

the sparse number of properties which remained in the city still belonging to the Nesha family after Simon Nesha's execution, including 'Nesha's widow's garden' on the Uzhorski Posad, 'Nesha's cottage in the possession of Mr. Statkevich', 'Nesha's garden, and a *punya* [hayloft] with it' on Podvinskaya Street, 'Neshina's pavilion, empty, the same Neshina's pavilion in the possession of Mr. Ramsha', and the 'Burgomaster Nesha's' empty plot of land in the village of Tumishchovichi, Vitsyebsk District.¹⁸ Curiously, Simon Nesha's sons, Hryhory, Markian, and Piotr, refrained from using their father's surname, Nesha, in the 1627-dated document.¹⁹ Instead, they identified themselves by using the last part of their surname, 'Andronovski', which comes from the name of the Andronovo family estate.

The compelling account of the sale and transfer of real estate by Simon Nesha's sons underscores the fact that these actions were not undertaken voluntarily, but were rather forced by external factors, as articulated in this significant historical document. In particular, the eldest son of the Nesha family, Hryhory, witnessed the occupation of Vitsyebsk by Moscow in 1654, where he assumed administrative duties in the Magistrate's office of the occupied city. It is noteworthy that, even during this period, he refrained from using his father's primary surname, instead identifying himself in official documents as Andronovski. In early 1658, Hryhory Nesha wrote a petition, commonly referred to as a *cholibitnia*, addressed to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich. In this document, he explained his view of the events of the previous decades. He introduced himself as 'your orphan Hryshka Semenov, son of Andronovskaya', a humble and penniless person. Hryhory recounted how his father had been forced to embrace the Uniate faith, but, even under duress, Simon Nesha had remained steadfast in his adherence to the Orthodox Christian faith. This unwavering commitment had led to the persecution and eventual demise of his father, who was subjected to violence and had had his property confiscated. Hryhory, who described himself as an orphan, chose to maintain his loyalty to the Orthodox Christian faith, which forced him to endure a life of hardship and exile.²⁰ The document implies that any demonstration of loyalty to the Uniate hierarchy by Hryhory Nesha in the late 1620s was a mere formality. With the advent of Moscow's occupation, Hryhory interpreted the events of 1621–1623, particularly the conflict between Josaphat Kuntsevych and Meletiy Smotrytsky, as a clash between the 'Polish' faith and the Orthodox Christian faith. Of note is Hryhory Nesha's palpable

18 М. Макараў et al., 2020, с. 38, 42, 43, 51, 52.

19 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 13, арк. 258–259.

20 *Россия и белорусские земли*, 2020, с. 252.

antipathy toward the Hurka Orthodox noble family, who had played a central role in the events of November 1623 but escaped retribution. In fact, the Hurka family was granted confiscated lands. For example, in March 1636, the ziemski court clerk Mykola Hurka received all the property of Jan Cinka, who had been exiled for the murder of Josaphat Kuntsevych.²¹ In his appeal to the Tsar of Moscow, Hryhory Nesha asked for the return of Vaska Hrakov's vacant *plyats* in Vitsyebsk, as well as the village of Alhove (Olhove), which was owned by Nicholas Hurka.²² He framed this request as a plea for reparation for his suffering due to the death of his father and his unwavering commitment to the Orthodox Christian faith. Apparently, this request was granted, and Hryhory Nesha continued to govern the district until the withdrawal of Moscow troops from Vitsyebsk, as stipulated by the Truce of Andrusovo in 1667.²³

The second group of individuals from Vitsyebsk for the period of 1623–1641 consisted of direct participants in the November events; these are the individuals who were exonerated and relieved of any legal responsibility by the Commissar's decree. This category includes two notable personalities: Filon Hrom, who held the position of the Deputy Burgomaster, and Fedor Sukharuk, who served as the Burgomaster. In the Commissar's decree of 22 January 1624, Hrom is explicitly mentioned as one of the Vitsyebsk residents who had shown a favourable disposition toward Josaphat Kuntsevych and who had actively participated in the service presided over by the Archbishop of Polatsk on the fateful Sunday of 12 November 1623.²⁴ Our research has yielded two invaluable documents concerning Hrom and his wife, Alena Klyha, in the form of their handwritten testaments.²⁵

Hrom appears to have experienced profound psychological distress following the tragic assassination of the Archbishop, an event which left an indelible mark on his psyche. On 1 October 1624, Hrom executed a will,²⁶ in which he lamented the sudden and severe illness which had befallen him. Unfortunately, Hrom died shortly thereafter, succumbing to his illness before 24 October 1624. This was less than eight months after the issuance of the Commissar's decree. Remarkably, Filon Hrom did not leave any descendants, which is a key aspect in both his and

21 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 17, арк. 146 адв.–148.

22 Ibidem.

23 *Витебская старина*, 1885, с. 239.

24 РГИА, ф. 823, оп. 1, д. 492, л. 19 об.–20.

25 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 12, арк. 155–159, 443–444 адв.

26 Ibid., арк. 155–159.

his wife Alena Klyha's wills. As described in these testamentary documents, the entirety of his main estate was bequeathed to his brother, Tymofey Hrom, and Tymofey's family.

Hrom's will expresses his desire to be buried "according to the custom of the faith, the ancient baptismal law of our Greeks". However, the will does not specify any particular Vitsyebsk church or name any particular priests to oversee this rite. It is noteworthy that Hrom, a wealthy and learned merchant during his lifetime, had an extensive reading and writing history. This is underscored by the presence of three pairs of eyeglasses among his possessions, which serves as a testament to his deteriorating eyesight in his later years. In contrast, Hrom's wife, Alena Klyha, left clear instructions in her own will regarding her last rites. She commended her body, burdened with numerous sins, to the grace and mercy of the Lord God Almighty in the Trinity, following the established customs and practices of the ancient Rus' Law and Greek traditions in the burial of the deceased. In her will, she remembered her confessor, Fr. Ignatius, a priest of the Vitsyebsk Church of St. John the Theologian, and appointed him as the person to conduct her funeral. Alena Klyha generously allocated fifteen *kopa* in Lithuanian currency for Father Ignatius' vestments and personally presented him with her silver drinking cup. In addition, the Church of St. John the Theologian received a kettle with distillation tubes for the production of vodka.

The Hrom family's property holdings remained constant during the 1630s. According to the 1638 inventory for Vitsyebsk, the family's property in the city included the residence of Filon's brother, Tymofey Hrom, located in the Upper Castle, his cottage in the Lower Castle, two residences with vegetable gardens also belonging to Tymofey Hrom, and two other houses with vegetable gardens registered under the ownership of Filon Hrom and his widow, Alena Klyha.²⁷ It is evident that Klyha survived her husband for a considerable period of time, as evidenced by her continued presence in the property records.

Filon Hrom's last will and testament included the Burgomaster Petro Ivanovich as one of his appointed executors. Notably, Ivanovich had faced persecution alongside Hrom and was also recorded in the same Commissar's decree as being a supporter of Josaphat Kuntsevych. This loyal associate and friend of Hrom prospered in the aftermath of the November events. His son, Stefan Piotrovich, who also held the position of the Burgomaster, achieved a level of financial stability

27 M. Макараў et al., 2020, c. 32, 34, 38, 39, 40.

significant enough to undertake the construction of his own town house on the town square in 1647. This building stands as a notable historical landmark, being the first civilian building constructed of bricks, as registered in the annals of Vitsyebsk's architectural history, excluding fortifications and castles.²⁸ The town house of Stefan Piotrovich, a one-storey brick building with a cellar, two entrances, and six windows, gained special historical significance. In the following years it was inhabited by Franciscan monks, and, after the withdrawal of Moscow's troops from Vitsyebsk in 1667, it was transformed into a chapel.

The manner in which the individuals who were involved in the events of November 1623 and subsequently acquitted of wrongdoing proved their innocence to outside parties is illustrated in a document addressed to the Burgomaster Fedor Sukharuk. This document, issued by the royal commissars, took the form of a letter of protection and was written the day after the decree was issued, that is, on 23 January 1624. It conveys the following: "We hereby inform you that Fedor Sukharuk, the Burgomaster of Vitsyebsk, together with other inhabitants of Vitsyebsk, has been involved in the murder of the venerable Father Josaphat Kuntsevych, the Archbishop of Polatsk. After a thorough investigation, it was found that he was not present during the commission of this heinous act, and those who conducted the interrogations did not bring any charges against him. Therefore, should he venture anywhere for trade or personal needs, no one is to detain or interfere with him".²⁹ Obviously, similar letters of protection were probably issued to all the participants in the trial who were accused but subsequently found not guilty. According to the year 1638 inventory for Vitsyebsk, Fedor Sukharuk's property holdings were considerable, including a house in the Verkhniy Zamok (Upper Castle), a vegetable garden in Uzhorski Posad near the new church on Bohoroditska Street, an unoccupied house in the same posad on Podvinska Street, another house with a vegetable garden in the same posad, an unoccupied *plyats* in Zaruchavsky Posad, and a vegetable garden in Slobodsky Posad across the Dvina River.³⁰

The third demographic category within the population of Vitsyebsk during the period 1623–1641 to which the study is devoted, consists of the personal attendants and servants of Josaphat Kuntsevych himself. These individuals were not only present during the murder, but also showed remarkable courage in defending

28 M. Макараў, 2022, с. 157–158.

29 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 12, арк. 150–150 адв.

30 M. Макараў et al., 2020, с. 33, 39, 42, 45, 46.

their pastor, enduring various injuries and mutilations which were inflicted by the angry mob. Importantly, no charges were brought against them because they were perceived as acting in defence of their spiritual leader. It is also noteworthy that the guilt of many of the other participants in the November events was often established on the basis of the testimony of the Archbishop's own attendants and servants. According to the Commissar's decree, these servants not only included a clergyman, Archdeacon Dorotheus Lecikowicz, but also about a dozen laymen. After the tragic event of the murder of Josaphat Kuntsevych, the vast majority of these people returned to Polatsk, and, for the most part, disappeared from Vitsyebsk life after 1624. It is a testament to the success of the research that relevant documents have been unearthed in the archives of the Vitsyebsk Ziemi Court and other archival collections, particularly in relation to one of the most intriguing figures in the inner circle of Josaphat Kuntsevych, notably, his Greek financial advisor, Emmanuel Cantakuzen.³¹

Emmanuel Cantakuzen emerges as the key figure responsible for the significant social progress which took place in the wake of the November events of 1623, as corroborated by historical documents. According to the Dominican Fabian Birkowski, who chronicled these events in his 1628 work, *The Voice of the Blood of Blessed Josaphat Kuntsevych*, Emmanuel Cantakuzen came from a line of Byzantine emperors.³² In the 17th century, he lived in Moscow and served as an economist and secretary at the court of Moscow's Patriarch Ignatius, who had played a role in the coronation of False Dmitry I in 1605. In 1610, however, Cantakuzen faced deportation from the country and began a journey which eventually led him to Vilnius. He arrived in Vilnius in the company of the defrocked patriarch and took up residence in the Holy Trinity Monastery. It was during his time in Vilnius that he had a fateful encounter with Josaphat Kuntsevych and formed a close and lasting bond with him.³³ Soon thereafter, Cantakuzen embraced the Union, and, at the end of 1617, he left for Polatsk with Josaphat Kuntsevych, who had been appointed the vicar of Polatsk. In this new role, Cantakuzen assumed the position of a court administrator within the Archbishop's domain.³⁴ While Dorotheus Lecikowicz was in charge of spiritual matters at the court, Emmanuel Cantakuzen was in charge of the administrative and civil affairs. This remained his responsibility until the tragic

31 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 15, арк. 15–18 адв.

32 F. Birkowski, 1629, s. 23.

33 A. Guépin, 1885, s. 141.

34 П. Кречун, 2019, с. 122.

events of November 1623, which marked a significant chapter in the development of his service and influence within the Archbishop's court.³⁵

Emmanuel Cantakuzen's life took a significant turn in Polatsk, where he married Mariana (also known as Maryna, born in 1594), a member of the esteemed local, noble family of Seliava.³⁶ Given the age dynamics of marriages for this period, with wives typically being somewhat younger than their husbands, and given that Cantakuzen is described as being a young man upon his arrival in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1610, it is reasonable to infer that his birth date likely falls in the late 1580s or early 1590s. He was probably introduced to his future wife by her older brother, Anastasii (also known as Anikey and monastically as Antonii Seliava), who was a Basilian and a disciple of Josaphat Kuntsevych. Following the passing of Archbishop Josaphat, Anastasius ascended to the position of the Archbishop of Polatsk, and, from 1641, he held the significant role of the Uniate Metropolitan of Kyiv, Galicia, and All Rus'.

The Seliava family maintained close ties with Josaphat Kuntsevych throughout his life. After the appointment of Josaphat Kuntsevych as the vicar of Polatsk at the end of 1617, one of the people who served at the court of the Archbishop in Polatsk was Toma Seliava, who was born in 1600 and happened to be the younger half-brother of Mariana and Anastasii. The decree by the Commissar mentioned Toma Seliava as being one of those who were with the Archbishop on 12 November 1623. It is noteworthy that, in 1662, Thomas Seliava was mentioned as being the Vice-Voivode of Polatsk.³⁷ It is also worth mentioning that, in 1655, it was Atanasii Seliava, another member of the Seliava family, who undertook the transportation of the coffin of Archbishop Josaphat Kuntsevych from Polatsk to Supraśl, protecting it from being attacked by Moscow troops.

According to the uncovered documents,³⁸ shortly after the tragic murder of Josaphat Kuntsevych, Emmanuel Cantakuzen relinquished his role at the Archbishop's court and became an ordinary secular nobleman, acquiring the status of 'landowner in the Vitsyebesk Voivodeship'. He seems to have come into a considerable sum of money, probably as compensation for the brutal mistreatment he suffered during the violent events of 12 November 1623. In particular, in October 1627, he gave a loan of 320 *kopa* of Lithuanian groschen to the noblemen Stanis-

35 A. Guépin, 1885, s. 192.

36 *Dzieje rodziny*, 2013, s. 106.

37 *Urządnicy*, 2018, s. 182.

38 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 15, арк. 15–18 адв.

law and Krystyna Przeborowski. In exchange for the debt, they gave Emmanuel Cantakuzen the Stare Estate located in the Vitsyebsk Province as collateral. Subsequently, from 1635 until at least 1654, he held the Ciechanowiecki Estate and the Bocheikovo Farm, both located in the Polatsk Voivodeship, as collateral for a loan of 50 thousand zloty.³⁹ In an important testament dated 4 May 1651, the Metropolitan, Anthony Seliava, appointed his brother-in-law, Emmanuel Cantakuzen, as one of his executors.⁴⁰ The metropolitan bequeathed to Cantakuzen two drinking cups inscribed with his coat of arms, “to remember me after my death”, and his sister Mariana received another silver bowl and three gilded bowls as part of the inheritance. The metropolitan entrusted Cantakuzen, together with Nicholas Korsak, with an important mission: to order from the best craftsmen in Vilnius two large silver candlesticks for the icon of the Mother of God in Zhyrovichy Monastery. They were also instructed to make a plaque with the details of the donation, which would be placed on the same icon.

The assassination of Josaphat Kuntsevych and its aftermath had a profound effect on the attitudes of many opponents of the Uniate hierarchy, causing them to reconsider their attitude toward the Archbishop and his actions. A prime example was the transformation of Josaphat Kuntsevych’s most prominent opponent, the Orthodox Archbishop of Polatsk, Meletiy Smotrytsky, who eventually embraced the Union – this is a story which has already been extensively researched and does not need to be recounted here. After the tragic events surrounding the murder of Josaphat Kuntsevych, we also note a change in the views of Konstantin Kraskevich, the former leader of the anti-Union faction in the town of Navahrudak⁴¹ – he began showing feelings of repentance. Moreover, King Władysław IV officially restored Magdeburg rights and freedoms to Vitsyebsk through a privilege issued on 7 October 1633 while encamped near Smolensk. In this royal decree, he explicitly acknowledged that, in less than a decade, the overwhelming majority of Vitsyebsk citizens had learned the necessary lessons: “After the attack of the Moscow enemy on our state, the inhabitants of this city dared to take great risks with their health and, having repeatedly defeated the enemy, defended the city of Vitsyebsk and the borders of our states from obvious danger, gave many prisoners and khorugas [banners – D. L.] to our Hetman of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania”.⁴² Interestingly,

39 *Dzieje rodziny*, 2013, s. 106.

40 *Историко-юридические материалы*, вып. 2, с. 255–286.

41 Д. Лісейчыкаў, 2019, с. 170–183.

42 М. Макараў, 2008, с. 201.

it was widely believed at the time that Stanisław Kosiński, the Rector of Polatsk Jesuit College and the former confessor of Josaphat Kuntsevych, had prayed for Josaphat's intercession to prevent the conquest of the city by Swedish troops in 1627. Moreover, during the Smolensk War of 1632–1634, the same intercession was believed to have helped the Polatsk garrison withstand a siege by Moscow's troops.⁴³ In this context, the actions of the people of Vitsyebsk appeared to be part of a broader pattern. In the early 1640s, the Uniate Archbishop of Polatsk, Antonii Seliava, certified that the citizens of Vitsyebsk were willing to enter into a holy union with the Roman Church of their own accord, with the people and their wives, children, and descendants pledging to become subject to and give obedience to the authority of the present Archbishop of Vitsyebsk and his successors for all time to come.⁴⁴ This declaration formed the basis for the issuance of a confirmatory privilege by King Władysław IV on 28 September 1641, which reinstated the Magdeburg Law in the City of Vitsyebsk.⁴⁵

The historical record, as revealed by the discovered documents, reveals a more complex narrative. In addition to the three categories of Vitsyebsk people who were resident during the 1620s and 1630s which have been studied above, there was a select group of individuals within the highest echelons of the city who, although not formally accused during the investigation, were the principal instigators of the rebellion. First and foremost, among these individuals were the ziemski court secretary, Lev Hurka, and the city secretary, Adam Kosov. The decision of the Commissar's court explicitly stated that the rebels, in pursuing their nefarious plans which were considered detestable by both God and mankind, had the support and complicity of Mr. Lev Hurka, the secretary of the Vitsyebsk Ziemski Court.⁴⁶ The meeting place of the 'anti-Kuntsevych party' was Lev Hurka's yard in the Lower Castle. According to the testimony of the shopkeeper Filon Nikiporovich, Hurka's subordinates, Rabets and Lapka, were among the crowd directly involved in the murder. Paradoxically, numerous passages demonstrating the guilt of Vitsyebsk ziemski court clerk mysteriously disappeared from the later copies of the Commissar's decree,⁴⁷ including the most famous version, prepared for publication by

43 S. Rohdewald, 2010, S. 282.

44 M. Макараў, 2008, c. 203.

45 Ibid, p. 202–204.

46 РГИА, ф. 823, оп. 1, д. 492, л. 15 об.

47 Compare with *Version 1* (edited): "Z dopuszczenia bożego, niejaki Melecysz Smotrycki przysłał niejakiemu Sylwestra, w odzieniu czernieckiem z listami swymi do miasta tutejszego witebskiego, zkađ ci mianowani czerńcy i Iwan Kamieniec pop poddany jego królewskiej mości tutejszy,

Ignatius Stebelsky in 1783. Astonishingly, the Commissar's court never even considered the question of Lev Hurka's guilt concerning the events of 12 November 1623. He retained his position as the ziemski court secretary and, in the following years, continued to issue documents, including those concerning Mosia Vovk, mother of Vitsyebsk Burgomaster and *landwehr* Naum Vovk, who, in January 1625, had been sentenced to death for the murder of the Polatsk Archbishop Josaphat Kuntsevych,⁴⁸ and documents related to the Vitsyebsk City Burgomaster, Fedor Sukharuk, issued in June 1625, aimed at preventing any trade-related restrictions resulting from the Archbishop's murder.⁴⁹ Lev Hurka served as a ziemski court official until his death in December 1632, and the royal commissars actively sought to deflect suspicion from him. One might speculate that Lev Hurka might have expressed remorse or shown obedience to the Uniate hierarchy; however, in his last will and testament, dated 20 November 1632, at Ranino Estate in Vitsyebsk district,⁵⁰ Lev Hurka clearly stipulated that his body should be buried "according to the rites of the Old Greek religion, by the monks of the monastery in Kutseina, according to the Old Greek faith". This 'Old Greek faith' ceremony was to be performed by the Orthodox monks of the Kutseina Monastery. Apparently, Lev Hurka had not accepted obedience to the Polatsk Uniate archbishops, as this directive implies.

Adam Kosov, the town clerk, is mentioned briefly in the Commissar's decree, but he had also, along with Lev Hurka, directly participated in the initial protests against Josaphat Kuntsevych in 1621. In March of the same year, Hurka and Kosov delivered a document to Vitsyebsk town hall which announced that Meletiy Smotrytsky had been appointed Archbishop of Polatsk by royal decree and identifying Josaphat Kuntsevych as an apostate. This event marked the beginning of the disobedience which ultimately led to the Archbishop's murder. The letter about Smotrytsky was brought to Vitsyebsk by a person named Sylvester, who wore a monk's habit.⁵¹ It is worth mentioning that one of Adam Kosov's sons (whose

który zbuntowawszy tajemnie pospolstwo..." (I. Stebelski, 1867, s. 199). *Version 2 (original):* "Z dopuszczenia Bożego nieiaki Melenty Smotrzicky przysłał nieiakiego Sylwestra w odzieniu czarnieckim **samowtorego** z listami swemi do miasta tutecznego Witepskiego, ktorzy stali w zamku we dworze Pana Lwa Hurka, pisarza ziemskiego witepskiego, skąd ci mniemani czerncy y Jwan Kamieniec, pop, a poddany Jego Królewskiej Mości tuteczny witepski, który y teraz przy Panu Hurku, pisarzu, iest przywiązawszy się, zbuntowawszy tajemnie pospolstwo..." (РГИА, ф. 823, оп. 1, д. 492, лл. 7–7 об.).

48 НГАБ, ф. 1751, воп. 1, спр. 12, арк. 84.

49 Ibid., арк. 150–150 адв.

50 Ibid., спр. 16, срк. 389–393 адв.

51 РГИА, ф. 823, оп. 1, д. 492, л. 7 об.

birth name was Stefan) had become an Orthodox monk under the name Sylvester, although there is no direct evidence that he was the same person who brought the letter. It is possible that Smotrytsky chose a monk of a noble lineage who was also the offspring of a local official to act as his envoy to Vitsyebsk, thus increasing the likelihood of success. This hypothesis is indirectly supported by the delivery of the letter concerning Smotrytsky, brought to Vitsyebsk by 'a certain Sylvester in monastic attire', and delivered to the Vitsyebsk Town Hall by Adam Kosov and others. It is probable that, in 1621, the residents of Vitsyebsk may not have been aware of Stefan's monastic name, and it was not indicated by the royal commissars.

The precise year of Stefan Kosov's birth remains unknown. It is believed that he studied in Lublin and Zamość during the early 1620s. He surfaced in Vilnius only in the latter half of the same decade, serving as a teacher at the Orthodox fraternity school of the Holy Spirit Monastery. It is highly likely that the royal commissars purposefully downplayed the significant role which Kosov had in the events of November 1623, and the clerk from the Vitsyebsk Grodzki court himself may have intentionally concealed information about Stefan's whereabouts in the early 1620s. Despite these actions, Adam Kosov maintained his position as a clerk in Hrodna, and his son Stefan (Sylvester) succeeded in building a prosperous ecclesiastical career within the re-established Orthodox hierarchy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Stefan rose to the position of the Orthodox Metropolitan of Kyiv for the period from 1647 to 1657, and it was him who welcomed Bohdan Khmelnytsky with great solemnity upon his entry into Kyiv in December 1648.

In 1638, Adam Kosov owned four houses in Vitsyebsk: one in the Upper Castle, and the others in Zaruchavski, Ruski, and Uzhorski posads.⁵² His second son, Yury, also lived in Vitsyebsk and refused to recognise the authority of the Uniate hierarchy. Yury's life continued as normal until the city was occupied by Moscow in 1654. Among the few nobles in Vitsyebsk District who pledged allegiance to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich of Moscow in October 1655, we discover the identities of Ostafiy Alexandrovych, Yury Adamovich Kosov, and Yosyf Andreevich Hurka.⁵³ In November 1656, Yury Kosov submitted a formal complaint to the occupying authorities. As part of the petition, he stated that a certain Vitsyebsk nobleman, named Yushka Kosov, had requested permission to travel to Kyiv and meet with his brother, the Metropolitan, Sylvester Kosov.⁵⁴ The authorities granted his request, and Yury

52 М. Макараў et al., 2020, с. 32, 41, 43, 49.

53 *Памятники истории*, 1999, с. 54.

54 *Россия и белорусские земли*, 2020, с. 236.

Kosov left Vitsyebsk for Kyiv. It is believed that this was their final encounter, as Sylvester Kosov, the Metropolitan, passed away in April 1657. An interesting piece of history took place in January 1658 when a hetman of the Zaporozhian army, Ivan Vyhovsky, exchanged correspondence with Yury Adamovich Kosov in Vitsyebsk.⁵⁵ Shortly after, Yury spearheaded the signing of the well-known Treaty of Hadiach. This treaty proposed that the Hetmanate be included in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a distinct entity known as the Grand Duchy of Rus'. One provision of the Treaty of Hadiach called for the elimination of clauses from the Union of Brest from 1596; however, the Senate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth requested that the provision be excluded from the final version of the treaty. Yury Kosov may have been amongst the Orthodox aristocrats who began seeking conciliation with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's authorities after their first encounter with the occupying Moscow government between 1654 and 1657. This might have been as a result of the fact that Yury and his father Adam's social status had remained largely unaffected following Josaphat Kuntsevych's assassination. On 4 August 1800, the descendants of Yury Kosov, who had converted to Roman Catholicism, submitted documentation to the Vitsyebsk Deputy Nobility Assembly with the aim of obtaining formal recognition of their family as Russian nobility.⁵⁶

References

- Birkowski F., 1629 – [Fabian Birkowski], *Głos krwie b. Iozaphata Kunczewica, archiepiskopa połockiego, także b. Iana Sarkandra, męczennika morawskiego y obrazu bransbergskiego*, Kraków, W Drukarni Andrzeia Piotrkowczyka, 1629.
- Dzieje rodziny*, 2013 – *Dzieje rodziny Ciechanowieckich herbu Dąbrowa (XIV–XXI wiek)*, red. H. Lulewicz. Warszawa 2013.
- Guépin A., 1885 – Alphonse Guépin, *Żywot Ś. Jozafata Kunczewicza, męczennika, arcybiskupa połockiego rit. gr., opowiedziany na tle historyi Kościoła Ruskiego*, Lwów: Gubrynowicz i Szmidt, 1885.
- Rohdewald S., 2010 – Stefan Rohdewald, “Medium unierter konfessioneller Identität oder polnisch-ruthenischer Einigung? Zur Verehrung Josafat Kuncsevychs im 17. Jahrhundert;” in: *Kommunikation durch symbolische Akte. Religiöse Heterogenität und politische Herrschaft in Polen-Litauen*, hrsg. Yvonne Kleinmann, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010, S. 271–290.
- Stebelski I., 1867 – Ignatius Stebelski, *Przydatek do chronologii, to jest rzeczy te, które w*

55 НГАБ, ф. 2512, воп. 1, спр. 43, арк. 48 адв.

56 НГАБ, ф. 2512, воп. 1, спр. 43, арк. 45–52 адв.

- poprzedzających dwóch tomach częstokroć się namieniały, a przez obszerność swoją umieścić się wygodnie tamże nie mogły*, vol. 3. Lwów, 1867.
- Urzędnicy, 2018 – *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy*, t. 5: *Ziemia połocka i województwo połockie. XIV–XVIII wiek*, pod red. Henryka Lulewicza, Warszawa: Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2018.
- Археографический сборникъ документовъ*, 1867 – *Археографический сборникъ документовъ, относящихся къ исторіи Сѣверозападной Руси, издаваемый при Управленіи Виленскаго Учебнаго Округа*, т. 1, Вильна: Управление Виленскаго Учебнаго Округа, 1867.
- [*Arheograficheskij sbornik» dokumentov»*, 1867 – *Arheograficheskij sbornik» dokumentov», odnosyashchihsia k» istorii Sverozapadnoj Rusi, izdavaemyj pri Upravlenii Vilenskago Uchebnago Okruga*, t. 1, Vil'na: Upravlenie Vilenskago Uchebnago Okruga, 1867.]
- Витебская старина*, 1883 – *Витебская старина*, т. 1., сост. А. П. Сапунов, Витебск: Типография Губернского правления, 1883.
- [*Vitebskaya starina*, 1883 – *Vitebskaya starina*, t. 1., sost. A. P. Sapunov, Vitebsk: Tipografiya Gubernskogo pravleniya, 1883.]
- Витебская старина*, 1885 – *Витебская старина*, т. 4., сост. А. П. Сапунов, Витебск: Типография Губернского правления, 1883.
- [*Vitebskaya starina*, 1885 – *Vitebskaya starina*, t. 4., sost. A. P. Sapunov, Vitebsk: Tipografiya Gubernskogo pravleniya, 1883.]
- Историко-юридические материалы – Историко-юридические материалы, извлечённые из актовых книг губерний Витебской и Могилёвской*, вып. 2, Витебск. В типографии Губернского Правления, 1871; вып. 21, 1891; вып. 22, 1891; вып. 24, 1893; вып. 25, 1894; вып. 30, 1903.
- [*Istoriko-yuridicheskie materialy – Istoriko-yuridicheskie materialy, izvlechyonnye iz aktovykh knig gubernij Vitebskoj i Mogilyovskoj*, вып. 2, Vitebsk. V tipografii Gubernskogo Pravleniya, 1871; вып. 21, 1891; вып. 22, 1891; вып. 24, 1893; вып. 25, 1894; вып. 30, 1903.]
- Кречун П., 2019 – Павло Кречун, “Святотроїцький унійний монастир і реформа 1617 року” in: Вадим Ададуров, Иван Альмес, Дарюс Баронас et al., *На перехресті культур. Монастир і храм Пресвятої Трійці у Вільнюсі*, Львів: Український Католицький Університет, 2019 (2-ге, виправл. й доповн. видання), с. 115–132.
- [Krechun P., 2019 – Pavlo Krechun, “Sviatotroitskyi uniinyi monastyr i reforma 1617 roku” in: Vadym Adadurov, Ivan Almes, Darius Baronas et al., *Na perekhresti kultur. Monastyr i khram Presviatoi Triitsi u Vilniusi*, Lviv: Ukrainskyi Katolytskyi Universytet, 2019 (2-he, vypravl. y dopovn. vydannia), s. 115–132.]
- Лісейчиков Дз., 2024 – Дзяніс Лісейчиков, “Місто після трагедії: життєві стратегії жителів Вітебська після вбивства Йосафата Кунцевича (1623–1644)”, in: *Святий Йосафат Кунцевич: документи і дослідження (до 400-ліття мученицької смерті)*, упоряд. Иван Альмес, Олег Дух, Львів: Видавництво Українського католицького університету, 2024, с. 407–422.
- [Liseichykov Dz., 2024 – Dzianis Liseichykov, “Misto pislia trahedii: zhyttievi stratehii zhyteliv Vitebska pislia vbyvstva Yosafata Kuntsevycha (1623–1644)”, in: *Sviatyi Yosafat*

- Kuntsevych: dokumenty i doslidzhennia (do 400-littia muchenytskoi smerti)*, uporiad. Ivan Almes, Oleh Dukh, Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Ukrainkoho katolytskoho universytetu, 2024, s. 407–422.]
- Лісейчыкаў Дз., 2019 – Дзяніс Лісейчыкаў, “Сооружены ест коштом и накладом отца Константына: сребраны напрастольны крыж з Новагародка і лёс яго стваральніка”, in: *Архіварыус*, 2019, вып. 17, с. 170–183.
- [Liszejchykaw Dz., 2019 – Dzianis Liszejchykaw, “Sooruzhjeny jest koshtom i nakladom otca Konstantyna: srebrany naprastolny kryzh z Novagarodka i jjos jago stvaral'nika”, in: *Arhivaryus*, 2019, vyp. 17, s. 170–183.]
- Макараў М., 2008 – Максим Макараў, *Ад пасада да магдэбургіі: прававое становішча насельніцтва местаў Беларускага Падзвіння ў XIV – першай палове XVII ст.*, Мінск: Экаперспектыва, 2008.
- [Makaraw M., 2008 – Maksim Makaraw, *Ad pasada da magdeburgii: pravavoje stanovishcha nasjel'nictva mjestaw Bjelaruskaga Padzvinnja w XIV – pjershaj palovje XVII st.*, Minsk: Ekaperspektyva, 2008.]
- Макараў М., 2022 – Максим Макараў, “Рынкавая плошча Віцебска ў другой палове XVI – пачатку XVIII ст.”, in: *Архіварыус*, 2022, вып. 20, с. 146–166.
- [Makaraw M., 2022 – Maksim Makaraw, “RynkavaJa ploshcha Vicjebska w drugoj palovje XVI – pachatku XVIII st.”, in: *Arhivaryus*, 2022, vyp. 20, s. 146–166.]
- Макараў М. et al., 2020 – Максим Макараў, Мікола Волкаў, “Інвентар замка і горада Віцебска 1638 года”, in: *Архіварыус*, 2020, вып. 18, с. 28–58.
- [Makaraw M. et al., 2020 – Maksim Makaraw, Mikola Volkaw, “Invjentar zamka i gorada Vicjebska 1638 goda”, in: *Arhivaryus*, 2020, vyp. 18, s. 28–58.]
- Памятники истории, 1999 – Памятники истории Восточной Европы. Источники XV–XVII вв.*, т. 4: *Крестопроводная книга шляхты Великого княжества Литовского 1655 г.*, Москва–Варшава: Древлехранилище, 1999.
- [*Pamyatniki istorii, 1999 – Pamyatniki istorii Vostochnoj Evropy. Istochniki XV–XVII vv.*, t. 4: *Krestoprivodnaya kniga shlyahy Velikogo knyazhestva Litovskogo 1655 g.*, Moskva–Varshava: Drevlekhranilishche, 1999.]
- Россия и белорусские земли, 2020 – Россия и белорусские земли в XVII – первой половине XVIII в. Сборник документов*, т. 1: 1619–1663 гг., укл. Е. Н. Горбатов, А. Б. Довнар, Ю. М. Эскин, Москва: Древлехранилище, 2020.
- [*Rossiya i belorusskie zemli, 2020 – Rossiya i belorusskie zemli v XVII – pervoj polovine XVIII v. Sbornik dokumentov*, t. 1: 1619–1663 gg., ukl. E. N. Gorbatov, A. B. Dovnar, YU. M. Eskin, Moskva: Drevlekhranilishche, 2020.]
- Святий Йосафат Кунцевич, 2024 – Святий Йосафат Кунцевич: документи і дослідження (до 400-ліття мученицької смерті)*, упоряд. Іван Альмес, Олег Дух, Львів: Видавництво Українського католицького університету, 2024.
- [*Sviaty Yosafat Kuntsevych, 2024 – Sviaty Yosafat Kuntsevych: dokumenty i doslidzhennia (do 400-littia muchenytskoi smerti)*, uporiad. Ivan Almes, Oleh Dukh, Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Ukrainkoho katolytskoho universytetu, 2024.]
- “Статьи”, 1861 – “Статьи, постановленныя на избирательномъ сеймѣ, для успокоенія

православной религии въ королевствѣ Польскомъ и Великомъ Княжествѣ Литовскомъ. 1632 ноября 1”, in: *Архивъ Юго-Западной Россіи, издаваемый Временною комиссіею для разбора древнихъ актовъ, высочайше учрежденною при Киевскомъ Военномъ, Подольскомъ и Волынскомъ генераль-губернаторѣ*, ч. 2: *Постановленія дворянскихъ провинціальныхъ сеймовъ въ Юго-Западной Россіи*, т. 1, Киевъ: Лито-типография Императорскаго Университета св. Владимира Акционерного общества Н. Т. Корчак-Новицкаго, 1861, с. 208–214.

[“Staty”, 1861 – “Staty, postanovlennia na yzbyratelnom seim, dlia uspokoieniia pravoslavnoi relyhii v korolevstv Polskomъ y Velykom Kniazhestv Lytovskom. 1632 noiabria 1”, in: *Arkhyv Yuho-Zapadnoi Rossii, yzdavaemi Vremennoiu komysseiю dlia razbora drevnykh aktov, visochaishe uchrezhdennoiu pry Kievskom Voennom, Podolskom y Volinskom heneral-hubernator*, ch. 2: *Postanovleniia dvorianskykh provyntsialnykh seimovъ v Yuho-Zapadnoi Rossii*, t. 1, Kiev: Lyto-typohrafiya Ymperatorskoho Unyversyteta sv. Vladymyra Aktsyonernoho obshchestva N. T. Korchak-Novytskoho, 1861, s. 208–214.]