

EXECUTION CANNOT BE PARDONED. HOW DID THE ORTHODOX POLEMI- CISTS OF THE 16TH CENTURY PROPOSE TO FIGHT HERETICS?

Ivan Yuryevich Nepryakhin

Abstract: *Based on the 16th century polemical texts from the territory of the East Slavic lands, the author draws attention to the discourse of non-violence of the scribes, who, however, wrote about other methods of combating heretics. The leading role in the confrontation with unofficial teachings is occupied by the denunciation of heretics and attempts to return them to the Church. But, the positive reaction of Orthodox authors to the European Inquisition is considered. But in fact, the authors did not call for the use of such practices in Orthodox lands but spoke about the otherness of their religious culture. Despite the need to combat the reformation teachings, the Orthodox Church began to look for sources of opposition not in the forcible liquidation of heretics, but in attempts to strengthen it internally, which shows the peculiarities of the development of the Orthodox Church in the late Middle Ages.*

Keywords: *Inquisition, Orthodox church, heretics, bookish tradition.*

Polemical texts have been one of the most important genres of Orthodox Church literature for a long time. On the basis of this corpus of works, a whole system of self-identification of an Orthodox person was built, who began to realize his cultural difference from Catholics ("Latins"). But a new challenge for the East Slavic scribes in the 16th century were heretical doctrines that spread throughout Eastern Europe (some of which were directly related to the Reformation, while others were rather original) became a major threat to the authority of the church in Eastern Slavic society.

It is obvious that the church faced the task of opposing these heretical movements, which received popular support. This problem was especially acute within the Kiev Metropolis in the second half of the 16th century, where reformation ideas began to actively penetrate the Orthodox population, large heretical circles arose, heretical and Protestant literature appeared.¹ However, in the Orthodox culture of the Eastern Slavic lands, no church institution similar to the Western European Inquisition has been formed. In such a situation the

¹ See: Podokshin 1970; Dmitriev 1990; Chuba 2002; Zema 2020.

question is arising about the methods of countering the Orthodox Church to heretics in the 16th century. To answer it, it is necessary first of all to pay attention to the attitude of the Orthodox scribes themselves to reports about the fight against heretics in Europe, as well as to identify alternative methods of opposing freethinkers.

“Inquisition” in the Grand duchy of Moscow in the late 15th – early 16th centuries.

First of all, attention should be paid to the first mention of the Inquisition in Old Russian literature at the the 15th – 16th centuries – “Speeches of the Emperor’s Ambassador”, dated 1490. This text, created in the entourage of Archbishop Gennady of Novgorod, tells (from the words of Ambassador Giorgio della Torre) to a potential Russian reader about the persecution of heretics in Spain during the reign of Maximilian I.² The text was created in order to prove the need to combat the heresy of the “Judaizers”. The text says that the Spanish king “с папными бискуп[ы] того лиха обыскивати ... да их казнили многими казнями и многими ранами да и сожгли.”³ This text clearly expresses the attitude of the Orthodox scribe to inquisitorial activity: “а слава деи и хвала того шпанского короля пошла по всѣм землям по латиньской вѣрѣ, что на лихих крѣпко стоит.”⁴

One of Gennady’s letters to Metropolitan Zosima speaks about the positive attitude of the Archbishop of Novgorod to the Spanish Inquisition: “Ано фрязовее по своей вере какову крепость держат. Сказывал ми посол цесарев про шпанского короля, как он свою очистил землю.”⁵ In addition, Gennady urged the Metropolitan to prove to Grand Duke Ivan III the need to hold similar European trials of heretics in Moscow: “И ты бы, господине, великому князю о том пристойно говорил, не токмо спасения ради его, но и чти для государя великого князя.”⁶

These sympathies of a major church figure were soon put into practice. In 1490, thanks to the efforts of Archbishop Gennady, a church council was convened in Moscow, the purpose of which was to condemn the heresy of the “Judaizers.” Based on the evidence gathered by Gennady, 9 people were found guilty of falling away from Orthodoxy and following heresy, the essence of which was

² Sedelnikov 1932, p. 51.

³ Sedelnikov 1932, p. 49.

⁴ Sedelnikov 1932, p. 50.

⁵ Kazakova 1955, p. 378.

⁶ Kazakova 1955, p. 378.

following Jewish traditions, as well as iconoclasm.⁷ Those convicted of heresy were sent to Novgorod for public punishment with a whip, but Archbishop Gennady additionally subjected the heretics to public ridicule: before entering Novgorod, the heretics were mounted on horses backwards, their clothes were turned inside out, and birch bark helmets and straw wreaths were put on their heads; the inscription on it was “Се есть сатанино воинство” (“This is Satan’s army”)⁸.

However, the struggle against the heretical movement of “Judaizers” did not end there. The fact is that even after the Council of 1490, an influential group of heretics remained in Moscow, which even had support at the court of Grand Duke Ivan III. In 1502, Joseph Volotsky joined the process of fighting the “Judaizers,” who soon became the leader of the fight against heretics: for this purpose, he created an extensive set of anti-heretical writings (the Epistles of Joseph Volotsky and the Book on Heretics), which became the main polemical tool in the fight against them.⁹ In 1504 another council was convened in Moscow, the purpose of which was the second condemnation of heretics, the result of which was not only their excommunication from the church, but also physical reprisals: most of the heretics were burned in cages, one of the leaders, Nekras Rukavov, had his tongue torn out before burning; and only a few were imprisoned in monasteries.¹⁰

Is it possible to say that the anti-Heretical processes of 1490 and 1504 became the first precedents of “inquisitorial” processes in the East Slavic lands? Despite the typological similarity of the process of the Council of 1504 with the methods of the Catholic Inquisition, the answer is not so clear. Of course, it should be recognized that the main reference point for the opponents of heresy – Archbishop Gennady and Joseph Volotsky – was the example from Spain: this is evidenced by the messages of Archbishop Gennady, which directly praise the practices of the Spanish Inquisition. However, Gennady not only sees a reference point in the Western example, but also directly borrows some models of denunciation of heretics (the use of similar terminology in relation to heresy, the similarity of the condemnation of heretics in Novgorod with the *autodafe*).¹¹ However, it should be borne in mind that the Council of 1504 had the closest connection with the council of 1503, at which the issue of church land ownership was discussed: Ivan III pursued the goal of seizing vast lands from the church and transferring it to state ownership, which was not crowned

⁷ Alekseev 2012, pp. 422–423; Manohin 2021, p. 426.

⁸ Kazakova 1955, p. 472.

⁹ Alekseev 2012, p. 438.

¹⁰ Kazakova 1955, pp. 216–217; Alekseev 2012, pp. 439–440.

¹¹ Zelenina 2008, pp. 118–124.

with success due to the opposition of authoritative church hierarchs.¹² In addition, the political overthrow of the patrons of the Moscow group of heretics – Elena Voloshanka, the wife of the son of Ivan III, and Dmitry, the grandson of Ivan III, who claimed the Moscow throne, also belongs to this time.¹³ Based on this, it can be said that the process against heretics was not only religious, but also political in nature, which later led to a close political union of church and state in Russia.¹⁴

A different character is also found in the humiliation of heretics in Novgorod in 1490. In fact, the heretical procession, which was initiated by Archbishop Gennady, is a method of ridiculing the participants of this action, which is why their position in society was overthrown. It is also impossible to talk about borrowing this “rite” from European culture: turning the situation of people inside out for the purpose of ridiculing them had quite ancient Russian roots. It turns out that during this process Gennady acted in accordance with the local laughing tradition, without borrowing special inquisitorial practices related to *autodafe*.¹⁵

In addition, Soviet and Russian researchers have repeatedly drawn attention to the rejection by Orthodox society of the massacre of heretics in 1504. In a polemic with the position of Joseph Volotsky on the issue of opposing heretics, the “non-possessors,” followers of Nil of Sora, who accused their opponent of cruelty, calling for mercy for repentant apostates. Such opposition led to the fact that Joseph Volotsky compiled a special, 13th “word” for “The Enlightener”, where he argued for the physical destruction of heretics and apostates¹⁶. So, it can be found that the methods used in the fight against heretics-Judaizers methods similar to “inquisitorial” methods did not become a typical phenomenon in Moscow Russia, but, on the contrary, did not have unambiguous support among Orthodox hierarchs (this is especially evident on the eve of the Council of 1490 and after the Council of 1504), and, moreover, they led to the formation of a different, more humane attitude towards heretics. The actual use of execution against “Judaizers” was caused, firstly, by the involvement of heretics in the political struggle within the Moscow state; secondly, the radicality of the main opponents of the heretics – Archbishop Gennady and Joseph Volotsky – in an effort to suppress the anti-church movement; and, thirdly, in broadcasting the “Inquisition culture” from abroad through ambassador of Maximilian

¹² Kazakova 1955, pp. 206–210; Alekseev 2002, pp. 294–301; Alekseev 2012, p. 439.

¹³ Alekseev 2012, p. 315.

¹⁴ Zelenina 2008, p. 126.

¹⁵ Lihachev 1984, p. 16; Alekseev 2012, p. 424.

¹⁶ Kazakova 1955, pp. 217–220; Alekseev 2012, pp. 440–441.

I, which was expressed in the acquaintance of the Orthodox Church with the history of opposition to dissent in Spain.¹⁷

Attitude to the Inquisition in the 1560s in the Kiev Metropolis.

The above information about the attitude of Orthodox church leaders to the Inquisition is unique, but not isolated. Surprisingly, after the defeat of the heresy in Moscow in 1504, there are no reports of any inquisitorial processes in Europe in the book culture of the Eastern Slavs. Its next mention dates back to the middle of the 16th century and is an independent account of a specific antiheretic process. The next mention in the Russian literature of inquisition trials is found in an anonymous polemical work against the “husses” (“гусы”), heretics who were probably associated with the Hussites, but were not their direct successors. In this text of the mid-1560s originating from Podolia, the teaching of heretics is described and denounced in great detail, as well as their brief history related to Jan Huss is given.¹⁸

According to this text, there once lived an orphan Gus Ionish, who had been herding geese since childhood. But one day he was noticed by a certain Latin philosopher (called “didascaly”, i.e. “teacher”), who took pity on seeing a poor orphan shepherd, and sheltered him, starting to teach literacy, and then philosophy. Soon the young man grew up, becoming the same educated philosopher. The future heresiarch received the name “Gus Ionish” from the author of the legend as an indication of the “profession” of the former goose shepherd.

Later, didaskal gave his student the keys to his entire estate, allowing him to dispose of everything except one chest, forbidding Gus to look into it. Then Gus Ionish “fell into reflection” that the teacher was like a father to him, and he was like a son to him; therefore, Gus wanted to have access to the entire didaskal estate. One day the latter left the estate, and Gus Ionysh, taking advantage of the situation, made a wax cast of the key to the forbidden chest and made a copy from the blacksmith. Unbeknownst to his teacher, the student opened a drawer and found in it books of the Old Testament written in Latin. After reading the contents of the books, Huss Ionish fell into meditation, thinking over the words “Listen, Israel: The Lord our God is one” (Deut. 6:4) and “Do not make yourself an idol and no image of what is in heaven above, and what is on the earth below, and what is in the water below the earth; do not worship them or serve them” (Exodus 20:4-5).

¹⁷ Mikelis 2021, pp. 150–151, 156

¹⁸ About them see: Begunov 1996; Dmitriev 2003; Zema 2003.

After that, Gus Ionish escaped from the didascal to Prague, where he began to teach heresy. After a while, Gus in the Czech Kingdom began to teach the people, recalling the commandment about the non-creation of “idols” given by God to Moses. The whole of Prague was “seduced” by these ideas: the inhabitants rebelled and began to break icons. This was soon heard by the Sigismund I, who, having gathered troops, tried three times to defeat the heretics. Only for the third time the king’s soldiers were able to defeat the rebels. Gus Ionych and other leaders of the heretics were captured and burned¹⁹.

The legend ends with the fact that to this day, when the Latins catch someone from the “husses”, they do not teach them the texts of Scripture, but torture and burn them as heretics: :

“Да и сїи сѣт сѣмя ономоу Х҃с҃у Ионышу и побѣждаеми соут за свои ересь, и от страха прочїим латином да их не съжжют огнем, понеже латини, нигдѣ обрящѣт боуди когю г҃са, не истязают его Писанїем, въ что вѣрѣет, якоже мы, христьяне, съ Святѣм Писанїем хоцем их побѣдити и обратити ко полезномуу и не блазномуу поути, ну тоу их предадут огню, и огнем их стязают и иссжашают, а не Ветхим и Новѣм Писанїем, якоже мы. И поистениѣ добре творят латини, и что потребуеет бльшаа истязанїа и прѣ съ таковыми прелщеными человеци, подобно же якоже б҃сномоу псоу. Егда же видиши его б҃сноующася, оубїт его, да не прочїи споганит болшаа сих ликованїа и цѣлбы”²⁰.

In this fragment, attention is drawn to the anonymous author’s attitude to the Inquisition process – he directly approves of the practice of persecution and burning of apostates from the faith, noting, however, that such activity is peculiar to Catholics. Speaking about the Orthodox tradition of fighting heretics, the polemicist focuses on the practice of denouncing and teaching heretics, the purpose of which is to return them to the bosom of the official church (“мы, христьяне, съ Святѣм Писанїем хоцем их побѣдити и обратити ко полезномуу и не блазномуу поути”).

In fact, the polemicist himself answers the question of why the practice of persecuting heretics and condemning them in specialized church courts has not developed in the Orthodox tradition. However, how can the information about nonviolent opposition to heretics in the texts be correlated with real church practice?

Orthodox struggle against heretics in the East Slavic lands.

The existence in the East Slavic polemical texts of the 16th century of the idea of a nonviolent struggle against heretics leads to a logical question: what, in this

¹⁹ Begunov 1996, pp. 365–366.

²⁰ Begunov 1996, p. 366.

case, were the measures taken by church leaders against heretics? In my opinion, the answer to this question should be sought in educational texts created as an answer to the manifestation of heretical thought. It should be noted that for the Orthodox East Slavic tradition in the Middle Ages there was no model of church processes against heretics – Byzantium did not develop its own clear system of anti-heretical processes. At the same time, the main goal of the controversy with heretics in Byzantium was their persuasion and return to the bosom of official teaching. In addition, it was in Byzantium that the idea of the rejection of the death penalty as a way of punishing misdemeanors was formed, which was also reflected in the anti-heretical activities of Russian Orthodox figures.²¹

Turning to the history of countering the “Judaizers» in the late 15th – early 16th centuries, one cannot ignore the fact that it was for these purposes that the so-called “Gennady Bible» was created, which became the first complete translation into Church Slavonic of the Old and New Testaments. As noted by Ya.S. Lurie, one of the translations of the texts of the Bible was, firstly, the desire to oppose the official Church Slavonic text of the Bible to heretics, which would become a source of proof of the fallacy of heretics when relying on sacred texts. Secondly, according to some sources, the “Judaizers” had their own translations of individual books of the Old Testament, which were absent from the corpus of texts of the official church.²² In addition, the controversy that arose around the church council of 1504 about the attitude towards heretics also led to the replenishment of the corpus of polemical and preaching texts, which is undoubtedly a manifestation of the nonviolent struggle of the Orthodox with heretics.

Turning to the experience of the Kiev Metropolis in the middle of the 16th century, it should be noted that in this region, one of the main opponents of heretical movements, whose number was quite large, was the elder Artemy, who created a large complex of polemical messages aimed at condemning the new teachings.²³ However, in these texts, the author’s position is extremely indicative – being an ardent opponent of these heresies (he called them “Luthor teachers,” which is a collective name for any heretical movements that Artemy compared with the Reformation, although they differed from the teachings of Martin Luther and Jean Calvin) – Artemy, like an anonymous polemicist author, wrote: “не подобаетъ же дивитися намъ о невѣжствующихъ и заблуждашихъ, но паче молитися о нихъ.”²⁴

²¹ Medvedev 1992, pp. 60–61; Roach 2012, p. 154.

²² Luriev 1960, pp. 271–283.

²³ About him see: Vilinskiy 1906; Dmitriev 1999; Zhurov 2021; Dmitriev 2022.

²⁴ Послания старца Artemija 1878, p. 1273.

Artemy's active polemical activity can be explained by his desire to convince heretics of the wrongness of their judgments. Moreover, in one of the letters he directly spoke about his desire to return the apostate monk to the bosom of the Orthodox Church²⁵, which once again proves that the peculiarity of the anti-heretical activity of the Orthodox Church is its preaching orientation, denying the need for physical influence.

In addition, it should be assumed that the book publishing activity has become the main tool of the fight against heretics within the Kiev Metropolity. Numerous printing houses established in the second half of the 16th century in this region aimed not only at "educating" the population and increasing the number of copies of the Bible translation; but also, first of all, the dissemination of official church literature, which was to become the main tool in the fight against heretical preaching²⁶.

REFERENCES

- Dmitriev, M. (1999) *Dissidents russes. II. Matvej Baskin*. Starec Artemij (Baden-Baden).
- Roach, A.P. & Angelovska-Panova, M. (2012) "Punishment of heretics: comparisons and contrasts between Western and Eastern Christianity in the Middle Ages", *Journal of history* (Macedonia) 2012, 47(1), pp. 141–171.
- Алексеев, А.И. (2002) *Под знаком конца времен. Очерки русской религиозности конца XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Санкт-Петербург). / [Alekseev, A.I. (2002) *Pod znakom konca vremen. Ocherki russkoj religioznosti konca XIV – nachala XVI vv.* (Sankt-Peterburg)].
- Алексеев, А.И. (2012) *Религиозные движения на Руси последней трети XIV – начала XVI в.: стригольники и жидовствующие (Москва)*. / [Alekseev, A.I. (2012) *Religioznye dvizheniya na Rusi poslednej treti XIV – nachala XVI v.: strigol'niki i zhidovstvuyushchie* (Moskva)].
- Бегунов, Ю.К. (1996) "Ян Гус и восточное славянство (По материалам новонайденного источника)". В: Лихачев, Д.С. (ред.) *Труды отдела древнерусской литературы. Т. 49*. (Санкт-Петербург), pp. 356–375. / [Begunov, Yu.K. (1996) "Yan Gus i vostochnoe slavyanstvo (Po materialam novonajdenного istochnika)". V: Lihachev, D.S. (red.) *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury. T. 49*. (Sankt-Peterburg), pp. 356–375].
- Вилинский, С.Г. (1906) *Послания старца Артемия (XVI века)* (Одесса). / [Vilinskij, S.G. (1906) *Poslaniya starca Artemiya (XVI veka)* (Odessa)].

²⁵ Artemija 1878, pp. 1420–1423.

²⁶ Nemirovskij 1974, pp. 7–13; Vladimirov 1981, pp. 34–45.

- Владимиров Л.И. (1985) “Издания и переводы Библии в идеологической борьбе в Великом княжестве Литовском”. В: Сидоров А.А. (ред.) *Федоровские чтения. 1981 г.*, pp. 34–45. / [Vladimirov L.I. (1985) “Izdaniya i perevody Biblii v ideologicheskoy bor’be v Velikom knyazhestve Litovskom”. V: Sidorov A.A. (red.) *Fedorovskie chteniya. 1981 g.*, pp. 34–45.]
- Дмитриев, М.В. (1990) *Православие и Реформация. Реформационные движения в восточнославянских землях Речи Посполитой во второй половине XVI в.* (Москва) / [Dmitriev, M.V. (1990) *Pravoslaviye i Reformatsiya. Reformatsionnye dvizheniya v vostochnoslavjanskikh zemlyah Rechi Pospolitoy vo vtoroj polovine XVI v.* (Moskva)].
- Дмитриев, М.В. (2003) “«Єресь гусів» та «єресь Феодосія Косого» в українсько-білоруському релігійному житті третьої чверті XVI ст.», *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична* (2002), 37, pp. 122–144. / [Dmitriev, M.V. (2003) “Eres’ gusiv ta eres’ Feodosiya Kosogo v ukrains’ko-bilorus’komu religijnomu zhitti tret’oi chverti XVI st.», *Visnik L’vivs’kogo universitetu. Seriya istorichna* (2002), 37, pp. 122–144].
- Дмитриев, М.В. (2022) “Ответ православной культуры Восточной Европы на вызов протестантизма в середине XVI в.: пример посланий старца Артемия”. В: Найденова, Л.П. (ред.) *Исследования по источниковедению истории России (до 1917 г.). Выпуск 7*, pp. 109–135. / [Dmitriev, M.V. (2022) “Otvety pravoslavnoj kul’tury Vostochnoj Evropy na vyzovy protestantizma v seredine XVI v.: primer poslanij starca Artemiya”. V: Najdenova, L.P. (red.) *Issledovaniya po istochnikovedeniyu istorii Rossii (do 1917 g.). Vypusk 7*, pp. 109–135].
- Журова, Л.И. (2021) “Послания старца Артемия: к вопросу о противолутеранской полемике в публицистике XVI в.», *Гуманитарные науки в Сибири* (2021), 28(3), pp. 23–28. / [Zhurova, L.I. (2021) “Poslaniya starca Artemiya: k voprosu o protivolyuteranskoj polemike v publicistike XVI v.», *Gumanitarnye nauki v Sibiri* (2021), 28(3), pp. 23–28].
- Зеленина, Г. (2008) “Сефарадская мудрствующие, фантомная ересь и слава шпанского короля”, *Ab imperio* (2008), 3, pp. 97–130. / [Zelenina, G. (2008) “Sefaradskaya mudrstvuyushchie, fantomnaya eres’ i slava shpanskogo korolya”, *Ab imperio* (2008), 3, pp. 97–130].
- Зема, В. (2003) “Руськомовні реформаційні пам’ятки та вчення Феодосія Косого: спростування історіографічного міфу”, *Україна в Центральній Східній Європі (з найдавніших часів до кінця XVIII ст.)* (2003), 3, pp. 139–162. / [Zema, V. (2003) “Rus’komovni reformacijni pam’yatki ta vchennya Feodosiya Kosogo: sprostuvannya istoriografichnogo mifu”,

- Ukraina v Central'no-Skhidnij Evropi (z najdavnishih chasiv do kintsya XVIII st.)* (2003), 3, pp. 139–162].
- Зема, В. (2020) *Київська митрополія перед викликами Ренесансу та Реформації*. (Київ) / [Zema, V. (2020) *Kyivs'ka mitropoliya pered viklikami Renesansu ta Reformacii*. (Kiev)].
- Казакова, Н.А. & Лурье, Я.С. (1955) *Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI века* (Москва; Ленинград). / [Kazakova, N.A. & Lurie, Ya.S. (1955) *Antifeodal'nye ereticheskie dvizheniya na Rusi XIV – nachala XVI veka* (Moskva; Leningrad)].
- Лихачев, Д.С. & Панченко, А.М. & Поньрко, Н.В. (1984) *Смех в Древней Руси* (Ленинград). / [Lihachev, D.S. & Panchenko, A.M. & Ponyrko, N.V. (1984) *Smekh v Drevnej Rusi* (Leningrad)].
- Лурье, Я.С. (1960) *Идеологическая борьба в русской публицистике конца XV – начала XVI века* (Москва). / [Lurie, Ya.S. (1960) *Ideologicheskaya bor'ba v russkoj publicistike konca XV – nachala XVI veka* (Moskva)].
- Манохин, А.А. (2021) “Собор 1490 г. как основа конструирования ереси жидовствующих”, *Христианское чтение* (2021), 4, pp. 412–430. / [Manohin, A.A. (2021) “Sobor 1490 g. kak osnova konstruirovaniya ere-si zhidovstvuyushchih”, *Khristianskoe chtenie* (2021), 4, pp. 412–430].
- Медведев, И.П. (1992) “Смертная казнь в толковании Феодора Вальсамона”, *Византийский временник* (1992), 53(78), pp. 53–61. / [Medvedev, I.P. (1992) “Smertnaya kazn' v tolkovanii Feodora Val'samona”, *Vizantijskij vremennik* (1992), 53(78), pp. 53–61].
- Микелис, Ч. Дж. (2021) *Жидовствующие. Новгородско-московская ересь XV века и ранняя Реформация* (Великий Новгород). / [Michelis, Ch. Dzh. (2021) *Zhidovstvuyushchie. Novgorodsko-moskovskaya eres' XV veka i rannaya Reformaciya* (Velikij Novgorod)].
- Немировский, А.А. (1974) *Начало книгопечатания на Украине. Иван Федоров* (Москва). / [Nemirovskij, A.L. (1974) *Nachalo knigopечатaniya na Ukraine. Ivan Fedorov* (Moskva)].
- Подокшин, С.А. (1970) *Реформация и общественная мысль Белоруссии и Литвы (вторая половина XVI – начало XVII в.)* (Минск) / [Podokshin, S.A (1970) *Reformaciya i obshchestvennaya mysl' Belorussii i Litvy (vtoraya polovina XVI – nachalo XVII v.)*. (Minsk)].
- Послания старца Артемия* (1878). В: Русская историческая библиотека. Т. 4. (Санкт-Петербург), pp. 1201–1448. / [Poslaniya starca Artemiya (1878). V: *Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka*. T. 4. (Sankt-Peterburg), pp. 1201–1448].
- Седельников, А.Д. “Рассказ 1490 г. об Инквизиции”. В: Никольский Н.К. (ред.) *Труды комиссии по древнерусской литературе Академии Наук*

Ivan Yuryevich Nepryakhin

(Ленинград), pp. 33–58. / [Sedel'nikov, A.D. "Rasskaz 1490 g. ob Inkvizicii". V: Nikol'skij N.K. (red.) *Trudy komissii po drevnerusskoj literature Akademii Nauk* (Leningrad), pp. 33–58].

Чуба, Г. В. (2002) "Текстологическая классификация украинских учительных Евангелий второй половины XVI в.", *Славяноведение* 2002, 2, pp. 82–97.

Ivan Yuryevich Nepryakhin

Post-Graduate Student

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

nepryahin-ivan@mail.ru