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CYRILLIC TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM

*The system is given first; a note on the reasons for its use follows.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyrillic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Cyrillic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ọy</td>
<td>ou⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g; Belorussian h</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е</td>
<td>je/e</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>šč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>і</td>
<td>ĭ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>ė</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>э</td>
<td>è</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>я</td>
<td>ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>f-th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>ė</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Ы-А</td>
<td>йч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Ы-Ж</td>
<td>йo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ÿ²</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No difference in pronunciation between this digraph and the previous character is implied.
2. Belorussian postvocalic semivowel [w] (including across word-boundaries).

- x -
In this note and throughout, pointed brackets <> are used to enclose graphemes under consideration. Square brackets [] enclose phonetic transcriptions. Double obliques (//) enclose phonemic transcriptions. Words under consideration are italicized. Translations of individual words and of brief citations are enclosed in quotation marks: ".

The system used here for the transliteration of the Cyrillic alphabet is broadly that used by historical linguists. The aim of using this system is threefold.

Firstly, it seeks to offer a readable and reasonable approximation of the sounds to those who do not know Russian, Belorussian, Old Church Slavonic and any other Slavonic languages cited here, including Common Slavonic.

Secondly, it seeks to enable those who are familiar with Cyrillic easily to reconstruct the original graphemes, so that such readers may imagine the text as it appears in the original.

Thirdly, it seeks to offer a version of the originals that reflects faithfully the number of syllables shown in the original. The conventional Library of Congress system (LoC) cannot encompass that aim, since it does not distinguish between the vowel [i] and the consonant [j], transliterating both with <i>. The Cyrillic letter <й>, representing /j/ after vowels, was innovated in seventeenth-century schools of Kiev (Kyiv) and entered Russian usage in the eighteenth century. In transliterations of primary sources, <j> is used where citations are from modern editions using <й>. Where I have had access to originals, the (only apparent) extra syllable is shown.

Alas, a special word is necessary on the subject of the 'softening' vowel-letters. The Cyrillic letters <я>, <е>, <и> and <и> , as well as <ё> ³ (when used), mark palatalization ('softening') of any previous consonant that can be palatalized. Four of these five are pre-iotized, that is, a [j] is prefixed to the vowel, in the following contexts: initially; after any other of the ten vowel graphemes in the modern alphabet; and after either of the

³. <ё> was allegedly the invention of Karamzin. See A.P. Vlasto, A Linguistic History of Russia, Oxford, 1988, p. 39. It is gaining ground in post-Soviet Russia.
modern ‘signs’, viz. <ъ> and <ъ>. <и> is pre-iotized after <ъ>. Logically, one should transliterate <и> as <ja>, <е> as <je>, <ё> as <jo>, and <ю> as <ju>. I have, however, conformed with tradition and transliterated Cyrillic <Ce>, where C = any consonant, whether or not it can be palatalized or softened, as <Ce>, e.g. <Пестрикі> is transliterated <Pestriki>, not <Pjestriki>. However, pre-iotized Cyrillic <е> is transliterated <je>, e.g. <Белое> = <Beloje>⁴, <Подмолоедье> = <Podmolod’je>. I have borrowed from the LoC the transliteration of <ё>, namely <ё>. In general a consistent transliteration <je> would probably be preferable, because in that case <ё> could be transcribed <е>.

Where it is necessary to show separately a palatalized Russian consonant without a context, a subscript j (⟨ј⟩) is used, e.g. /lj/.

**Historical Aspects**

No transliteration is offered for Old Russian letters not required in the thesis.

The change of inherited initial /le/ > /lo/ (which has some importance in the text of the present thesis) took place before inherited /le/ became pre-iotized.

The modern use of <ъ> and <ъ> to indicate respectively depalatalization and palatalization of the previous consonant developed from the original function of these letters as ultrashort vowels (the so-called *jers*). The transliteration in either case is ‹ъ› and ‹ъ›. The ‘default’ implication is the modern usage. When vowels are intended, this is indicated in the text.

The Cyrillic letter <ъ> is transliterated <ё>. Eventually the phoneme thus represented (originally perhaps [æː], cf. Old Russian *мьпа* versus Finnish *määrä*) coalesced with /le/, which is normatively either prepalatalized or pre-iotized. The transliteration here shows

---

⁴. This is transcribed from the modern spelling; the earlier version was <Белоје>, i.e. <Beloje> (see below).
<jê> initially and <ê> elsewhere. The present form of the name of the River Jemenka
(originally Бменка, as argued in Chapter Two of the present thesis) shows the pre-
liotization in question.

On occasions when it is relevant only, Old Russian <θ> is transliterated <f̜>̝. This is
unsatisfactory, but is meant to indicate that this letter is found only in Greek words
containing <θ>, pronounced [θ] (voiceless interdental spirant) in Mediaeval Greek. Some
carly Russians may have pronounced this as [f]. Later (specifically after the fall of the
jers) the sound [f] became pronounceable to many Russians, and they then pronounced
<θ> as /f/. On occasion our transliteration needs to show that the two letters <ϕ> and <θ>
have different origins, whence <f̜>̝, meaning 'this letter represents an /f/-sound
originating from a Greek /θ/, which is transliterated into English as <θ>'. An inability to
pronounce [f] or [f̜] marks many Nevelers, but far from all, in the seventeenth and
eighteenth centuries. Such markers may pattern with economic status.

The reader should bear in mind that Russian <a> is transliterated <l>, and that when
followed by <a>, <ə>, <o> or <y>, transliterated <a>, <y>, <o>, <ω>, the <l> will be
hard, i.e. depalatalized. When we are dealing with Polish transcriptions of Nevel'
placenames, however, <l> is a soft, i.e. palatalized /l/. Thus Polish <Polock> ≡
transliterated Russian <Полок>. In this context it should be stated that there is no
evidence whatsoever in our Polish primary sources (principally AGAD AR XXV) of <l>
pronounced as [w]. In the Polish of today's Belarus' the hard /l/ phoneme is still
pronounced as such.5

TRANSCRIPTION OF POLISH PRIMARY SOURCES

As far as possible I have been absolutely faithful to the seventeenth- and
eighteenth-century Polish primary sources. Any normalization is a shameful destruction
of historical source material. A case in point is the local version of the Greek name

5. I had the opportunity to hear this for myself during several visits to Belarus' annexed to research
journeys to or from Nevel'.
Theodōros. The modern Russian version is Fjodor, found once at the end of our period. Much more often we find either Fiedor or a very local Chwiedoń. The documents in AR XXV make generous use of diacritics, using what A.P. Wavell termed 'the pepper pot method' of sprinkling the marks at random. While <с>, <а> and <і> are used, often accurately, other diacritics are of dubious significance or without any meaning at all, except perhaps to express the inventorist's mood.
## TRANSLITERATION FROM CLASSICAL GREEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>x (= [ks])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ωω</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>b, v</td>
<td>οω</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>σ, ζ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εν</td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>z (= [zd]⁶)</td>
<td>υ</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ει</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>οι</td>
<td>oi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### TRANSLITERATION FROM MEDIÆVAL GREEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αω</td>
<td>av</td>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>x (= [ks])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>g (= [γ])</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>d (= [d])</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>σ, ς</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευ</td>
<td>ev</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>z (= [z])</td>
<td>υ</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>th (= [θ])</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>kh (= [χ])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ò (= [o])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ε, i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>οι</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be borne in mind that <η> was pronounced identically with <η> in Mediæval Greek, as were <οη>, <ελ> and several other combinations. Similarly medieval <β>, <γ> and <δ> had changed from voiced stops to voiced spirants. This fact had various reflexes in Russian. Russian had the sounds /b/ and /v/, and letters to represent both; Greek <β> (<ν>) is transliterated into Russian with <н> (<ν>). We shall transliterate Classical Greek <β> with <b>, but Mediæval Greek <β> with <ν>.
Russian <r> (<g>) was already a spirant, and remained so in Nevel' until modern times; some older Nevelers still use that pronunciation. No distinction is made in our transliteration, but it should be remembered that Classical Greek <γ> is [g], while Mediæval Greek <γ> is [ɣ], i.e. a voiced velar spirant. Russian transliterated Mediæval Greek <δ> as <d>, i.e. it wrote an interdental spirant as if it were a dental stop. We transliterate both Classical and Mediæval Greek <δ> as <d>, but it should be recalled that the latter is [d].

TRANSLITERATION FROM HEBREW

In a very few cases I have been obliged to attempt transliterations from Hebrew. Where I have done so, I have done my best to use the system employed in The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Ancient Languages. At least I may be, for any readers with good Hebrew, a source of innocent merriment, and I comfort myself with the thought that chutzpah is by origin a Hebrew word.

In conclusion I would recommend to the reader the analysis of transliteration methods printed by A.W. Lawrence as the last paragraph of his Preface to Seven Pillars of Wisdom, with the citations from his brother T.E. Lawrence that follow. This brief summation is not merely wise: it is enough to make a corpse laugh.

---

PREFATORY NOTE

It was through Michael Rose, a London solicitor, that I first heard of the town of Nevel' and came to know something of its history. Nevel' was the town from which both his grandparents came. Together Michael and I visited the town in 2001, returning in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005; but from our first visit we had understood that here was a place whose story deserved to be widely known.

In a sense Nevel' has become a lost city. Set at the very edge of the Russian Federation and of Pskov oblast', it is little noticed by the centre. Its old ties with what is now Belarus' are often forgotten just across the border. Lithuania does not recall that it once ruled Nevel'; in Poland the memory of the sometime Newel has, on the whole, faded. As for western Europe, it has not forgotten what it never knew. This thesis, then, is a first small attempt to bring Nevel' to the attention of the English-speaking world.
In Time of ‘The Breaking of Nations’

I

Only a man harrowing clods
   In a slow silent walk
With an old horse that stumbles and nods
   Half asleep as they stalk.

II

Only thin smoke without flame
   From the heaps of couch-grass;
Yet this will go onward the same
   Though Dynasties pass.

III

Yonder a maid and her wight
   Come whispering by:
War’s annals will cloud into night
   Ere their story die.

Thomas Hardy, 1915

INTRODUCTION: THE VOYAGE OF THE ANIARA
The single street of a hamlet near Nevel'. Lolling with the reins in his lap, a man drives his two-wheeled cart; it runs smoothly on pneumatic tyres. Past a scatter of wooden houses he drives his load of hay; he greets a friend coming the other way with a scythe over his shoulder. It is June 2001; Nevel' hay-making is in full swing. No machines are used. The collective-farm system has long collapsed.

That evening our new Nevel' friends explain the importance of hay. Those few people who own a cow must somehow get the animal through the cold season. Even here, at 56° 1’ N. (only the latitude of Edinburgh), cattle must be indoors for about half the year. As traditionally in Russia, Nevel’’s cattle are not turned out until St. George’s Day, 23 April, according to the Julian calendar, which means on 6 May2. One cow needs the hay from more than one person’s patch, so friends and acquaintances all contribute their math. Many people have a little patch of land for the purpose. This generosity brings its reward in the spring. Each haymaker is entitled to a share of the dung accumulated over the winter. The dung is taken home and dissolved in water, and this liquid fertilizer is one of the secrets of the extraordinary success as kitchen-gardeners achieved by Nevelers,3 who can conjure red peppers and full-sized lemons from the sour earth.

---

1. Nevel’ has been known in history also as Newel, Nevelis, Nevelia (in Latin), and, as I shall argue hereafter, Nevelá. I shall attempt to adhere to the usual principle that a place should be spoken of as it was by the ruling power at the date in question. There will be some difficult cases, however, and in them I shall regard Nevel’ as the ‘default form’, on the grounds that in 2011 that is the usual form and there is no current dispute about the border (with Belarús), a few kilometres south of the town. The name Nével’ has initial stress, a fact that gives a first hint as to its origin.

2. A former Nevel’ collective farmer explained to me that before that date the grass never look green but it has not had time to develop much nutritional value, and it is noteworthy that the Julian calendar suits the reality on the ground (literally). For some account of St. George’s Day customs see Polina Rozhnova, A Russian Folk Calendar, Moscow 1992, 84-85 (in English): L.V. Belovinskij, Encyklopedičeskij slovar’ rossijskoj žizni i istorii. M., 2004, p.184, s.v. Jegorij vešnij; and Ju.A. Fedosik, Čto nepojatno u klassikov, ili Encyklopedija russkogo byta XIX veka. M., 2002, 20. St. George’s Day is also the first day for fieldwork. It is noteworthy that the peasant uprising of 1847 which affected Nevel’ county and neighbouring counties began on or about St. George’s Day. The date, 23 April (OS), is recorded in F. Slapskij, O volhennij pomeščičij krest’jan c Viťbskoj gubernii v 1847 g. in Nevel’skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 29-40, though its significance is not brought out. The date is recorded on p. 31.

3. There was no English word for a citizen of Nevel’ when Michael Rose and I first visited Nevel’. To answer this need the word Neveler sprang unbidden to my lips, result no doubt of youthful reading of Christopher Hill and H.N. Brailsford; be assured a researcher’s prejudices will find him out. Nonetheless, the word seems serviceable enough and will be used throughout, irrespective of the governing power at any particular time.
Most Nevel' families have access to some little piece of land to grow vegetables on. Many live in detached log-built houses, always with a garden adjacent, sometimes with fruit trees. In 2001 those Nevelers who are dependent directly or indirectly on the state sector for their money-income are paid very badly and many months in arrears. It follows that their survival depends on what they can grow themselves. They will eat this produce. They may barter it for small items of industrial manufacture, or perhaps offer some to friends who will in turn offer them some product which they happen to have access to. Money, being inedible, is unimportant in such transactions.

There is a 'scissors' crisis in progress here, but not in the sense of the well-known graph from the early days of the October Revolution. Industrial products such as scissors are either unavailable or unaffordable. Survival is the prime need. One thinks of that Old Russian primer of good housekeeping and family values from the mid-XVith century, the Domostroj (the title, calqued approximately on the Greek οἰκονομία (oikonomía), might be translated 'Building a Household'), which instructs us 'how to dig the beds in spring, and apply manure, and collect manure over the winter'.

This cycle - hay, dung, vegetables - thrusts itself on a west European visitor as some shade of our forgotten ancestors here returned to life. Most Nevelers have access to some land. Those who live in the blocks of three- or five-storey Soviet flats often have a dacha with a piece of land attached. Anyone may go into the forests and meadows around the town and forage for stovewood, mushrooms, and berries, in particular bilberries and lingonberries, the latter, for example, being rich in vitamin C, numerous organic acids and tannins. The extensive lake from which the town takes its name provides many kinds of fish. All this is legal; but since the end of the Soviet Union much

4. This passage can be found in the original orthography in Wybór, ed. Lehr-Splawiński, Witkowski, 245. For a version in modern Russian see Domostroy, ed. V. Semin. SPb., 1992, 73. To a significant extent the world of the Russian-language Domostroj is that of Commonwealth Newel in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
5. True, a north European visitor might be less surprised, because of what is known as 'all men's right' to supplement their diet with berries, mushrooms and the like. There is a photograph of such local 'found food' (including sea buckthorn (Hippophae rhamnoides), an excellent source of vitamin C) in Puteshestviye v Nevel', ed. Maksimovskaja, 62. The items were gathered near Lake Čerstvica, the probable site of the battle of Nevel' (1562).
of Nevel’s forest wildlife, particularly elk, has been poached for meat\textsuperscript{7} (it is unclear whether the poachers were local or incomers, or in what proportions).\textsuperscript{8}

Nevelers prefer fresh, local food from Nevel’s woods and fields. In this they are, if you will, ‘ahead’ of their west European neighbours, who are only now beginning to turn away from food in tin or plastic bag. But the point is that back-garden farming, fishing, and hunting and gathering are a necessary part of Nevel’s life today.

A recent essay, suggestive if idiosyncratic, by Vladimir Maxnač and Sergej Maročkin\textsuperscript{9} suggests that the Russian house (dom) was always associated with a piece of land (usad’ba), until Soviet mass building severed the link between the two. This was as true of the peasant’s loghouse as of the barskij dom, the master’s residence. True, the essay serves a nationalist agenda, for example in its plea for a return to high birthrates among ethnic Russians. However, the ordinary Nevel’s way of life presents precisely a picture of an economy dependent on housekeeping, the terms being etymologically synonymous.\textsuperscript{10}

Few in the English-speaking world know anything of Nevel’, and the most basic aim of the present thesis is to launch Nevel’ as a topic into that which Russian scholars call ‘scholarly circulation’ (naučnyj obixod). My own experience is that Nevel’ provides rich material for meditation and thoughtful consideration. For the moment let us give some orientation to the reader visiting Nevel’ for the first time.\textsuperscript{11}

---

\textsuperscript{7} In 1978 adult students of mine in Finland belonged to a syndicate which held a licence to kill fifteen adult and fifteen young elk as part of the annual cull of these animals, which present a danger to traffic. It was explained to me that an adult elk provides 400 kilogrammes of meat. The value of so much meat to early modern people must have been considerable. Elk meatballs are rather similar in taste to beef meatballs. As this thesis advances it will be seen that the author has conscientiously sampled all relevant foodstuffs.

\textsuperscript{8} By 2010 some degree of conservation has been imposed. Wild boar, for example, are now given extra food by hunters (Putecestvice v Nevel’, ed. Maksimovskaja, 62).

\textsuperscript{9} The essay bears the same title as the book in which it appears: M.I. Gel’vanovskij \textit{et al.}, \textit{Russkij gorod i russkij dom}, M., 2004.

\textsuperscript{10} The initial element in economy, Greek \textit{wōikos}, is identical with Polish wieś, Old Russian \textit{v’s}, both meaning ‘village’. This Old Russian \textit{v’s} is a homophone of a word encountered hereafter, \textit{v’s} ‘Vepsä’.

\textsuperscript{11} It may be appropriate at this point to specify all the visits to Nevel’ I have made. Michael Rose and I
The town, which at the end of the Soviet era had a population of 26,000, is situated at the northern end of a large lake of the same name, and (mainly) on the right bank of the River Jémenka. This watercourse debouches from the lake and flows northeastwards into another complex of lakes, including Lake Bolšoj Ivan. Nevel' is mainly a wooden town. It has one Orthodox church, dating from the nineteenth century; other places of worship were destroyed during the Second World War and later under Khrushchev. A concentrated German air raid in July 1941 destroyed about half the town’s wooden buildings. To a degree the ravages of this attack have never been made good. Nevel' is a green town: in summer it drowns in the foliage of its numerous fruit trees.

In Soviet times there were some significant factories in the town, producing furniture, automated telephone exchange equipment, dried milk, and tinned fruit. At the time of writing (June 2011) the only local industrial product is vodka.

Nevel' is also the centre of an extensive district or rajon (see Map 1), stretching some eighty kilometres from east to west and fifty from north to south. It had become the most important settlement in the area by the end of the sixteenth century. Historiographically, that position is established by the two-year treaty of 1566. Here Nevel' is no longer referred to as a voïost' or subordinated territory of some other town (see Chapter Four below). There are, however, grounds for thinking that Nevel' was locally important in the first half of the fifteenth century (see Chapter Three). In the seventeenth century Newel is the heart of a latifundium slightly larger than the modern district; references to places just outside the modern bounds will be found in Chapter Four (the ‘Batory Bridges’) and Chapter Five. The town’s local significance has never been

---

12. On the fate of Nevel' during the war and the occupation, which lasted until 6 October 1943, see: Kniga pamyati. Pskovskaja oblast' Nevel'skij rajon. Usvjatskij rajon, ed. M.V. Jeltyšev et al., Pskov 1994, passim, and in particular pp. 26-27 (facilities and livestock destroyed) and 365-380 (list of civilians murdered; many more names have been recovered since this book was compiled).

13. Nevel' was one of the largest territories in the so-called ‘Neuburg properties’. See the map in Andrije Macuk, Barac’ba mahnackix krupovak u VKL 1717-1763. M., 2010 (in the copy of this work seen by me the map is loose).
in doubt from 1566 to the present. One of the primary aims of the present thesis is to show that Nevel' is not the least of the cities of Judah,\(^{14}\) that is, that ‘size’ and ‘importance’ are not synonyms.

The Nevel' hinterland is known in Russian as Nével'sčina (locative na Nével'sčine) and in Polish as Newelszczyzna. The landscape is in the main gently undulating, much afforested, the woodlands interleaved with glorious flower meadows and with uncountable streams, rivers and lakes. Chapter One below will give an account of that landscape from its onomastics. There are still hundreds of rural hamlets, but most of them are dying, since only the grandparental generation remains in them. There are a few larger villages, such as Ust'-Dolyssy, twenty kilometres to the northwest of Nevel'.
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Nevel' is newer than its name, which goes back, as I shall argue, to a time when people of Baltic-Finnic language lived in the area, more than a millennium ago. I shall also offer an identification of the specific Finnic group that lived on Lake Nevel'. The Polish version of the name is Newel, which, unlike the Russian, is without palatalization of either of the first two consonants. This contrasts with two other toponyms in the same borderland: Siebież and Wielisz, where both Polish and Russian have the first two consonants palatalized. It follows that the name Newel entered Polish through the prism of a non-Slavonic language, most probably Lithuanian. Thus the question of intercultural encounter imposes itself from the very beginning of Nevel' history. Further, I shall argue that Lake Nevel' was part of a trade route, which again raises the matter of cultural contacts. A principal topic of this thesis will be the effects of Nevel’'s ‘interstatus’, its ‘being betwixt’, so to speak, on the life of the town and its countryside.

The earliest mention of the Lake Nevel' area may be in the Novgorod annals under the year 1185, whether the place there intended is the village of Jemenec on the opposite shore from modern Nevel' town or, as I shall argue, the River Jemenka. In that year

\(^{14}\) Matthew, 2, 5-6 (quoting, approximately, Micah, 5, 2).
(while far away Prince Igor' was a captive of the Polovcians) the forces of Polock found themselves pinched between the power of Novgorod and Smolensk. Hence even as it enters history the Nevel' area acts as the stage for a drama of confrontation between states. As time passes the centre of gravity will grow more remote from Nevel'. To the south-west first Troki and later Warsaw will claim Nevel' as patrimony. To the north-east Novgorod will cede place to Muscovy, which will in turn become transformed into Russia, the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and the Russian Federation.

Even before 1185 the name Nevel' must have been on human lips: otherwise the name would not have lasted until the advent of literacy. Only in 1503, however, does Nevel' enter written history. At that date Nevel' features in a treaty under which Lithuania cedes this and other places to Muscovy. There is no disguising the fact that this date is disappointingly late, and there has been very little archaeological investigation in the modern Nevel' district, let alone in the town itself. Our first two chapters are an attempt to extend knowledge of Nevel farther back into the past. The procedures adopted are outlined in the next paragraph.

In Chapter One we shall examine a large number of Nevel' toponyms, specifically village names, in an attempt to establish when the area's settlements were established and by whom. The author, a linguist masquerading as history student, will try to distinguish the stratigraphy of Nevel' toponyms, suggesting, for example, that Nevel' is older than Krívicy, which in turn is older than Karolinovka. The results gives clear answers to such questions as: who named the human landscape? What kind of people were they (for example, what was their sense of humour?)? How did they live? What was their religion? No more of this, lest the plot be spoiled. Let us add, however, that the analysis of more than two hundred village names makes rather hard pounding for the reader.15 Chapter One has therefore been left short, while perfectly long enough for its purposes.

15. Two reference works were essential to the research for Chapter One. The first was Max Vasmer, ÓSŘJa (for full reference see Abbreviations). It is an exemplar of painstaking scholarship, improved in some cases by the translator. The other was compiled by the extraordinary army doctor, sometime sailor and lifetime lexicographer Vladimir Dahl, a protégé of Pushkin, whom he attended on his deathbed; he was rewarded with Pushkin's talisman ring as a memento. Again, for a full reference see Abbreviations. The third edition, which is the basis of modern reprints, was realized by Professor L.A. Baudouin de Courtenay of Dorpat (Derpt, Tartu) University, who, like Dahl himself, spent time in Russian jails. References to Dahl are by column, not by page.
Chapter Two is somewhat longer, although it deals only with two toponymic sets: Nevel' itself and variants; and Jemenka and its variants. This will yield useful information from prehistoric times. Moreover it will unmask the mythologizing of the modern name of Lake Bol'soj Ivan. The investigation will carry us south to Constantinople and north to the Arctic Circle. This chapter, too, is relatively brief, and it may be wondered why the two chapters have not been merged. The answer is that the reader may feel better served by two brief journeys into intricate linguistic argumentation than by a single longer trek.

Chapter Three is an attempt to place Nevel' in its context. Nevel' began Finnish but became East Slav by culture and language. It was part of the possessions of Polock, and some account is given of that city and its status, which was itself marginal. Polock derived part of its income from annual raids on its neighbours, as did those same neighbours (Lithuanians, Novgorodians, Livonians). By the early fourteenth century Polock came under Lithuanian control. Slowly we begin to acquire information about Nevel', even before it is mentioned by name.

Once we have stepped over the threshold of history, we find that the long period from 1503 to 1772 divides into three approximate ‘centuries’. The sixteenth century, to which Chapter Four is devoted, runs until 1600, when a distant volcano presages the Time of Troubles. Over this century we can derive some knowledge of Nevel' and its importance from the treaties in which it figures. That importance grows from almost negligible to quite considerable. The Battle of Nevel' (1562) is debated internationally; Nevel' is used as fulcrum for operations against other towns, including Polock itself. A zenith for the century is reached during and just after the negotiations between Poland, Muscovy and Pope Gregory XIII's representative, Antonio Possevino, SJ. At this time messengers post by land and see without delay, bringing news of Nevel' to Moscow.

16. Both Nevel' and Jemenka are hydronyms, and it is well known that water-names preserve ancient information (for example, English rivers named Avon preserve the British etymon of Welsh afon ‘river’; hence Celtic-speakers lived in England before the English). However, many Nevel’ hydronyms appear at first glance to be Baltic (as opposed to Baltic-Finnic), and my ignorance of Lithuanian made further investigation of local hydronyms impracticable. Perhaps some researcher with the required skills will take on the task.
Wilno, Rome and London. Hence Chapter Four asks: how does Nevel' acquire such importance so quickly?

'This book,' wrote Sir John Morris Jones in the introduction to his *A Welsh Grammar*, 'has the misfortune to have a history.' The present thesis, not pretending to the importance of Morris Jones's great work, has suffered the same misfortune. The author, coming to the study of history just as his contemporaries were seeking plots for the planting of the bergamot, found himself unable to abandon commitments at home in London to research abroad for a year. Much could have been done with that time, for information on Nevel' has been scattered by time's storms. Moscow, Petersburg, Vilnius, and in particular Minsk hold much material about Nevel'; unconsidered trifles to those who are interested in grander fare, glorious banquets for the historian of Nevel'. How to proceed?

Since Nevel' belonged for six decades and more to the Radziwiłł family, I had already begun to investigate the Radziwiłł Archive in Warsaw. I found that in *Dzial XXV* of that archive there were more than thirty inventories of Newel and its hinterland, and I decided to concentrate on those inventories, inasmuch as they offered a guarantee of relevance. Much useful information could doubtless have been found here and there in all the other sections, but, given the limits on my time, I could not afford to cast my bread on those wide waters. In the course of the years 2005-2009 I made nine journeys to the Polish capital, where I worked for periods of a few days or a week on the microfilm copies of the Newel inventories.

---

18. The earliest is AR XXV 2612, of 1619. Hereafter reference will generally be made in the form '2612, 21', to be understood as 'Radziwill Archive, *Dzial XXV*, item 2612, page 21'. In case of ambiguity a fuller version will be given: 'AR XXV 2612, pp. 3, 21'.
19. The Radziwills' administrators inherited also two earlier inventories, 1619 and 1629. The third inventory was made in 1636, when Newel was a royal town in the possession of the Radziwills. All remaining inventories are later than 1649, when Newel became a private Radziwill town in perpetuity.
On application the author will be glad to complain to anyone who will listen about how difficult these texts are to decipher. Celluloid, bad ink, spillage of that ink and other fluids (see Chapter Five), orthographic vagaries and poor penmanship – but enough. Faced with hurried notes jotted down about Newel and its countryside three centuries ago, one realizes that one should have devoted one’s life to the study of Polish handwriting, Middle Polish grammar, the idiosyncrasies of Polish vocabulary in Lithuanian Belorussia, and many other related matters.

Yet these inventories can be quarried for information: on the built environment, the size of the population, on town institutions (‘healthcare’, prisons, the market, etc.), the townspeople’s religious life, the economy, and other matters. Much can be gleaned about the countryside, as well. We can, moreover, see human activities developing over the course of a century and a half. To extract such information, it is true, we need to work hard, and also to exercise some imagination, without allowing ourselves to be abducted by it.

It is normal procedure for researchers reproducing quotations from such texts to standardize the orthography to conform either with contemporary or with modern practice. All such choices, however, involve a judgement on the editor’s part that must prejudice the reader. I have therefore included some indication of every mark made by the authors of the inventories, either by reproducing it as closely as possible or by giving a description within square brackets. These editorial procedures offer readers the opportunity to make their own interpretations, to draw their own conclusions, and, as the Russian saying has it, to ‘smile and know better’. There follows some information about the ‘orthography’ of the inventories.

Of the punctuation almost none is relevant and much is meaningless. Hardly any of the diacritics of modern Polish are used, except that Ʌ is often (but not always) distinguishable from Ɉ. Ʌ and Ɇ are sometimes found in the earlier inventories, later much more frequently. The lack of diacritics makes it harder to hear Nevelers'
voices: did they pronounce [ź] as [z], for example, which would reveal a stronger regional influence, in turn implying less influence from Moscow and Warsaw? If there are few useful diacritics, many useless ones are found: aimless squiggles, dots and lines above, below and amid the text. These can be confusing, for example when a curlicue rather like a question mark, namely 〈?〉, is placed next to a word. Idiosyncrasies abound: an inventorist may write 〈a〉 and 〈z〉 identically, to give an extreme example.

In general, and this is a matter not without theoretical importance, the inspectors acted unwittingly as gatherers of complex and useful information about the linguistic state of the Newelszczyzna. Their very indifference to the population and its concerns meant that, for example, they noted without emendment, sometimes in the same street, cases of speakers who could pronounce [f] and speakers who could not. They noted Belorussian doubling of soft consonants in the context of original jeř' (Ilja (Ujas) noted as Illa), and nearby the lack of that doubling. It follows that on the streets of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Newel one could hear speech that was influenced by Russian and a much more local dialect (there are also examples of Polonized language, too).

Examples of such phenomena could be multiplied many times. The material has the advantages of field research, but also those of linguistic naivety: the inventorists had no idea of the significance of what they heard, but wrote it down as best they might. In order to use this material, one needs to remove the Polish earmuffs they wore; and to wonder also to what extent the inventorists’ Polish was perfect. That done, we can hope to distinguish individuals whose language was Polonized, Russianized, or localized.

Some justification must be offered here for the use of linguistic procedures in order to extract historical information. Let us imagine two happy archaeologists who have stumbled into a cave once occupied by early humans. One shines a lamp on the walls and roof and says ‘Look! Painted animals!’ The other kicks at the floor with a scuffed boot and says ‘Look! Worked flints and potsherds!’ Both discoveries are important; the two

21. The compilers occasionally refer to their work as rewizya, meaning ‘inspection’ or ‘auditing’, e.g. at 2613 (1629), p. 78.
22. Obviously enough, we cannot always be sure who supplied the information. Was the name Pilip offered by the man himself or by his servant? However, since the function of the inventories is primarily fiscal, the information must have come in the main from householders and landlords.
are seeking information from different sources. A linguist will wonder why historians
discard linguistic information that would cast new light on the point they are debating (for
example, by eschewing linguistic anomalies in texts). The historians may reply 'This is
the wood; it will give us the big picture.' The linguist says 'But these are the trees. They
too will tell us something.'

Our accounts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, then, are largely based
on the inventories, and those accounts are longer and more detailed than previous
chapters. Chapter Five deals with the seventeenth century from the Time of Troubles
until the strange affair of different styles in the two inventories of 1700. This century and
the previous one are characterized by frequent changes of power. Nevel' is like a child
within a skipping rope as it turns. Two great regional powers swing the rope of their
frontier over and over. Nevel' must jump to their rhythm, must try to avoid tripping, try
to stay upright.

It now becomes possible to form a clearer idea of life in Newel and its rural
surroundings. There is a long gap in the middle of the century (from 1636 to 1681), and
there other sources will be required; but the inventories enable us to recreate a living
picture of Newel life in the past. That is another prime aim of this thesis. That life is
often hard. We know from the inventories that there are stables in Newel; at times we
suspect that the Four Horsemen keep their dreadful steeds there at livery. Hunger,
edemic, fire and war can all be reconstructed for Newel in the seventeenth century. So
can spiritual life, work, and even relaxation with beer or something stronger. That
'something stronger' becomes very important in Newel life by the end of the century.

Our eighteenth century is short (1700-1772), but Chapter Six is our longest, for
the inventories now enable us to give a fuller account of life. We can say more about the
variety of occupations in Newel. Those occupations were practised by members of
extended families whom we can trace from the end of Commonwealth rule back into the
early seventeenth century. We can say something of the role of women in those families
and occupations. We can even say something of how one's given name affected one's
chances of prosperity, as long as we listen to what the inventories are telling us. To a
degree we can compare the town with the countryside. We can carry forward our tale of Newel spiritual life, mark the late advent and steady growth of a Jewish community in Newel, and specify how Jews, burghers and nobles cooperated in economic development.
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Too many hares are now running to count. Local historians should have the widest training possible: they need to be experts on everything. Nevel' requires the writer to understand the history of Finnic, Baltic and Slavic settlement in northeastern Europe, early legal systems, military history, Rus' (and the Rus'), Polock exceptionalism, trade, landholding, and taxation. One should be clear about the homioiusian controversy, the Kurbiskij correspondence, the Council of Trent, and the Catholic aspiration to retake Constantinople. Knowledge of apiculture, tar-making, and military architecture is also useful. Not for a moment can I claim deep knowledge of these fields.

Nor is there a shelf, not even half a shelf, of books with Nevel' in the title. The most important book devoted to the history of the town and the district is Nevel'skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja (for full reference see Abbreviations). This is invaluable in several ways. It provides extracts from a number of primary sources and information from old official documents, surveys, and the like. The notes to each section or set of extracts adumbrate other important themes in Nevel' history. There is a brief chronicle of the town’s and the district’s history where every line is like a signpost to a major aspect of history. Yet its aim is precisely to point the way for more detailed investigation. My thesis aims to go further along the path to a thoroughgoing history of Nevel' town and Nevel' district.

Much interesting material for Nevel' history can be found in the series Nevel'skij sbornik, 1 (1996) – 15 (2010), all ed. L.M. Maksimovskaja. This annual publication reproduces the papers delivered at the Bakhtin Readings in Nevel'. By far the greater part, however, concerns the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Wishing in some sense to
repay Nevelers for their many kindnesses to me since my first visit there in 2001, I chose to write about the period for which little historiographical material is available in Russia.

An attempt was made at a popular history of Nevel' in 1980.\(^{23}\) G.V. Petrov, not a Neveler, was commissioned to write a brief historical studies of Nevel' as a provincial town. Petrov had access to good primary sources (which, unfortunately, he does not cite) on the Revolution in Nevel' and other matters. There is a strong hagiographical tendency to his account of both the Revolution and the Great Patriotic War. He is weakest of all on the period when Nevel' belonged to Lithuania and the Commonwealth. At no point did I feel a need to cite G.V. Petrov.

Useful and relevant information on Nevel' can be found in secondary literature written by Belorussians (Belarusians), whether we go back to the days of Turčinovič in the nineteenth century,\(^{24}\) A.P. Grickevič in the Soviet era,\(^{25}\) or Andrēj Januškevič\(^{26}\) and Henadž Sahanovič\(^{27}\) in the post-Soviet period. For those who see Belorussia (Belarus') as an entity in itself, Nevel' is not a ball to be racketed to and fro between Muscovites and Lithuanians. Nevel' is the permanent, the political empires are the transient. It is true that, because of intra-Soviet boundary changes in 1924, Nevel' has long ceased to be officially a Belorussian town and is now Russian. This has led to amnesia ever since. Thus in Poland between the end of the Second World War and 1989, researchers tended to forget that Newel had ever been part of the Commonwealth.

There is an advantage, however, in the lack of Nevel' historiography. Franklin and Shepard note in the introduction to their *Emergence of Rus 750-1200*:\(^{28}\)

\(^{24}\) I.V. Turčinovič, *Obzorenije istorii Belorussi s drevnejših vremen*. Mi., 2006 (= idem, SPb., 1857). On citation in Chapter Four an account will be given of the dual pagination system in the modern edition, and of the discrepancies surviving into that edition in the numbering of footnotes.
\(^{25}\) A.P. Grickevič, *Častnovladel'českije goroda Belorussii*, Mi., 1975. Happily, Grickevič has continued to write in post-Soviet times, as Anatol' Hryckevič. His article ‘Maršinaľnyja territoryj Belarussij. Nevel' i Sebež a XVII-XVIII stv.’ *Spadźyna*, 1, 1995, is very interesting, although its utility is diminished by the fact that there is only one citation-reference in the second half of the article (compared with ten in the first).
\(^{27}\) I have consulted Henadž Sahanowicz, *Historia Bielorusi Od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku*, tr. Hubert Łaszkiewicz, Lublin, 2002 (original apparently *Narys historii Białorusi da konca XVIII st*).
In setting priorities we have been acutely aware of Ševčenko’s Law of the Dog and the Forest. A dog approaches a virgin forest, goes up to a tree, and does what dogs do against trees. The tree is chosen at random. It is neither more nor less significant than any other tree. Yet one may reasonably predict that future dogs approaching the same forest will focus their attention on the same tree. Such is often the case in scholarship: the scent of an argument on one issue draws scholars into more arguments on the same issue.

Now Nevel’ is just such a virgin forest, hardly entered even by Russian and Belorussian scholars. Once I had decided to hunt out primary sources, I found that copies of chronicles in the library were filthy with the dust of ages, whereas the secondary sources in the next bays were well-thumbed, dog-eared (those dogs again), and underlined ineptly throughout. Students, it appears, are joining in debates about rival interpretations of facts without visiting those facts for themselves.

‘Fact’ has been a problematic word since at least the time of E.H. Carr, and it would be foolish to pretend that anything done in the past is necessarily a historical fact. Once a fact is accepted as significant, that significance must be elucidated and evaluated. Nonetheless there is something to be said for introducing to scholarship the toponyms Dudki, Dudčino and Bykovo and interrogating this triangle, its sides six or eight kilometres long, for any possible historical meaning. This theme will be elaborated in Chapter One. I hope that there is at least a little freshness in the trees I have chosen to visit, as there is freshness in the surviving Nevel’ forests of mast-pine.

Russianists may have forgotten, but Swedes have not, that the winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature one year after Alexander Solzhenitsyn was the poet Harry Martinson. The historian of Nevel’ can find a great deal on which to reflect in Martinson’s Aniara, his cycle of poems reviewing ‘mankind in time and space’. The cycle concerns the Aniara,

an emigrant spaceship that goes off-course and carries thousands of emigrants into deep space. They have everything they need, but they know that they will die on this ship, and that they will be replaced by their children, and still the ship will not reach the constellation of the Lyre, towards which it is travelling at enormous, pointless speed. In the thirteenth poem, the ship’s Chief Astronomer gives a lecture on the depth of space. Among other things he says:

Now let me tell you what I’ve heard of glass
and then you’ll understand. In any glass
that stands untouched, unmoved for long enough,
a bubble in that glass will gradually
move with endless slowness on the way
towards another point within the glass
and after a millennium the bubble will
have made a journey there inside the glass.30

When one studies the history of Nevel’ one has the impression sometimes of endless activity, as ignorant armies clash, the town burns, new masters arrive, a siege ensues. The Jemenka then seems the river into which, says Heraclitus, we cannot step twice: today it is a Finnish river, tomorrow Balt, the next day East Slav, the day after Polish. And yet there is a Parmenidean stasis throughout the period for which we have detailed information from the inventories. Could we return through time to 1772, we would see a man driving his cart out into the suburbs of Nevel’ for haymaking. Could we return to the summer of 1619, three months after the Commonwealth of the Two Nations took over Newel, we would see a man – apparently the same man, driving the same little horse. Has our bubble moved so little in the glass?

30. Ibid., poem 13, p. 28, here given in the present author’s translation, as are all translations, unless otherwise specified. The original reads:
Jag skall berätta vad jag hört om glas
och så skall ni förstå. I varje glas
som står tillräckligt länge överört
forflyttas glasets blåsa efterhand
ändligt sakta mot en annan punkt
i glasets kropp och efter tusen år
här blåsan gjort enresa i sitt glas.
CHAPTER ONE: THE DISCOURSE OF LANDSCAPE

...Far off before him meadows and fields of gold stretched motley and flowery, and villages could be glimpsed; here and there herds grazed about the meadows...

A.S. Pushkin, \textit{Evgenij Onegin}, 2, I, 8-11.\textsuperscript{1}

---

\textsuperscript{1} Вдали

Пред ним пестрели и щели
Луга и нивы золотые,
Мелькали сёлы; здесь и там
Стада бродили по лугам...

Before humanity enters a particular geographic zone, points in it cannot usefully be called 'places'. When people enter an unfamiliar locality they begin to realize it in different ways, of which perhaps the most important is the giving of names to the landscape. New Adams, new Eves entering new Edens, they give names to the landscape as they find it and as they shape it. The set of toponyms in a given area is unique. Toponyms and their meanings are often noted by local historians, but most often this is done only in passing and for one or two places. Yet the sum of toponyms in an area form a text, and that text should be read systematically. This text can be read, and this reading will set us down amid a discourse. My contention is that Nevel' toponymy is a kind of discourse that speaks to the modern listener about the past. I propose to enter the human landscape of Nevel' in the first place by investigating its toponyms, since the earliest textual mention of Nevel' comes only in 1503. This first chapter will deal with the names of villages. These will be termed 'Village names'. The term will be abbreviated to VN (singular) and VNs (plural).

We proceed here as scholarship should, aware that words change their meanings, old meanings being forgotten: see, for example, the village name Kaverzy below. Again, the Russian word rogač acquired the meaning 'cuckold' only in modern times (see VN Rogačjovo, below). Some names will be very old (that of Nevel' itself, for example), while others are relatively new: see VN Karalinovka below. Our view of the historical landscape may be drastically foreshortened, and events of a millennium ago confounded with those of the eighteenth century. These are the problems that arise from any palimpsest. Our contention here is precisely that Nevel' toponymy is a kind of palimpsest.

These caveats entered, we move on to an examination of the toponyms of Nevel' district, concentrating mainly on the names of some three hundred and eighty-two populated

2. SIRIO, 35-1, 399.
3. These are the set of village names on a rare modern map of Nevel': Nevel'skij rajon Pskovskoj oblasti. ROSKARTOGRAFIJA, Novgorod, 2001, 2006. It was first issued to mark the eightieth anniversary of the Nevel' rajon's formation on 1 August 1927.
points. Most are very small. All will be referred to as ‘villages’. The use of this term should not be taken to imply the presence of a church at any stage in the past.

The village toponymy of Nevel’ reveal the colours of the land: white (VN Beloje), light blue (Goluby), dark blue (Siničino, referring to the bluetit, Parus caeruleus), blue-grey (Sivecevo), green (Zelen’ki; Zeljonyje Lugi) and reddish (Ryžesiden’je, Rudicy, Rudnja; here the reference is to iron ore deposits; the red ochre may also have been used as paint). Most widespread is black: Černecovo (a reference to monks Černecy); Černonosy, Černuxa, Černjai, Čjornyj Dvor and Čjornyje Stajki. Yet overall we see a kaleidoscope: Pestroki, cf. Russian pjostrij ‘multicoloured’). We should bear in mind two specialized meanings of the the word cjornyj: ‘taxable’ (opposite belyj ‘tax-exempt’; and (of wooden structures) ‘painted with tar’.

The relief of the landscape can also be read: Verxitno, Vysokoje, Vysockije, Gorki, Goruška, Goruški, Bugry, the anatomical-sounding Lobok, Gololoby, Lobacjovo, abrupt Krutelevo, the gap at Ščerbin (< ščerb ‘gap’). There are three villages called Rovnoje: much of our landscape is flat. It is stoney: VNs Kamenka, Dedov Kamen; and underpopulated – Pustki, Pustyńki (this latter may refer to a hermitage (Russian pustyn’; but the basic point stands). Yet discovery is always rediscovery: we see signs of earlier habitation in Pogrebišće ‘burial place’ and in two VNs Gorodišće ‘stockaded settlement’, as also in Starosel’je (‘Old Settlement’), Staroje (‘Old [Place]’, and Staryje Karavai (‘Old Karavai’ (on the meaning of karavaj see below)).

---

4. For the present chapter I analysed the names of two hundred and twenty-eight villages (about two-thirds of the total); for reasons of space a few have been deleted. A few more will be added in the next chapter.
5. All the village-names will be found in Appendix I.
6. One technical meaning of this word is ‘tax-exempt’. Land-holding arrangements are a major source of Nevel’ toponymy, as will be seen below.
7. The reference may be to the dove or wild rock-pigeon, whose blueish neck-feathers give the name for the colour in Russian. The details are complex and controversial; see ĖSRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, 432-433, s.vv. голубой, голубь. The Belorussian term for pigeon is holub, with the depalatalization of final soft labials typical of it and of Polish.
8. Lobok is a diminutive of lob ‘forehead’ and in place-names refers to the brow of a hill (compare many Welsh place-names in Bron- (soft mutation Fron-) or Tal-, both of which mean ‘forehead’ (Fromeysyllite, Talyllyn). The usual reference of lobok in everyday Russian is to the mens Veneris.
Toponymy speaks of the rocks and soil of Nevel'. We have mentioned VNIs referring to iron ore\(^9\). VN Glinčino (\(<\) glina ‘clay’) reminds us that clay is relatively scarce hereabouts, wooden vessels replacing earthenware. The soil is acidic: Kiseljovo, Kiseljovo, Kisloje. Pesok implies a permeable sandy soil, as do VNIs Suxanovka\(^{10}\) and Sušnjovo. ‘Wet’ place-names are commoner: Vodača, Studenec ‘well’, Zarcě ‘beyond the river’, Zaručevje ‘beyond the stream’, Luži ‘puddles’, Podlužje ‘by the puddles’, Jurovo, cf. juri ‘vodovorot, sil’noje tečenije’ (‘whirlpool, strong current’)\(^{11}\), Vologino ‘damp’ (from a colloquial East Slav version of the Church Slavonic vlaga ‘damp [noun]\(^{12}\)). There is land in the water: two VNIs Ostrov ‘island’. From the root max ‘moss, marsh’ come the VNIs Mošenino, Zamošča-Kanovskaja, Zamošča-Kubekaja, Zamošč ‘but’, VNI Lomy is a dialect word for a marsh found in Pskov and Tver’ oblast’s\(^{13}\). The VN Osivik comes from osov ‘piece of collapsed earth along a bank, pit, hillside, slope’\(^{14}\).

Despite poor soil, there is plentiful vegetation; bare ground is noteworthy (Gololoby, Golyni). Broad-leaved trees include oaks\(^{15}\) (Dubininio, Dubišče, Dubokraj\(^{16}\); birch (VN Berjozovo); the guelder rose, viburnum, or snowball tree (VN Kalinčino); and the dampleving willow (Ivevo), aspen (Osinovka) and alder (Ol’xovec). Lepešiša derives from the root of lepešnjak ‘low clump of willow or alder’\(^{17}\). However, needle-leaved woodland predominates: Borki, Borok, and two villages called Borouxa (Bopoyxa), all from bor ‘needle-leaf forest’. Firewood lies on the forest floor: VN Tatyrino is, I suggest, a variant of tatur ‘obrubok dereva’ (broken off piece of wood)\(^{18}\). Fallen timber bobs in the watercourses: Kokorevo, cf. kokóra, kókor ‘flood-borne tree with roots and branches’\(^{19}\).

---

9. Extraction of iron ore was conducted in Nevel at least as early as 1681. AR XXV 2615/1, of that year, p. 12, mentions an iron ore quarry as already long established.
10. This VN could also derive from the surname Suxanov.
11. See ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, IV, 531.
12. See ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, I, 340, s.v. vodoea.
13. ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, 515-516, s.v. lom.
14. Tolkový slovar\(^{1}\), comp. Vladimir Dahl, 2, column 1817, s.v. osivik.
15. The timber is highly prized. In early modern times Nevel was a centre of tanning; oak bark is used in the process (alder too is used). Xoroševič and Zimin notes (PB V, 64) that the oak was formerly one of the most widespread cultivated species of tree, specifically in the Vitebsk volost\(^{1}\). See also next note.
16. Dubokraj is at the extreme southeast of the modern Nevel’ district. The full meaning is probably ‘oaktree boundary’.
17. ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, 484, s.v. alepneivik.
18. ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, IV, 28, s.v. mamyj; Tolkový slovar\(^{1}\), comp. Vladimir Dahl, 4, column 731 s.v. Tamųlb. Vasmer notes that the word is used in the Arkhangel’sk dialect, whence its accentuation tátur (because of the Finnic substratum there).
One other plant specifically ‘mentioned’ in the ‘text’ of Nevel’ is *xmel* ‘hops’ (VN *Xmelinec*).

Local wildlife included fish: VN Karasi ‘carp’, VN Sominó from Russian *com* ‘sheatfish*20*, Wels catfish, *Silurus glanis*. Fish are preyed on by numerous beavers – there are two VNs Bobrovo. There are also two VNs Barsuki (‘badgers’). Volčj Gory (‘Wolf Hills’) brings the howl of wolves*21*; there are snakes at Zmeinó*22,23*. ‘Zajcevo’ refers to the hare, which, while a useful food source, is also (like the snake) a taboo animal*24*. Beetles are commemorated at two villages called Žukovo.

Birds include the dipper (Aljablevo, Russian *oljabka* (with Belorussian *akan'je*), *Cinclus cinclus* or its subspecies *Cinclus aquaticus* ‘idem’*26*. Kljastica represents the crossbill, *Loxia curvirostra*, again in a Belorussian form with *jakan'je* (replacement of unstressed *e* with *n* (*e* or *je* with *ja*), cf. Russian *kljost*, genitive *kleštá*). Other passerines are the thrush (VN Drozdovo), sparrow (Vorobjovo), bluetit (Siničino, with local confusion of *c* with *č* (cf. Russian *ciniča*))*27*) and siskin (*Čiževščina, cf. Russian *čiž* ‘idem’). Another taboo creature is the magpie: VNs Soročino, Soroki. Waders include the larger (VN Kuliči, cf. Russian *kulik*)*28*) and the smaller (VN Zuji, from *zu*)*29*.

---

20. The sheatfish or sheathfish is now apparently to be referred to as a Wels [sic] catfish (see: Peter S. Maitland, *Guide to Freshwater Fish of Britain and Europe*, L., Revised edition, 2000, 7 (on nomenclature), 11, 167. The creature is magnificently hideous but is prized for its flesh and roe. The largest apparently reach five metres (ibid., 167). A Nevel’ angler told me that specimens two metres long are not unusual.
21. There are still wolves in the Nevel’ area and they still represent a danger to sheep.
22. The accent of Sominó and Zmeinó show a pattern for naming villages after fauna. We can thus be sure that the reference is not to Old Russian *com* ‘the Soome’, modern Finnish *Suomi* (on the Finnic presence in Nevel’ see next chapter).
23. The name reflects the taboo: змей ‘the earthy one’ < земля ‘earth’. See *ESRJa*, comp. Max Vasmer, II, 100, s.v. змей.
24. There was earlier a village Lisice Jamy, ‘Fox Holes’; it is mentioned on p. 35 of AR XXV 2612.
25. *Akan'je* is the change whereby some or all unstressed *o* are pronounced as an *a*-like vowel. This change affects central and southern Russian dialects and all Belorussian. In Belorussian orthography, unstressed original *o* is re-spelled as *a*.
27. On the confusion of sibilants, its significance and diagnostic usefulness see below, discussion of *Krivicy* in the next chapter.
28. ‘Obščeje nazvanije golenostoj bolotnoj dići’ (‘a general name for long-legged palustrine game-birds, *Tolkovyj slovar*’, comp. Vladimir Dahl, 2, column 1737, s.v. *kulik*. We should mention the possibility that the reference is in fact to Russian paschal panettone, *kulić*.
29. ‘Obščeje nazvanije nebol'sik kulikov’ (‘a general name for the smaller waders’ (*Tolkovyj slovar*, comp. Vladimir Dahl, 2, column 554, s.v. *kulik*).
whooper swan, whose presence is marked at the village of Kolpino. The modern sense of the word *kolpik*, ‘spoonbill’, is an example of the reassignment of an old name in a new world (cf. the North American use of ‘robin’). Originally the word, related to Lithuanian *gulbis*, *gulbė*, referred to whooper swans (*cygnus cygnus*; winter visitors to the Nevel’ area). Game birds include woodcock, *Scolopax rusticola*, Russian *sluk*, (VN Sluki); and black game, *Tetrao tetrix*, Russian *teterev, tetjorka, teterja* (VN Tetyorkino, Teter’ki). This is a spectacular edible bird with an elaborate courtship ritual performed at a lek (Russian *tok*).

What we have seen so far of the Nevel’ area as depicted by its toponymy presents a picture of practicality (soil, trees for timber, fish, animals and birds for food) partly balanced by the aesthetic (colour-names, the snowball tree, birdsong, beaver for furs). Further elements remain to be added. The most important of these is the human. Many villages are named after human beings. Of such villages the overwhelming majority commemorate an individual, very few a group.

The loftiest person commemorated in a VN is the head of the Muscovite state: Carjovo. This name cannot antedate Ivan IV’s assumption of the title of tsar, in 1547. The earliest extant Newel archive mentions that one part of the Newel hinterland, *włośc* Mikolska, provided personal income for the tsar: ‘Włośc mikolska ktora była na cara’.

The VN commemorates the office rather than an individual.

Next we consider all the Nevel’ VNs deriving from Orthodox Christian names.

---

32. In English the species is called collectively *black grouse* or *black game*: the male is a *blackcock* (written as one word) and the female a *grey-hen* (hyphenated). See OED, s.vv. (the phrases are treated as words and have separate entries).
33. 2612, 41.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VILLAGE NAME</th>
<th>PERSONAL NAME</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antipenki</td>
<td>Antip</td>
<td>From diminutive Antipenko of Belorussian-Ukrainian type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artjomovo</td>
<td>Artjom</td>
<td>Two villages of this name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avdejkovo</td>
<td>Avdej</td>
<td>From diminutive Avdejk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogdanovo</td>
<td>Bogdan</td>
<td>From diminutive Borisko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borisovo</td>
<td>Boris</td>
<td>From diminutive Bor'ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bor'kovo</td>
<td>Boris</td>
<td>From diminutive Demško</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed'kovo</td>
<td>Faino</td>
<td>From diminutive Fed'ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenevo</td>
<td>Fina</td>
<td>From a diminutive Fenja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipecevo</td>
<td>Filip</td>
<td>Apparently from a diminutive &quot;Filipec&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frolovo</td>
<td>Frol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraximovo</td>
<td>Geraxim</td>
<td>From diminutive Griška</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grīškovo</td>
<td>Grīgoriy</td>
<td>From diminutive Il'jenka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il'jenki</td>
<td>Il'ja</td>
<td>From diminutive Isaak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isakovo</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>The unusual accent (contrast with Ivánovo-Voznensk and many other place-names) shows Polish influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanovo</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Apparently from a diminutive Ivanec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivancevo</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanašovskoje</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Shows Russian epenthetic /l/) (lx' ), cf. Ivlevo above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivancevo</td>
<td>Jakov</td>
<td>From Greek εὐφημεῖν ('euphēmein) with Russian prefixation of /j/- . Note location-suffix -ščina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubeckoejo</td>
<td>Jefim</td>
<td>As above with formant -ixa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefimov-ščina</td>
<td>Jemeljan</td>
<td>From Latin Āemiliānus with Russian iotization of /#e/- , and with a diminutive suffix /ko/.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemeljan-</td>
<td>Jemeljan</td>
<td>Diminutive of Jermolaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemel'ja-</td>
<td>Jemeljan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemel'ja-</td>
<td>Jemeljan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemel'ja-</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>From a diminutive Leonec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonovo</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leoncevo</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makary</td>
<td>Makar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. A superscript asterisk before a form indicates a reconstruction.  
35. Because stress in Polish is almost always on the penult.  
36. This does not derive from the rare common noun jermak 'handquerns', which is of Çagataj (Old Literary Uighur) origin and a wildly improbable etymology for a Nevel' toponym. See ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, 25, s.v. crmáx.
### TABLE 1.3: NEVEL' TOPOYMS FROM ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN NAMES (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VILLAGE NAME</th>
<th>PERSONAL NAME</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar'jino</td>
<td>Mar'ja</td>
<td>Colloquial Russian version of name (<em>Mar'ja</em>, cf. learned form <em>Mar'ja</em>). Village possibly named after a church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikonixa</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>With feminine suffix -ixa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikonovo</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>Evidently from a diminutive <em>Pavljučko</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavljučki</td>
<td>Pavel</td>
<td>Derives from version with oblique-case stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrovo</td>
<td>Pjotr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savino</td>
<td>Sava</td>
<td>From a diminutive Stepan'ko (Russian usually hardens ň in such positions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semjonovo</td>
<td>Semjon</td>
<td>From Latin <em>Iustinus</em> with Russian loss of initial /j-/ (perhaps a Swedish substratum feature(^{37})). From a diminutive form, possibly <em>Vasiljok</em> (<em>Baculěk</em>); as a common noun this means 'cornflower', <em>Centaurea cyanus</em>, and the village could be named after the flower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepan'kovo</td>
<td>Stepan</td>
<td>As previous item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ustinovo</td>
<td>Ustin</td>
<td>From diminutive <em>Vas'ka</em> (<em>Baciska</em>); this is also a nickname for goats(^{38}), which were once commonly kept or hunted in Nevel' district and are the source of many village-names – see below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasil'kovo</td>
<td>Vasilij</td>
<td>Apparently from a diminutive <em>Vlas&quot;k&quot; &gt; Vlasok</em>, genitive Vlaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaskovo</td>
<td>Vasilij</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{37}\) Compare Swedish ung with English young.

\(^{38}\) See *Tolkovyj slovar*, comp. Vladimir Dahl, 1, column 410, *s.v. bacilěk*.
This table, consisting of more than forty toponyms deriving from Orthodox given names, is highly significant.

We begin our analysis of this table with a word about the sex of the persons after whom villages are named. Only two are unequivocally female, viz. Fenevo and Mar'ino. The former can only have been named after an individual; it is a diminutive. Had it been named after a saint, the full form would have been used. The case of Mar'ino is less sure. The Nevel' records do not show any church of that name, although there were churches dedicated to the Virgin, e.g. there was a Church of the Annunciation in seventeenth-century Nevel' town. But whether we believe that one or that two of the hundreds of Nevel' villages were named after individual Orthodox women, it's a pretty poor tally. In a word, the discourse of Nevel' toponymy is almost relentlessly male. It may seem hardly worth noting this extreme bias towards men as name-givers for villages; but I believe that the point is worth making precisely because by the late seventeenth century we will find records of individual women land-holders, and by the end of our period women will be playing a demonstrably important role in Nevel' business dynasties.39

An important point about the table is that it contains none of those names, such as Volodimer" or M'sislav", that speak of a pre-Christian East Slav past. Still less do we find names from the previous generation, such as Igor' (from Ingvarr) or Oleg (from Helgi): names of undoubtedly Scandinavian origin, recalling not so much the advent of the Varangians as their assumption of state power in the East Slav lands. It follows that these names were given by a community that was already Christian, as part of a pioneering expansion into the landscape; contrast the much older name of Nevel' itself, certainly a throwback to pre-Christian times, as we shall see hereafter.

It will be seen that a large proportion of these names derive from diminutives. In mediæval Rus' applicants for a grant of land generally used a disparaging diminutive as a

39. A few more women are commemorated in VNs; they will be noted ad locum.
ritual act of self-abasement. Some of these VNs may represent a permanent record of such transactions. It is, however, possible that they show a healthy disrespect for the village headman.

Thus our table makes it clear that Nevel' villages dates predominantly from an era when the populace had been converted to Orthodox Christianity, a fact confirmed by the VN Popki 'little Orthodox priests', as also by Spas-Balazdyn', where the first element is 'saviour' (the second corrupted from borozda 'furrow'), Cerkovisče 'large village with an [Orthodox] church', and Černecovo from černec 'member of the [Orthodox] "black clergy", monk', Ponomarjovo from ponomar 'sexton', Popadi'no from popadja 'priest's wife'.

Apart from these Orthodox names, there is a pair of VNs deriving from Catholic given names. Karlovo is probably named after the last Radziwiłł owner of the lordship of Nevel'. Similarly, Karalinovka is surely named after Ludowika Karolina Radziwiłłowna, Margravine of Brandenburg (if you are a margravine, you can have a village named after you). The spelling shows Belorussian akan'je.

We should add that there is only one name deriving unequivocally from a surname, namely Korsakovo, from Korsak and variants. As early as 1475 the Korsak family is associated with Jazno, at the far western edge of modern Nevel' district. In 1507 we find one Iwan Michalowicz Korsak confirmed as the holder of land at Newel, Siebież and Siahiki (although he was probably unable to take advantage of the fact; see Chapter 4). It is worth recalling that the first wojewoda of Polock was a Korsak (Vasilij Dmitrijevič).

40. Petitioners' names often appear hypocoristically in Muscovite and Old Belorussian documents. See Fjodor Uspenskij, 'Zametki o bytovani očesćv v domongol'skoj i moskovskoj Rusi' in Speculum Slavie Orientalis: Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages, ed. Vyacheslav V. Ivanov and Julia Verkholantsev. M., 2005 [hereafter Speculum Slavie Orientalis, ed. Ivanov and Verkholantsev], 214, where we read: 'K XV v. gipokorističeskije formy ličnyx imjon v dokumentax i celom rjade pis'mennyx istočnikov, a sudja po vsomu, i v ofisač'nom bytu, priobretajut očitotlivyj etiketnyj karakter; oni prizvany podčerknut' zavisimyj social'nyj status imenujemogo lica' ('By the XVth century hypocoristic forms of personal names in documents and in a whole series of written sources, and, judging by all appearances, in official usage also, acquire the clear character of a matter of etiquette; they are meant to emphasize the dependent social status of the person named').

41. The Nevel' inventory of 1684 (AR XXV 2615/2) was compiled for her (see p. 1 of that document).

42. PG, II, No. 156, 49-50.

43. See Krzysztof Pietkiewicz, Wielkie księstwo litewskie pod rządami Aleksandra Jagiellończyka, Poznań, 1995, 140, and footnote 156, which refers us to KWML (the Warsaw copy of the Lithuanian Metrica), Book 194, 318-321 and gives the date as 22 VIII 1507.

44. See: PG, V, 25.
Beyond these two groups of toponyms based on Christian names there is a further

group based on sobriquets. In early modern times sobriquets were an important source of

surnames; at the same time they show us the casual humour of the community that gradually

named these Nevel' villages. VN Akulino, if not from the female name Akulina, derives

from akula, okula, ‘one who eats excessively at another’s expense’45; Babinskije, from baba,

so that we have here another village probably named after a woman, albeit disparagingly;

Borodino ‘beardy’, to which or to whom we may add Usovo ‘whiskers’; Ušakovo ‘[big]

ears’; Xvatynja ‘Grabber’; Krivonosovo ‘Crooked nose’; Laskotuxino from laskotuxa

‘tickler’, cf. dialect verb laskotat', loskotat' ‘to tickle’; Rogačovo from rogač ‘the horned

one’. Dahl notes the meanings ‘strong or stubborn person’ and adds that the meaning

cuckold’ was new in his time (1801-1872).

These toponyms too bring us the authentic voice of old Nevel', as if Xor' and Kalinyč

had had a phonograph. The voices we hear belong to people who find physical oddities

amusing, whether they be matters of election, like the size of a chap’s beard, or of chance,

like a crooked nose. There is a very strong social prejudice against greed: we dislike

overeaters, grabbers, bullies and the like. We find some amusement in a man who tickles

people, most probably women.

These villages, then, perpetuate the names of individuals or the nicknames of

individuals or groups of villagers. There are a few more Nevel' place-names that invoke

larger groups; these will be examined in due course. For the moment let us note this strong

tendency to value the individual.

The local word for a village was apparently selo, found in the VNs Sel'cy ‘Little

Villages’, Starosel'je ‘Old Settlement’ and Velikoje Selo ‘Great Village’. Houses and

villages often burned down, as is to be expected in a wooden built environment – VN

Pogoreloje.

45. This is Dahl’s definition of this word as used in the dialects of Pskov and Tver' (Nevel’ has been in both

gubernii in its time, and at the time of writing is in Pskovskaja oblast’); see Tolkovyi slovar’, comp. Vladimir

Dahl, 2, column 1731, s.v. okyza. The aken'je spelling is appropriate enough in what was after all Belorussia

until 1924, but in any case the etymology may indeed be from akula ‘shark’; see ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II,

131, s.v. okýza.
How did early Nevelers provide for themselves? They were dependent on arable agriculture and animal husbandry, as most Europeans were from the establishment of settled life until the industrial revolution. They certainly hunted as well, whence VN's deriving from names of edible birds and animals. The evidence includes the following VN's:

**Arable farming:** Rytovka from *ryť* ‘to dig’; Paxlovo from *paxar* ‘to plough’; Niv’je from *niva* ‘crop-field’; Mjakinčino from *mjakina* ‘chaff’; Avinišče from *ovin* ‘drying-store for grain’ (note *akan’je*). A secondary meaning of this word is ‘stack of rye consisting of 300 sheaves’ and rye was probably the main grain crop. Turnips are grown: Repišče from *repa* ‘turnip’ with the suffix -*išče*, which is often accretive (hence ‘large turnip-producing village’). Lastly, Punišče derives from *punja* ‘shed, etc.’. Dahl gives also the meaning of a wickerwork bower ‘where people put all sorts of things [gde skladavajut vsjačinu] and where the master sleeps in summer’. It is possible that the three VN’s Bojkovo, Bojok and Bojovo belong here. They may refer to threshing: *bojok* (boých), or in Pskov dialect *bojkó*, is the swipple or swingle of a flail, as opposed to its thole.

**Animal husbandry:**

1) **General:** Čjornyje staji ‘black byres’; two VN’s Stajki and Stajkino; ponds are noted at Prud, Prudiny and Prudok.

2) **Sheep and goats:** Bol’šoje Ovčino and Maloje Ovčino from *ovčina* ‘cured sheepskin’; Jaroški from *jarka* ‘ewe that has not yet lambed’; two VN’s Kozlovo and Kozly, both from *kozjl* ‘goat’. VN Kozyrevo has, I suggest, the same reference, *pace ESRJa*, comp. Max Vasmer, s.v. қоырыма; the modern sense ‘a trump at cards’ derives from the assertiveness

---

46. If we ignore the context, we may assign this VN rather to a homophonous root *pax* ‘blow, puff’. In its context, however, agriculture seems appropriate.
47. These had a stave; see epigraph to Chapter Six.
48. See: *ESRJa*, comp. Max Vasmer, III, 113-114, s.v. овин (the reference to rye is on 113).
49. *Tolkovyj slovar*, comp. Vladimir Dahl, 3, column 1412. The custom of having a summer kitchen in an outhouse and a summer sleeping place is widespread in North Eurasia.
51. This also means ‘spring crop’. The reference is broadly agricultural.
of the billy goat; Jazno from jazno ‘goatskin’ 53. Likewise Kožemjačkino refers to the older word for a tanner, koženjaka. It derives from koža ‘hide, skin, leather’ and mjit’ ‘to press’. Koža itself originally meant ‘goat’s [skin]’, i.e. kožja [skura].

3) Cattle and horses: Bykovo from byk ‘bull’ 54; Korovčino from korova ‘cow’; Telešovo and Telicy, both from ’telé’ ‘calf’. Molokojedovo means ‘Milk-eater’. Both Dudki and Dudčino come from duda ‘cow-whistle’. Six kilometres to the west of Dudki and eight to the southwest of Dudčino we find Bykovo, so that the association between the whistles and cattle-herding is certain. Asnica is a Belorussianized spelling 56, from osten, genitive ostna (the r here silent) ‘cattle-goad’. The name argues that oxen were used for ploughing and the like. Konnovvo from kon ‘horse’ shows that horses were also kept. In winter the livestock needed forage: VN Senjutino from seno ‘hay’. Dogs were kept: Sukino, from suka ‘bitch’.

4) Fowl: Gusevo from gus’ ‘goose’ (not necessarily domesticated). Similarly with duck: Seleznojovo from selezen’ ‘drake’. There is no trace of chickens; yet in the seventeenth century the Nevel’ area produced many thousands of eggs annually.

Toponymy tells us also of handicrafts and other economic activity: VNs Kaverzy ‘osiers’, cf. modern Russian kaferznyj vopros ‘tricky [i.e. intricated] question’; Pletni ‘osiers’ (cf. modern Russian spletni [= s + pletni] ‘gossip’ [i.e. ‘things woven together’]; Košeljovo from koš ‘basket’, an older meaning preserved in Polish; cf. modern Russian košeljok ‘purse’. Lutno derives from ‘linden bast’, modern Russian lut; Belorussian lut ‘young linden tree, the bark from it’ 57.

53. ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, IV, 550, s.v. jeζno.
54. The word may also be used to refer to the potency of a bridegroom. Similarly the village of Karavai (with akan’je) refers to the fecundity of the bride. The connection with korova becomes clear if we repel the placename as Korovai. A korovai is a pie served on the eve of a wedding. The custom is very old, for the word is also found in the same senses in South Slav languages. See ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, M., 1986, 332. Prince Vasilij III and his bride en seconde noce Jelena Glinskaia were offered korovai at their wedding; each pie was carried by four servitors. See Razrjadnaja kniga 1475-1605. Volume I, Part II. Comp. N.G. Savič, ed. V.I. Buganov. M., 1977, p. 195. Jelena and her son, born 25 August 1530, will return to our story hereafter (cf. R.G. Skrymnikov, Carstvo terrora. SPb., 1992, 81).
55. Common Slavonic. The modern Russian is teženok, with a second diminutive suffix added (-"k", giving -ot after the falls of the jers).
56. A sign that the meaning has been forgotten.
57. ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, Moscow, 1986, 536, s.v. lút.
VNs Kovalixa and Kovaljovo derive from koval ‘farrier, smith’, who makes axes (VN Topory), each with a haft (Obuxovo from obux ‘haft’), and scythes (Kosilovo, probably also Koscy and Kos’kovo, all ultimately from kosa ‘scythe’). Iron ore is exploited (Rudicy, Rudnja, Železnica). Pitch and tar are made: VNs Djogtevo (from djogot’ ‘tar’) and two VNs Smol’niki from smola ‘pitch’.

There are signs in plenty that Nevel’ life could be distinguished without great difficulty from a bed of roses. Some examples are: Lixolet’je ‘bad year’, Xoljavino from xaljava ‘slovenly person, lazybones’ (some local problems were made locally). If hard times came knocking at the door, Nevelers did what poor people still do: put up with it (VN Terpilovo from terpet’ ‘to bear, suffer, put up with’). We hear also war music: Kazakovo; Puškarjovo from puškar’ ‘cannoneer’; Strelecovo from strelec, the term for a Muscovite infantryman.

We may now sum up what we have discovered so far. The first thing that forces itself upon our attention is the degree to which the map of Nevel’s populated centres is transparently Slav in vocabulary. While not wishing to belittle the skill and labour entailed in analysing Nevel’ toponyms, I must point out that this is a rather typical colonized landscape; few VNs are really hard to understand. Nearly all are of East Slav origin. Some show Belorussian features, such as akan’je or jakan’je. Others reveal specifically Russian characteristics, such as the hypercorrect Xoljavino. A few placenames show some Polish feature – Ivanóvo (where Polish accentuation overlays a name that is both Orthodox and East Slav), Dominikóvo, Karalinovka. There is no trace of the Radziwiłł family’s sometime commitment to Calvinist Protestantism.

---

58. A definition of the difference between these two products may be in order. ‘Pitch is tar inspissated’ (Bishop Berkeley) *(OED s.v. inspissate).*

59. The importance of pitch is confirmed by the microtoponymy and by early surnames. In the 1619 inventory (AR XXV 2612) we find (p. 17) a pustosz called Smolnikowo and another called Smoleniowo (p. 34); in AR XXV 2615/1 (1681) we find on p. 54 [misnumbered ‘30’] a village called Smolino, probably the modern village Smolniki A, 2615/2 (1684) tells us that in the village of Smolnikowo there were three taxable landholders: Jwan Smolnik, Fiedzko Smolnik, and Onufrey Smolnik with his son Oisp.

60. The first o is hypercorrect: the correct first <a> in xaljava has been mistaken for a Belorussianism and wrongly ‘corrected’ to <o>.

61. Indeed my best efforts have found no trace at all of Protestantism in pre-partition Nevel’.
The significant number of VNs deriving from the names of individuals of Orthodox Christian culture – some forty VNs, or more than ten per cent of the total – argues that landholding arrangements were of crucial importance in the naming of the landscape. This is confirmed by the fact that many of the given names in question are diminutives, because the landholders were petitioners for royal favour. Moreover those names do not speak of the earliest period of Rus' Christianity, when we find names of Scandinavian or of pagan East Slav origin. The VN Carjovo and the prevalence of the colour black in VNs (perhaps with the sense ‘taxable’) provide further evidence of what we might call the cadastral origin of much Nevel' toponymy. Although some VNs in the Nevel' area are attested before the name of Nevel' itself (for example Jazno⁶²), yet where there is evidence for dating, it often speaks of the sixteenth century. Strel'covo, for example, cannot bear a name older than the foundation of the corps of strel'cy from 1550.⁶³

However, this relatively simple model of Nevel' and its hinterland will change when we attempt to answer the question: does toponymy speak to us of any larger groups to which Nevelers may have belonged? We shall deal with that question in the next chapter.

Meanwhile we may summarize the implications of what has been said so far. Confronted with a town whose documented history goes back only as far as 1503, one would like to find a much older document to illuminate the dark years before that date. The village names of Nevel' district have indeed proved to be such a document, and from it we have been able to learn significant facts about how life was lived in old Nevel'. We have also been able to date the naming of Nevel' villages to some small extent: most of them have been named later than the full establishment of Orthodox Christianity in the East Slav lands. Many of the same villages appear in the Polish-language records from 1619 onwards. A few older names will be examined in the next chapter.

⁶² PG, II, No. 156, 49-50.
There are more than 400 villages in Nevel district. A straight line drawn from Lake Jamno to the River Jemenka passes through none. The distance is 34 kilometres approx.
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CHAPTER TWO: A WAY THROUGH THE WOODS

Priests from Paaritsa were brought here:
and they christened all our woodlands,
they were christened, they were sprinkled,
Thence the backwoods grew the sleeker
and our woodlands started putting
leaves on treetops and grass groundward...

*Old Finnish song*¹

---

1. Tuotiin papit Paaritsalta:
   ristittihin miään metsät[.]
   ristittihin, kastettiin,
   Siit alkoi salo siletä
   metsät meidän kasvaella
   lehet puuhun, ruoho maahan...

Song performed by an unknown singer at Sakkola in the Karelian Isthmus in 1854 and collected by K. Slöör (1833-1905). Slöör was inspector of the Finnish-language schools in St Petersburg. See: M. Branch, M. Kuusi, K. Bosley, *Finnish Folk Poetry - Epic*, H., 1977, 326, 556, 601 (I have used my own translation). Michael Branch notes (556) that the poem was widespread in Estonia, and represents the advent of Christianity to the Baltic-Finnic world.
On the basis of toponymy, can we say anything about larger groups to which Nevelers may have belonged?

There are indeed some signs of the presence of different ethnic groups to be found in Nevel’ toponymy. One such ethnic toponym is Litvinovo, near which we also find Vil’no. The latter can scarcely be older than the foundation of the Lithuanian capital. Litvinovo is certainly an exonym, that is, a name given by outsiders, since it contains a Slav singulative suffix to individuate the Old Russian mass-noun *litva* ‘the Lithuanians’. This surely indicates that Litvinovo was named after an individual of Lithuanian origin. Most probably this is a late name given to a ‘Lithuanian’ incomer. We know that East Slavs of Lithuanian geographic origin did come to live in the Nevel’ area.

There are important historical implications in the name of the village of Krivicy, about forty kilometres to the west of Nevel’. Here we have the name of a Slavonic tribe, the Kriviči. The name of an ethnos occurs as a toponym only at the margins of its territory, because the name is given by outsiders. Later the inhabitants may take the name to themselves and affirm it as a badge of identity; or they may retain their own name for the place. In the case of the village of Krivicy, the origin of the name has been forgotten; it is here offered to scholarship, as far as I know, for the first time.

This oblivion forestalled the usual modern Russian administrative process of ‘correcting’ dialect forms to standard Russian versions, and the ethnonym is preserved in the toponym, as in Baltic amber. The forgetfulness is explained by two facts. Firstly, the

---

2. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries individual Nevelers originating from remote communities were given their nationality as an official surname, e.g. in 1636 we are told of ‘Jan Szwab’ (‘John the German’ (for at the time Swabian was used by synecdoche as a term for any German)) (AR XXV 2614, p. 4), and in 1694 of Fiedor Szwed (‘Theodor the Swede’) (AR XXV 2617, p. 80).
3. See, for example, the story of one Ivaško Ivanov, who spent about two years in Nevel’, until the summer of 1631 (see: R-B, No. 85, p. 108). He came from Nieswiż and was termed ‘Lithuanian’, but was clearly an East Slav. He then crossed the border to Velikije Luki and was interrogated about his knowledge of Lithuania. More on Nevel’ as a centre for intelligence hereafter.
4. Krivicy is a much older name than Litvinovo, given before the identity of separate Slav tribes was subsumed into larger political groupings.
accentuation of the toponym is Krívicy, whereas the tribal name is oxytone kriviči. An explanation will be proposed hereafter. Secondly, the VN Krívicy exhibits a feature termed cokan'je. This is the replacement of historic č (Cyrillic ч) with c (Cyrillic ç). This feature is specifically associated with the Kriviči. The two features, taken together, made the place-name unrecognizable to Russian administrators after 1773.

This phenomenon can be shown to have existed in the Nevel' area from early in our documented knowledge of it. In the Nevel' inventory of 1684, we find the name of the village known nowadays as Čuprovo, according to Russian norms; but here it stands as Cuprowo.

We noted above that the VN is accented Krívicy. We also saw that the ‘correct’, or at least the modern, accentuation of the ethnonym is oxytone, i.e. the accent is on the last syllable: Kriviči. If that version is the ancient usage, then the ‘error’ makes it clear that the village’s name was given by a community that altered the accent because their own language demanded initial stress – accent always on the first syllable. It was therefore not given by Lithuanian-speakers, for they would have been indifferent to the position of the accent and would have accepted the oxytone without thinking. Nor does it conform with Polish usage: that would demand penultimate stress.

There are in the Baltic hinterland two possible sources for the stress-shift in the place-name Krívicy. One of these is the Indo-European Baltic language Latvian, where all words have initial accent: Latvian has been drastically affected by a Finnic substratum, i.e.

5. This accentuation, although given in dictionaries, is not completely uncontroversial. Some Russians do pronounce kriviči, and Vasmer offers that version (ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, II, s.v. kriviči [sic]). If the ethnonym derives from kriví, one might expect an oxytone derivative. On the other hand kriviči may be a false analogy based on such forms as moskiči. More on this will be found below.

6. The confusion is very old: see A.P. Vlasto, Linguistic History, 306, §10 3 ('покане is found in the earliest Novgorod documents'). On 333, in §62, he gives examples from those documents. This implies that the phenomenon affected also the dialect of the Slovène. Cokan'je is a substratum feature reflecting the fact that the Baltic-Finnic languages have few sibilants.


8. For example, the name is found in that form in records of the year 1878; see G.V. Petrov, Nevel', L., 1980, 38. We find the name in the same form in the Nevel' Bolshevik newspaper Molot, edition number 9 (191) of 21.1.1920, p. 2, «Gorodskaja xronika» ('Town Chronicle').
the ancestors of modern Latvians spoke a Baltic-Finnic\textsuperscript{9} language.\textsuperscript{10} They imposed the Finnic stress pattern on their adopted Indo-European Baltic language. However, there is no VN of Latvian origin in the modern array of Nevel' district toponymy.\textsuperscript{11}

It will be clear from what has been said about speakers of Latvian that the other linguistic community that could have named the village is the Baltic-Finnic, for their speech would also have had initial stress.

The Baltic-Finnic languages form part of the Uralic language group, which is unrelated to Europe’s largest language group, the Indo-European (in particular they are unrelated to the Indo-European Baltic languages Lithuanian, Latvian, Old Prussian, etc.). The modern Baltic-Finnic languages derive from an extinct language conventionally called Common Baltic-Finnic (hereafter CBF).\textsuperscript{12} Its surviving members are Liiv or Liv (alas, almost extinct), Estonian, Vatja (R. vodskij. Old Russian vod'; probably now extinct), Ingrian (Inkeri, R. ižorskij), Vepsä\textsuperscript{13} (R. vepsskij, Old Russian v's' and variants), Karelian (karjala, karel'skij) (if this is not a dialect of Finnish) and Finnish (suomi, finskij). None of the modern languages is spoken as far south as Nevel'. To the north and west of these languages we find the Saame or Sami languages, R. saamskije jazyki (once called ‘Lappish’), which are more distantly related to Baltic-Finnic.

\textsuperscript{9} The adjective has been hyphenated throughout, to emphasize the fact that these languages are and were members of the Finno-Ugrian language family and that their proximity to the Indo-European Baltic languages is only geographic.
\textsuperscript{10} See Bernard Comrie, *The Languages of the Soviet Union*, C., 1981, 100, paragraph 3, and 147, paragraph 2 (‘present-day Latvians can be viewed as linguistically assimilated Baltic-Finnic speakers’). On the fixing of the accent see 149.
\textsuperscript{11} In two Polish-language documents dating from the year 1754, AR XXV 2623/1 (p. 68) and AR XXV 2623/2 (also p. 68), we find a pustom called simply Łotysze ‘Latvians’. It is in the far north-east of the Nevel district, i.e. at the other extreme from Krivicy and Litvinovo.
\textsuperscript{12} The perspective here implied is that of the ‘tree diagram’ of the type that would show, for example, Portuguese, Italian and Romanian as branches stemming from the ‘trunk’ of Latin. Individual Baltic-Finnic speech communities have interacted with one another and with other speech communities for several millennia, so that the tree-and-branches picture is in part deceptive, but it is retained here pragmatically.
\textsuperscript{13} There is no consensus among scholars as to the correct form of the ethnonym. Comrie uses Veps, based on Russian (see Bernard Comrie, *The Languages of the Soviet Union*, C., 1981, 94 et passim), Hajdu’s translator Vepsian (see Peter Hajdu [Hajdú Péter], *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*, translated and adapted by G. F. Cushing, London, 1975 (hereafter Hajdu, *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*, 15 et passim). Even among Finns we find both Vepsa and Vepsä (see references in the bibliography to the chapter by M.M. Xijmaaljainen [M.M. Hämäläinen] in *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, III, ed. V.I. Lytkin et al., M. 1966, 101. Hämäläinen states that vowel harmony ‘obychno ne rasprostranjaetsja dal'she vorogo ili tret'ego sloga’ (ibid., 84, point 8), which implies that we should expect Vepsä. This form is used also by Jalo Kalina in his Tšmerensoomaalaisten kiellen balttilaiset lainasant, H., 1936, to which much reference will be made below (see p. IX, abbreviations (s.v. veps); so that is the form we shall adopt.)
Has any Finnic population left traces in Nevel' toponymy?¹⁴

We may attempt an answer to that question by seeking a Finnic ethno-toponym, for where we find one ethnic toponym, such as Krivicy, we should look nearby for another, reflecting the presence of a different ethnic group: the sense of such toponyms is always distinctive. Hitherto this matter has not been raised in connection with Nevel'.

In this context we must now consider the VN Jemenec, which is also the name of the lake on which that village stands, and four more hydronyms, viz. the rivers Jemenka and Jamenka and Lakes Jamenec and Jamno. Let us first give some notion of their relative positions. A schematic map is provided at the beginning of this chapter.

In the far south of the modern Nevel' district there is a small lake called Jamenec. From this debouches a river, the Jamenka, which flows in a half-circle to the northwest, north and northeast, until it enters Lake Jemenec. On the opposite shore stands a village of the same name. From the north shore of Lake Jemenec another river, the Jemenka, crosses a narrow isthmus to Lake Nevel', which it enters at the southern end. The town of Nevel' stands at the northern end of the lake, at the point where yet 'another' river, also called Jemenka, leaves on its way to the complex of lakes called Bol'soj Ivan and Malyj Ivan in the northeast of Nevel' district.¹⁵

Thus these waters and the village situated on one of them span almost the whole of Nevel' district from the northeast to the south. I suggest that the initial element Jemen-, Jamen- or Jamn- has the same meaning in all five items, and that it is indeed an ethnonym, marking this part of the Nevel' district out from the area first occupied by the Kriviči, at the extreme west of the Nevel' hinterland.

Old Russian sources, including the Povest' vremennyx" lèt" (hereafter PVL)¹⁶, mention a Finnic tribe named ṣAMB (Jam'). The name occurs in the list of the communities

¹⁴. We repeat that the accentuation kriviči is not absolutely certain. However, the cokan'je seen in VN Krivicy also argues Finnic origin, inasmuch as all the Baltic-Finnic languages are poor in sibilants, with the partial exception of Karelian, where Russian influence is the explanation.
¹⁵. We shall return to Lake Jamno below.
¹⁶. Ostrowski et al., PVL, X I 11,11, p. 21-34. Of five early mss. four have the reference to ṣAMB (Jam').
that paid tribute to Rus' and stands between a large group of Finnic ethnoses (Baltic-Finnic, Volgaic and Permian) and a list of Balts: 'čjud', merę [sic], ves', muroma. čeremis', mor"dva. perm'. pečera. l jam'. litva. zimigola. kors'. norova. lib'. This list divides after pečera (a Finnic people living on the River Pechora). Before that point we are moving ever farther eastwards and northwards from Lake Ladoga, the early bridgehead of Rus' power. Then comes the mention of Jam', after which we are on or near the Baltic littoral: Lithuanians, Semigalians, Curonians, Narva, Liiv. Again, there is a northward direction to the catalogue, since the Livonians lived in what is now Latvia.

This arrangement is not the whimsical fancy of an unsophisticated mediaeval geographer. The chronicler’s (or chroniclers’) approach was consistent, careful, and fiscal: he or they listed first the tribes living north and east of Ladoga, then those to the south and west. So where were the jam'? I suggest that they were close to the Lithuanians, and more precisely that they lived in (among other places) Nevel'.

Moreover, if we believe that the division in the list comes after the ethonym jam', we arrive at one of two problematic positions. Either their position in the list is irrational and without significance, while the other peoples are listed in a sensible order; or we think that this ethnos lived farther north and/or farther east than the Permians and the Pečera.

Jam' is one of the Slavonic reflexes of a Finnic ethonym found also in Finnish Häme. An ethnos of this name eventually moved to the province of Finland that now bears its name, a land of low hills and uncounted lakes where a native of Nevel' would feel perfectly at home. The Rus' made war against them in 1042, 1123, 1142 and 1149. In 1832, according to Kannisto et al., A.J. Sjögren expressed the hypothesis that 'tässä olisi puhe joistakin Venäjälle jääneistä hämäläisten jälkijoukoista’ — 'here it would be a question of some remnant groups of Häme who had stayed behind in Russia' (the original was presumably in German). Kannisto’s work dismisses the idea: ‘...[A]ccording to the conclusions of modern research it did not happen this way, and the view should be that even

17. Jus malyj <ʌ> (<e/>, nasalized e/) is sometimes found for oral /a/ as no more than a variation in handwriting.
18. Ibid., X 1 11.10-11.11 (pp. 55-56) (reading of the Laurentian ms.).
such early Russian raids as these were directed into Finland. It may now be time to revert to Sjögren’s view.

However, we should bear in mind that a single ethnonym may apply to ethnoses living remotely from one another. The Sorbians (in eastern Germany) and Serbians (of the former Yugoslavia) present a clear example. Similarly the ‘Saxons’ of Essex and of Romania bear the same ethnonym, but have little in common nowadays. From the Finno-Ugrian world we might remember the names Mōš (a moiety of the Mansi), the ethnonym Mansi (or Man’si) itself, and the Magyar, which derive from a single etymon. Thus it may be that the ‘Nevel’ Hāme’ were not especially close to the Hāme of Finland. Further, according to G.M. Kert, the ethnonym Hāme shares an etymon with Sami, Sabme, Saami and variants: the endonym of the peoples formerly known by the exonym Lapp. Kert states firmly that both words derive from the Baltic root žem- ‘land, lowland’. To this Vasmer adds, again without qualification, that the Finnish endonym Suomi ‘Finland’ and Sabme are reflexes of one etymon. It seems to me improbable that both these pairings can be correct, but in either case it seems well established that Hāme reflects an original term that, from the geographical standpoint, was very widely used as an ethnonym.

That the late prehistoric population of Nevel’ was hāmālāinen (of the Hāme) seems clear from the following considerations.

In the first place, Old Russian sources call the Hāme not only jam’ but also jēm’ (bмь). This alternation may be reflected in the coexistence of modern Nevel’ toponyms with both Jam- and Jem- (more of this below). In the second place, the Finnish genitive case of Hāme is Hāmeen, earlier Hāmehen, which would offer an explanation for the <n> in all five toponyms (Jemenec, Jemenka, Jamenec, Janenka, Jamno).

In these hydronyms we find (East) Slav suffixes -ka and -ec. In most early records of the potamonym Jemenka, however, the -ka is absent, although it is probably present in the very first occurrence. Early cases are tabulated below.

21. Ibid.
22. See Jazyki narodov SSSR, III, ed. V.I. Lytkin et al., M. 1966, 155 (the chapter on the Kola Saami language is by G.M. Kert).
23. The documented history of Nevel’ begins in 1503, and that of the River Jemenka in 1185.
TABLE 2.1

EARLY REFLEXES OF THE HYDRONYM JEMENKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>PHRASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novgorod Primary</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>folio 117</td>
<td>na jẽmnînicê (na Ымъницъ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle, Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>= p. 228(^{24})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR XXV 2612</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>nadrzekâ ýmienia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>narzece ýmienie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR XXV 2613</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>nad Rzekã Jemieniañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nad Rzekã Jemienkãñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nad Rzekã Jemiennãñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR XXV 2614</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>nad Rzekã Jemienãñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>na rzece Jemienieñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR XXV 2615/1</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>idzie rzekã Jemionãñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>na Rzece Jemienieñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR XXV 2615/2</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>na Rzece Jemienieñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR XXV 2616</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>na Rzece Jemienieñ Nad Rzekã Jemienãñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We note that the second syllable of the form *Jemiona* (1681) shows the change of Common Slavonic /e/ to /o/, which happens when the /e/ is not followed by a soft consonant, i.e. before a hard consonant or before zero. This change never affects /e/ (e)\(^{25}\). This difference in treatment of the first and second syllables shows that *Jemiona* represents an earlier *'jêmen-* (or, to express the same idea in Cyrillic, *'бмен-*). Now e (e) was a more open sound than e. This can be seen, for example, in the fact that the Old East Slav reflex of Old

---

\(^{24}\) Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov. ed. A.N. Nasonov. Ld., 1950, 228. For more on this locative form see Chapter Three of the present thesis.

\(^{25}\) It will be objected that such a change occurred in the pronoun *jejó*, previously written *eš*. What has happened here is something quite different: the word has merely been made to rhyme with its masculine equivalent *jevó*. 
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High German *hlēf* is *xlēb*, a fact which correlates perfectly with Finnish *Hämeen*, where *ä* is a more open sound than the -ee- of the genitive case ending.

We turn now to the River *Jamenka*, which flows into Lake Jemenec, and to Lake *Jamenec*, from which the Jamenka derives (literally). It is possible that the version with *Ja-*(A-) is merely a variant showing Belorussian *jakan’je*, i.e. the pronunciation of unstressed *je* (*e*) as *ja* (*a*). Yet there is another explanation. It was noted above that Old Russian sources refer to the Hämme as both *ēm* and *jam*. It is therefore at least possible that the name *Jamenec* is based on the latter. This third toponym is so positioned as to make the end of a clear line, as outlined above: Lake Jemenec – River Jamenka – Lake Jemenec – village of Jemenec – River Jemenka – Lake Nevel’ – River Jemenka – Lake Bol’soj Ivan. This looks very much like a borderline: its extent is approximately forty kilometres. Ethnonyms appear on the map where two or more ethnoses live close together.

There is yet another cognate hydronym right on the boundary of the modern Nevel’ district: this is Lake Jamno, which presents the *Ja-* variant of the ethonym as well as the -n-present in all the other variants found from 1619 to the present day. Lake Jamno is physically remote from the other reflexes presented here, perhaps thirty-five kilometres away. Jamno is WNW of Jemenec, north by west from the village of Jemenec. Yet, if it is remote from those other reflexes of *Häme*, it is much closer to the village of Krivicy. It is even possible that the VN Klinovoje ‘Wedge-shaped’ shows the Kriviči as a wedge dividing one group of Hämme from another.26

There is a little more evidence of Finnic people living in the Nevel’ area, in two toponyms mentioned in a Polish inventory of 1761, viz. *Czuchnowo* ‘Finnish’27 and *Podczuchonia* ‘Near the Finnish place’28 (from East Slav *ćučna*, ‘mocking nickname of Finns’29). The former, a village, was six or seven kilometres east of Nevel’ town. The latter, a *pustosz*, was a few kilometres to the north of modern Nevel’, in the neighbourhood

---

27. AR XXV 2632, 93.
28. AR XXV 2632, 77.
29. Max Vasmer, ESRJ, IV, 389, s.v. *ćučna*, with reference to the second Pskov chronicle, s.a. 1444.
of the village of Krivonosovo, which exists now as it did then. Though the two were in a different dziesiątek [decurium], it is possible that the name Podczuchonia refers to Czuchnowo. Near Podczuchonia there was a village called Worozeyki, to be understood as Woróżek, from Russian verožit' 'to shamanize'. This is surely no coincidence, since we know for certain that the ancient Finns practiced shamanism. Furthermore, the verb verožit' must be of purely Christian origin: it derives from the common noun vrag, or rather its colloquial East Slav equivalent vorog, i.e. 'enemy'. Only Christians felt so threatened by shamanism, or were so ignorant of it, that they associated it with 'the enemy', i.e. the Satan of Judaeo-Christian tradition.

From this evidence it follows that when Christianity came to Nevel', it was brought by East Slavs, for they are the only users of words with the shape CoroC. These East Slav Christians lived beside Finns who still practiced shamanism.

We turn next to the name Nevel' itself. That form of the name is not attested during the sixteenth century. The earliest extant forms, from early treaties and wills, are as shown in Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Nevļja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Nevle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Nevļju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>na Nevle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nevl'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The earliest forms in Polish redaction, however, show alternation between forms with -wel- and forms with -wl-. They are set out in Table 2.3 below.

30. See, for example, M. Branch, M. Kuusi, K. Bosley, *Finnish Folk Poetry: Epic*, H., 1977, 48-49, especially the last paragraph on p. 49.
31. South Slav words containing the sequences CraC and ClaC (where C = any consonant other than l, r (hard or soft)) often have Russian reflexes with the shapes CoroC and ColoC.
## TABLE 2.3: POLISH FORMS OF THE NAME NEVEL’, 1619

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>WORD TYPE</th>
<th>FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Toponym</td>
<td>newla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Toponym</td>
<td>newel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>Areal toponym</td>
<td>wNewelszychyź/nie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Toponym</td>
<td>newlem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Local adjective</td>
<td>newelskiego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This alternation is of a type common in the Slavonic languages. Ultimately it results from the fall of jers, the inherited Common Slavonic ultrashort vowels /"u/ and /" (jer") and (jer’). In the mid-eleventh century at the latest these started to disappear from Old Russian when found in isolation. Where they occurred in series in successive syllables, the last disappeared and the previous one strengthened to a full vowel – /"o/ became /o/, /"/ became e. If there were three, the earliest in the series also disappeared.

A special situation comes about when one case within a paradigm has two jers while another case has only one. Thus nominative Pav’l” gives modern Pavel, but genitive Pav’la will give Pavalę. The evidence from the Polish sources is that Nevel’ was another such word, originally having had the nominative form ‘Nevl’i’ and the genitive ‘Nevl’ja. These two forms would have given respectively modern nominative Nevel’ and genitive Nevlja.

Which form of the nominative is the more authentic? Although the Polish, disyllabic version is attested almost half a century later, it is more authentic. Firstly, it is supported by the adjective newelskiego and the ‘areal’ noun phrase wNewelszychyźnie. Secondly, the inventory in question was compiled on the spot, by ‘field researchers’. Thirdly, the Russian version shows no special knowledge of the area and was in all probability written by someone for whom the difference between Nevl’ and Nevel’ was a matter of indifference. The very fact that the nominative is not attested in Russian for sixty-nine years after the first attestation of an oblique case demonstrates the instrumentality of Muscovy’s attitude to Nevel’.


33. It should be stated clearly that authentic examples where the last consonant in the word is <l> are rare. The high-register word žezl ‘sceptre’ occurs in a popular form žezel, which argues an earlier ‘żezl’; in all probability that form never existed and żezel is an analogical form. Both Pavel and Nevel’ are foreign loanwords, which native speakers have evidently remodelled to give them a more familiar shape.
The name Nevel’ itself was identified long ago as being of Baltic-Finnic linguistic origin. This was known already to Nikolaj Ivanovič Zorin, who in a 1925 publication wrote: ‘The town’s name evidently came from the Finnish root ‘nev’, meaning sea, water; from this root come, e.g., Neva, nevod, and so forth...’

Nowadays we would not consider that the word nevod has a Baltic-Finnic etymology, but there is every reason to accept the notion that the name Nevel’ has.

The element nev- descends from an original form *neva, the asterisk indicating a reconstructed form. Its reflexes are found here and there over most of the area from Nevel’ in the south to the north of Finland and the Arkhangel’sk area of Russia. But the story begins to become complicated when we examine Zorin’s confident explanation of what the ‘Finnish root “nev”’ means – ‘sea, water’. The reconstructed form is identical with the form neva found in modern Finnish (a rather rare word), for Finnish is the most ‘conservative’ of all the Baltic-Finnic languages in its phonology, i.e. it is closest to the Common Baltic-Finnic language from which the modern languages descend. In Table 2.4 we list all the linguistic forms of the root attested from Lithuania to the Arctic. It will be immediately apparent that the range of meanings attested is as wide as the geographical incidence of the root.

---

35. See ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, III, 55-56, s.v. něvod.
36. As opposed to toponyms, which will be examined below.
37. The quantifier ‘all’ will be qualified immediately after the end of the table.
### TABLE 2.4: LINGUISTIC REFLEXES OF FINNIC NEVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>MEANING AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>növa</td>
<td>Standard Estonian</td>
<td>'Gully, bed, channel; canal'[^38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>neeb,</td>
<td>Estonian dialect</td>
<td>'current in a river, the sea or a lake; a stream, a canal; the previous bed of a river'[^39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genitive neeva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>naev</td>
<td>Estonian dialect</td>
<td>'Whirlpool'[^40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>neva</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>Attested from 1745 with the meanings 'marsh, bog, quaking bog'. Modern meaning is 'an open marsh, usually not overgrown with trees; land beyond a marsh; mud, slush'[^41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>neva</td>
<td>Karelian</td>
<td>All three forms mean '[stretch of] water, body of water'. Most of the examples given in the standard Karelian etymological dictionary relate to men falling into water[^42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ňeva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ňepra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>nova</td>
<td>Vepsä</td>
<td>'Quaking bog; bog'.[^43] Again, one of the examples concerns the danger of such places: 'The horse fell into the bog'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^40]: Ibid.
# TABLE 2.4: LINGUISTIC REFLEXES OF FINNIC NEVA (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>MEANING AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>niva</td>
<td>Finnish dialect</td>
<td>‘Small waterfall, current in a river, moving eddy in a stream’&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;. Probably borrowed from the Saame (‘Lappish’) languages, which are Finno-Ugrian (but not Baltic-Finnic). These may in turn have borrowed it from more southerly Baltic-Finnic languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>níva</td>
<td>Russian, Arkhangelsk dialect</td>
<td>‘Small cataracts in rivers, Arkh[angel'sk], 1846-1847. Northern rivers. A small waterfall, Arkh[angel'sk], 1885&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;. Loanword from Saame; unrelated to the native Russian homonymous word meaning ‘grain field’, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>njauve</td>
<td>Inari Saame</td>
<td>‘Place in a river where the current is stronger, raging; small cataract where there are no rocks’&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>njärve</td>
<td>Kautokeino Saame</td>
<td>‘Open water amid ice, lead’&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among these eleven words with their variants we find many meanings. They can be grouped into four:

# TABLE 2.5: MEANINGS OF LINGUISTIC REFLEXES OF NEVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Channel, canal, (old) course of a river; open water amid ice, lead;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Place where current is stronger; moving eddy in a stream; whirlpool, small cataract, small waterfall;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marsh, bog, quaking bog;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Body of water;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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If we correlate these general areas of meaning with their geographical distribution, broadly speaking from south to north, we find a pattern:

**TABLE 2.6: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF MEANINGS OF NEVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING (See Table 2.4)</th>
<th>REFLEXES (see Table 2.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6, 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is to say, the same meaning is found at the extremes of the geographical range; there follow a second and a third pairing of senses, moving closer to the centre of the geographical range; and a fourth meaning is found at that point.

The phenomenon of linguistic innovation in the middle of a geographical spectrum is well known. One example from the realm of phonology is the *satom* innovation in the middle of the Indo-European range: to east and west the words for *hundred* have a *k*- sound (e.g. Latin *centum*), but languages from Slavonic to Sanskrit have made a change *k* > *s*\(^{48}\). Innovations in *vocabulary* in the middle of a geographical area are also well known, for example in Japan\(^{49}\), where vocabulary items have been successively innovated in the centre and then radiated northwards and southwards.

What is perhaps less usual in our argument is that here we are dealing with an innovation in *meaning* in the middle of a range. Another example that springs to mind is that of the Slavonic word *město*, which originally meant ‘place’. This meaning is retained in the

---

48. This schema is not uncontroversial. The western ‘wing’ of the *centum* languages consists of Celtic, Italic, Germanic and Albanian, whereas the eastern ‘wing’ is represented only by the two Tokharian languages A and B. Tokharian is poorly attested and was spoken by small populations in Xinjiang. Therefore some prefer a picture wherein the Indo-European languages are divided into an eastern and western group, in which the *satom* languages – the Baltic, Slavonic, Iranian, and Indic groups – have innovated, while the *centum* languages have not. Under this view, Tokharian would have been the language of a group of western incomers.

north (Russian mest’o) and in Serbia in the south (mišto), but in between, in Poland, the
meaning ‘town’ has been innovated50.

Less usual, too, in the case of ‘neva is the fact that no fewer than four general
meanings are involved here. Of these meanings ‘channel’ is rather remote from ‘body of
water’; the meaning shifts involved are much less abrupt if we take one step at a time. We
will then move from ‘channel’ to ‘place where current is stronger’ and thence to ‘moving
eddy in a stream; whirlpool, small cataract, small waterfall’. We have moved from ‘water
safe for navigation’ to ‘water unsafe for navigation’. We move on to the meaning ‘unsafe
wet place [into which one may fall]’ (i.e. quaking bog, bog, marsh) and finally to the
meaning ‘body of water [into which one may fall]’, particularly if we take into account the
examples cited in the relevant dictionaries. Thus we find we find nebrah pakui mužikku
‘into the water fell the mužik’ and ne Vaughan kiboi mužikku da sinne kuolí ‘into the water there
fell a mužik and there he died’51.

In addition to ten vocabulary items derived from CBF ‘neva in seven languages
(including the non-Baltic-Finnic languages Russian and Saame), there are six place-names,
apart from Nevel’ itself, that derive from the same source52. They are listed in Table 2.7.

50. Vasmer suggests that this new sense was calqued on Old High German Stat, meaning both ‘place’ and
52. The morpheme also occurs as second element in a couple of compound toponyms.
TABLE 2.7: TOPOYMIC REFLEXES OF FINNIC NEVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Nevelis</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>Meaning probably relates to some feature of the river(^5). The presence of -l- shows that this name should be grouped with Nevel', Nevala and Nivala.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Nevala</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>‘Place of the neva’. This is a village outside Narva. Structurally almost identical with Nevel’(^6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nevá</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>The name of the river on which St. Petersburg stands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Nevó</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>An old name for Lake Ladoga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Nivala</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>63°54' N 25°0' E. Very similar in structure to Nevel’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Niva</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>64°12' N 29°30' E. This place and the previous one are located, like Nevel’, where rivers flow into lakes(^7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reviewing this table, I suggest in the first place that the element -l- in the name of Nevel’ is identical to that found also in Nevelis, Nevala and Nivala. It represents the Baltic-Finnic suffix -la/-lā, which denotes precisely place, e.g. pappila ‘priest’s, pastor’s house’, Hyrylā ’steamy place’, Anttila ‘Antti’s place’, niemelā ‘place at the headland’. It is the commonest place-name-forming suffix in Finnish toponyms. It is noteworthy that three of the six place-names in Table 2.7 show the suffix, i.e. it was often found important that a location was not merely a neva but the place of a neva.

---

55. Both places can be found in *Suomen kartoisto 1999*. Sixth edition, centennial atlas. John Westerholm and Pauliina Raento, Porvoo 1999. Map 5. Since Finnish settlement this far north dates back only to early modern times (see Peter Hajdu [Hajdú Péter], *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*, translated and adapted by G. F. Cushing, London, 1975 (hereafter Hajdu, *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*), 208 (end of second paragraph)), the likelihood is that both Nivala and Niva are Saame names borrowed into Finnish.
There are objections to this interpretation. Dr Sergei Nikolaievich Bogatyrev pointed out to me\textsuperscript{56} that another toponym in the same region, namely Gomel', occurs in earlier sources without -l-. This seems an example of East Slav epenthetic /l/ after labials, and Nevel' (often found as Nevle, et sim., in early sources) would be a parallel case. The same suggestion was made independently by Professor Nikolaj Leonidovič Vasīļjev of the Mordovian State University in Saransk, who was kind enough to double the readership of my article on the place-name Nevel\textsuperscript{37}. We might compare a hydronym from the Vitebsk area, Lepel', at least if we accept Vasmer's note 'Iz dř[evne]-russ[ogo] 'Lēpl' s l epentheticum' ('From O[ld] Russ[ian] 'Lēplb with l epentheticum')\textsuperscript{58}. Here at least we may suggest that the etymology quoted by Vasmer, and proposed originally by K. Būga in 1922, is open to question. Instead of Latvian lēpa 'water lily', Lithuanian lēpis 'bog arum' we might suggest CBF 'leppālā 'place of the alders'. By the same token Nevel' is 'the place of the neva'. For the moment, however, it is unclear which sense of neva is meant.

On balance it seems to me that the meaning 'place of the neva' fits into the toponymy and hydronymy of Nevel' in a doubly systematic way; it matches other toponyms where the -la suffix is not to be doubted (Nevala, Nivala), and it proclaims that the settlement was the beginning of a neva. To that term we now return.

The toponyms do not, so to speak, pattern with the various meanings of the reflexes of the word neva. The toponyms in the main refer to rivers, to lakes, and to the places where the two meet. From the far north, where we have a Niva and a Nivala both sited where rivers enters lakes, through Lake Ladoga-Nevo and the River Neva\textsuperscript{59}, to the town of Nevel', we have a single pattern.

I suggest, therefore, that, whatever the innovated meanings of "neva" in Baltic-Finnic languages, there are sound reasons to think that the toponyms containing "neva" do not embody those innovations; rather they share a single basic meaning, the oldest one.

\textsuperscript{56} By electronic mail, January 2011.
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{ESRJa}, comp. Max Vasmer, II, Moscow, 1986, 483, s.v. "Nevela."
\textsuperscript{59} The Russian accentuation of Nevá and Nevó derives from a rule of Finnish pronunciation, evidently old, that the second syllable of a word whose first syllable has a short vowel in an open syllable has a secondary accent on the second syllable, which is half-long: něvá, in IPA ['ne̞ va̞].
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Before making a final suggestion as to what those who named Nevel' meant by neva, I would like to add two more toponyms that may preserve the Finnic root 'neva. Hitherto they have been located in my sleeve, concealed there because they are much more controversial than any of those in Table 2.7. As far as I know they have not previously been discussed in the context of Finnic toponymy. Indeed, the second name is my own rediscovery; it has been forgotten since the seventeenth century and cannot therefore have been examined previously with the use of modern linguistic procedures.

The first is a very prestigious toponym, one noted long ago, apparently by an emperor, no less: Νέσσογαράδας, i.e. Nevogardás. This name occurs in Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, Περὶ ἑδύνω [Concerning the Peoples] (De administrando imperio [How to Run an Empire]), Chapter 9 (Κεφάλαιον Θ’ (neither title is authorial, and no guarantee is offered that the emperor was the true author of the work)\(^60\). The text was previously read as Νεμογαράδας; but, as Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard note\(^61\),

‘The “Nemogardas” of the De administrando’s manuscript was emended to “Nevogardas” by J. B. Bury (‘The Treatise De administrando imperii’, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 15 (1906), 543, n. 1). His emendation was accepted by later scholars, e.g. D. Obolensky in R.J.H. Jenkins, ed., De administrando imperio: II Commentary (London, 1962), 26; Ob upravl. imperii., 310 (Mel’nikova and Petrukhin). It is quite possible that the settlement at Gorodishche then [i.e. before the eleventh century] bore a name such as Nevogardas, corresponding to the Slavic form ‘Novgorod’ (literally, ‘New Town’). It is no less possible that Gorodishche was known by a number of different names or hybrid forms\(^62\), reflecting the heterogeneity of its population...’.

---

\(^{60}\) This section is conveniently available, with a Polish translation, in Wybór, ed. Lehr-Sławiński, Witkowski, 20-25. The word in question is on p. 20, and in the Polish translation on p. 23. However, that version of the text does not even note Bury’s emendation (see below).  
\(^{62}\) On the probability or otherwise of hybridity see below.
This needs a little expansion. Gorodišče, situated at and around the point where the River Volkhov flows out of Lake Il'men, was a very important settlement and a precursor of Great Novgorod. Franklin and Shepard suggest that the peculiarly insular character of Gorodishche among the settlements in the eastern lands [eastern, that is, from the point of view of Viking incomers - P.M.] was expressed, apparently from the outset, in its name, if one accepts that Scandinavian sources denote it by “Holmgarðr”\(^{64}\) [i.e. Holmgardr – P.M.] (literally, “island compound”); and that this name was only later transferred to the emerging town of Novgorod nearby.

For it has been assumed that ‘Nevogardas’ is simply ‘Nograd’ draped in a Byzantine chiton. Let us at least consider the possibility that the scribe of the De administrando wrote what the author meant. Are there any arguments in favour of accepting the ε of the original?

1. Bury, who thought the μ an error for β, apparently had no doubts about the ε.

2. The main population of the Gorodišče area was Finnic. At the period when, as Shepard and Franklin suggest\(^{65}\), it may have been the seat of a Rus’ chaganus or khaqan who styled himself in the manner of the Khazar khaqan, Slavs were not an important element in the population. If we accept the ε, the first element of Nevogardas becomes intelligible as a Finnic place-name element, as we should expect in a Finnic-speaking area. If Franklin and Shepard are right on the matter of hybrid toponyms, the combination of nevo and gardas is not problematic.

---

63. Ibid., 40.
64. According to V. L. Janin, ‘...termin <xolm>, xoroso izvestnyj v Novgorode, označal ne ves’ gorod, a lish’ Slavenskij konec’ (‘But the term “Holm”, well known in Nogorod, meant not the whole town but only the Slavenskij Konce’) (see V.L. Janin, Srednevekovyij Novgorod, 22-23). According to this thesis, the original koncy were primarily linguistic communities: Slovene, Krivic [Krivic], Merja, Čud’ (ibid., 24). This version is not really compatible with the idea of nomenclature migrating together with the settlement.
65. Franklin and Shepard, Emergence, 40, citing 'ibn Rusta on the title of the Rus’ ruler, who may or may not have existed, and who in the former case may or may not have lived at Gorodišče. Tread softly, this is marshy ground.
3. If we reject the \( \varepsilon \) as a mere error for \( \alpha \), we must imagine that Gorodiščë, a non-Slav settlement, had a Slav name meaning “New Town”, and that it then migrated to a second new town.

4. Further, there is a precedent for the confusion of Finnic neva with Old Russian nov”. The river Neva is known in Swedish as Ny, “New”66.

5. This new hypothesis would reinforce another, namely that at an early stage the town consisted of koncy where different linguistic communities resided\(^{67}\). The Finno-Ugrian koncy would have called the whole town Neva, Növa or Nova. The term would have been comprehensible to both Čjuda’ and Merja. If they were numerically preponderant, the name could then have been adopted by both the Slav and the Scandinavian residents. Both would then have applied folk etymology and renamed the town ‘the new fortified town’, respectively R. Nov” gorod” and Sw. Nygardr.

There are, then, some arguments for accepting the \( \varepsilon \) as genuine, and with that acceptance comes at least the possibility that Gorodiščë’s other name was Baltic-Finnic and began with the sequence nev-. It may also be taxonomically significant that the main settlement at Gorodiščë is located at the junction of river and lake\(^{68}\). This is also the case with at least two of the place-names cited in Table 2.7, namely Nivala and Niva. It also applies to Nevel’ itself.

There are, however, arguments against the identification of the first element in Gk. Nevogardás (Νεβογαρδᾶς) with CBF ‘neva.

1. We should then be faced with a bilingual place-name. Such things are indeed far from unknown. However, if we look at modern Finnish compound place-names, we find large numbers of compounds, but overwhelmingly with two Finnish elements: Pitäjänmäki ‘Parish’s Hill’, Mustasaari ‘black island’, Joutsenlahti ‘swan cove’, Mäntyharju ‘pine esker’, Vähäjoki ‘small river’. Even where Finns and Swedish-

---

67. V.L. Janin, Srednevekovyi Novgorod, 22-23.
68. See the map in Franklin and Shepard, Emergence, 34, and commentary on the settlement’s position, 33.
speakers have long lived side by side, the Finnish versions of toponyms are either of
different meaning (F. Kokkola ‘place of the beacon’ versus Sw. Karleby ‘Charles’s
town’) or simply translate both Swedish elements into Finnish (F. Pukinmäki, Sw.
Bocksbacka, both meaning ‘buck’s hill’).

2. The name Novgorod in early Rus' texts is treated as a ‘loose compound’ – in other
words, both parts of the word are declined: for instance, nominative nov’ gorod”,
locative novē gorode. If we accept that the name was originally part-Finnic, part-
Scandinavian (nev- + gardr), we would have to imagine that the Slovène of
Novgorod reinterpreted the pre-existing name as meaning ‘new town’ and adjusted
the vowel e to o accordingly; and that they did so rather quickly, since the name is
found in its usual form in very early records.

3. So radical a re-evaluation of so well established a toponym would depend on the
emendation of a single letter in a text that is not Scandinavian, Finnic or Slav but
Greek: weak fulcrum, long lever, heavy load.

On balance, then, it is rather less than more likely that the toponym Novgorod must be
reconsidered; the ground is too soft. On the other hand, the prima facie case required
investigation as soon as Bury made his emendation, more than a century since. It is a sign of
Neveľ’s marginality that the possibility has not been examined hitherto,

If Nevogardas, though quite sturdy for a straw man, has yet proved unable to stand on
its own feet, the last place-name to be considered here will be found more robust.

We have already mentioned that a dozen kilometres to the northeast of Neveľ we find
a lake now known as Bolšoj Ivan. Something unexpected about this hydronym, and relevant
to the toponym Neveľ’, emerges from an examination of the extant inventories of
Commonwealth Newel from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, where many variants
of the hydronym occur. These variants can in turn be compared with evidence from the
Kniga Polockogo pohoda 1563.69

On the western shore of Lake Bol'soj Ivan we find, unsurprisingly, the village of Zaivan'je ('Beyond Ivan'). Given that the armies of Ivan III and Ivan IV stormed to and fro through this landscape, winning and losing battles, one is not surprised by these names.

However, surprised we should be, because the name Bol'soj Ivan is not found until the eighteenth century. In an inventory dated 'w Roku 1764. Augusta 16. Dnia Latina' we find the phrases 'Woytownstwo Zaiewanskie / Dziesziontek Zaiwanski'. Now unless we imagine that the Radziwiłłs had decided to mark the bicentenary of the Muscovite capture of Kazan by renaming two bodies of water after Ivan IV, our suspicions will be aroused.

And indeed, a few pages later in the same inventory we meet a different form: 'Summariusz Woytownstwa Zaiewanskiego'. In March of 1763 we have: 'Woytownstwo Zaiewanskie / Xtkow 2 / Xtek Zaiwanskie', and later: 'Summariusz / Woytownstwa / Zaiewanskiego'. Similarly in December 1761 we find both Zaiewanskie in the neuter, agreeing with Woytownstwo, and Zaiewanski in the masculine, agreeing with dziesiątek (spelt Xtek).

The forms Zaiewanskie (in various combinations of minuscule, majuscule, and majuscule subscript), its genitive Zaiewanskiego and locative Zaiewanskim are encountered in inventories from the years 1764, March 1763, 1761, 1754, 1748, 1689 and 1681. Although in the later inventories we never find the lake as a noun, it is present in the September 1689 inventory in the form Jewan (nominative), as part of the phrase Jezioro Jewan Wielkie. The neuter gender of the adjective means that it qualifies Jezioro, not

---

70. AR XXV 2626/1, 123.
71. 'In the year 1764. On August 16. By the Latin date', i.e. by the Gregorian calendar. Note the oddity of the macaronic phrase, a Polish masculine genitive spatchcocked onto the ablative of a Latin feminine adjective, presumably because the Latin word dies is sometimes used as a feminine noun (as in Dies irae, dies illa: judgement day was coming to the Commonwealth).
72. Ibid., 134.
73. AR XXV 2625, 39, 47.
74. AR XXV 2624, 9, 109.
75. Ibid., 202.
76. AR XXV 2626/1, 134; 2625, 39, 47; 2624, 9, 109, 202; 2623/3, 53, 149; 2623/2, 50, 58, 146, 149; 2623/1, 50, 58; 2621, 29, 83, 86; 2615/2, 10; 2615/1, 4, 7, 13.
77. AR XXV 2615/2, 10.
Jewan, i.e. the phrase means 'the great lake Jewan', not 'the lake Great Jewan'. Here is the origin of the confusion with the by-name of Ivan III. The phrase *Jezioro Jewan Wielkie* is found also in the inventory of October 1681.\(^78\)

Before 1681 we find a long gap in the Nevel inventories, a result, no doubt, of the extreme disruption visited on the Commonwealth and its borderlands in the mid-seventeenth century. The next (that is, the previous) inventory dates from 1636. It is during this forty-five-year gap that the lake name Jewan had come into being, for the versions we find in 1636 are quite different. They include *ZaJeziorom Niewanem*\(^79\) (twice; the capitalization and line division in mid-word are identical) and *nad Niewanem*\(^80\). Both these forms imply either a masculine nominative *Niewan (N)ewan* or a neuter nominative *Niewano*. We also have a genitive form, *Niewania*\(^81\), which implies a masculine nominative *Niewat*\(^82\).

Regressing still farther through time, we come to an inventory of 1629, which has a feminine adjectival form in the phrase *Wlosc ZANiewanska*\(^83\), and the masculine *Zaniewanski* in the phrase *WLosc Zaniewanski*\(^84\), with aberrant assignment of *wośc* to the masculine gender\(^85\).

Lastly we come to the first of the Nevel inventories, compiled in 1619. Here, in a list of villages, we find the phrase *Sioło Nanie[naw]nie*\(^86\), where the reading is dubious, as shown. Here we may imagine a metathesis of *n* and *w*, which would give *Naniewanie*.

---

78. AR XXV 2615/1.7.
79. AR XXV 2614, p. '26', right-hand side (p. 56 in modern pagination). The pagination in this inventory has been rather poorly handled. Double pages are numbered 1-10. The next double page is unnumbered; the following one is correctly numbered 12. Numeration runs correctly until 17; the following double page is misnumbered ‘16’. The next two double pages are respectively ‘17’ (for 18) and ‘19’ for 20. The next was also numbered ‘18’, then renumbered ‘19’. Thence to the end all numbers have been ‘corrected’.
80. Ibid., p. ‘25’, right-hand side (p. 54 in modern pagination).
81. Ibid., on the second of the double pages numbered ‘16’ (p. 34 in modern pagination).
82. Or, theoretically, a soft neuter version *Niewanie*, but it is hard to imagine that in any form of East Slavonic ('Nesanie' or 'Hesanie') (but see below).
83. AR XXV 2613, 33.
84. Ibid., 79.
85. If we take the lack of diacritics as meaningful, then the change of gender is easy to accept; but the *f* is big.
86. AR XXV 2612, 23.
There are other versions of the name, too: Sioło naniewniane and Pustoszy naniewniane. The former appears to be a VN of nominative plural form, something very common in East Slav toponymy generally and also frequently to be found in the Nevel’ area. In Pustoszy naniewnani we should have a feminine singular genitive, based on a feminine nominative ‘Niewan’ (not the masculine version implied by genitive Niewania in the 1636 inventory (see above)). On the other hand the phrase Pustoszy naniewnani may consist of two nouns in apposition (‘the wastelands [known as] Naniewani’), in which case this too would be a nominative plural. At all events ‘Naniewani’ clearly means ‘on Newani’, and ‘Naniewanie’, emendment accepted, would be ‘on Niewan’ or ‘on Niewano’.

And curiously enough the last form to be mentioned, also from the 1619 inventory, comes in a list of lakes: ‘Jezior 3 / Krotai, niewano, Osce’. Here then is the lakename, this time in an unequivocally neuter form. We thus have forms of this hydronym of all three Slavonic genders, shown by adjectival agreement in the case of the masculine and feminine, and unequivocally in the case of the neuter by the occurrence of the nominative.

There follows a summary chart of the route backwards to reconstruct the earlier form of the lake’s name.

---

87. Ibid., 59.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., 23.
90. The same is true of the name Nevel’ (Newel), which occurs as masculine and feminine, and also as neuter Nevle (Newle).
## TABLE 2.8: SUMMARY OF REFLEXES OF MODERN HYDRONYM ‘IVAN’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMS</th>
<th>DATE &amp; SOURCE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zaiewanskie</td>
<td>12.2.1766 AR XXV 2629, p. 6</td>
<td>Implies noun ‘Jewan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiwanskie</td>
<td>1764 AR XXV 2626/2, p. 111</td>
<td>Implies noun ‘Iwan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiewanskiego</td>
<td>1764 AR XXV 2626/1, p. 134</td>
<td>Implies noun ‘Jewan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jezioro Jewan Wielkie</td>
<td>March/April 1688 AR XXV 2616, p. 10</td>
<td>Nominative. Wielkie is governed by Jezioro. The noun Jewan is hereby attested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nad Niewanem</td>
<td>1636 AR XXV 2614 p. 54(^{91})</td>
<td>Instrumental of a noun Niewan or Niewano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niewania</td>
<td>1636 AR XXV 2614, p. 34(^{92})</td>
<td>Genitive of a masculine noun Niewań</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANieWanska</td>
<td>1629 AR XXV 2613, p. 33</td>
<td>Feminine nominative of an adjective deriving from Niewan, Niewań or Niewano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nad Jęziorem Zaniewanem</td>
<td>1629 AR XXV 2613, p. 33</td>
<td>Instrumental of an otherwise unattested noun Zantiewan or Zaniewano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jezior 3 […] niewano</td>
<td>9 March 1619 AR XXV 2612, p. 23</td>
<td>Nominative neuter noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к Неваню озеру [k Nevanju ozeru]</td>
<td>16 January 1563 Kniga Polockogo poxoda(^{93})</td>
<td>Middle Russian dative singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{91}\) This is on the fifty-fourth page of the document, on an unnumbered sheetpage following one misnumbered ‘25’. There is an item number 32 at the left-hand side of the page (in a list of noblemen holding land).

\(^{92}\) This page is on a double sheet misnumbered ‘16’ (the previous double sheet is numbered ‘17’).

\(^{93}\) *Kniga Polockogo poxoda 1563*. Ed. K.V. Petrov et al., SPb., 2004, 57.
I suggest that beyond this obscurity it is perfectly clear that we are dealing here with another reflex of the Baltic-Finnic word *neva*. Further, the persistence of final *n* or *ñ* in all the Polish versions indicates that the Polish-speaking inventorists heard from their informants a form with final *n*. We can thus reconstruct an original *nevan*, which is quite simply the genitive case of *neva*. It is possible that precisely this form lies behind the modern form because non-Finnic incomers managed to absorb only the first part of a compound such as *Nevanjärve* 'the lake of the *neva*', which in modern Finnish would be *Nevanjärvi*. If the second half of the compound was indeed *järve*, that would explain the palatalization at the end of the form *Niewania* (1636). A parallel case is that of the hydronym Lovat' (a river flowing through, among other places, Nevel' district), where, according to Mikkola's explanation, the palatalization of the final *t* is a trace left from CBF *joke* (Finnish *joki*).\(^{94}\) There are, however, other simple explanations of the softness of the final *n* in *Niewania*\(^{95}\).

Dr S. N. Bogatyrev raised in discussion with me an astute objection to the idea that the *-n*- in Jemenka, Jemenec, etc., could represent the CBF genitive case-ending. When in modern Finland the first element of compound river-name figures in the genitive, the name bears, so to speak, a 'bureaucratic' character, e.g. *Rajanjoki* 'frontier's river'. Such a 'bureaucratic genitive' would be anachronistic in the context of a series of old toponyms. At the time of that discussion I had not yet encountered the name of Lake Jamno, which also contains *-n*-, nor the many versions of Lake 'Nevan' that also include *n*, either as last letter or with other letters following. It seems to me that we have clear evidence here of a toponymic habit or custom practised by the Häme when they lived in the Nevel' area. Needless to say, it can have nothing to do with the modern 'bureaucratic' use of the genitive case. Rather it must have been a manner of formation that was later abandoned. The village of Jamny, near Novgorod Velikij, may be another example of the same root with *-n*-.

Why, it may be asked, did the change from *Niewan* to *Jewan* and eventually to *Iwan* (Russian *Ivan*) occur? The deletion of the <n> (<h>) results from the co-occurrence of such

---


\(^{95}\) For example, the locative of a nominative /nêvan/ (*Hesvan, Niewan*) or /nêvanõ/ (*Hesvanõ, Niewanõ*) would be /nêvanõ/ (*Hesvanõ, Niewanõ; earlier *Hesveb*), the second *n* in which is soft. A soft nominative /nêvan/ (*Hesvano, Niewanõ*) could then be backformed.
phrases as za nego with znał ego. A false correction then occurred: 'If we say zanevanskij, then we should call the lake Jevan, as we say za nego and ego'.

Central to this argument is the pronunciation of the accusative-genitive of the <r> in jegó (ezo) as [v]. Since this is emphatically not a Belorussian phenomenon (still less a Polish), it follows that by the late seventeenth century Muscovite Russian-language influence was very strong. In part this may have been the result of the assignment of Nevel' to Russia under the treaty of Andruszowo/Andrusovo; but it may reflect also an aspiration towards unification with Russian Orthodox co-religionists, among whom this pronunciation was now normative. The mechanism may be termed 'status emulation': Nevelers heard Russians (infiltrators or traders, for example) saying not ezo [ja'ho] but ezo [ju'vo] and thought 'I want to sound like that', because these were people whom they admired.

This is significant as part of debates about continuity between Kievan Rus', Muscovy and Russia. The mechanism delineated here implies that Nevelers aspired to unification with Russia for reasons connected with their own time, pace the Russian nationalist view. We shall see later that Nevelers had good reason to nurture such aspirations, pace roseate views of the Rzeczpospolita as a noble democracy with a perfect constitution.

What is particularly noteworthy in the presence of the toponyms Nevle (from an earlier *Nevelă) and Niewan (from *Neva-) is that it implies a specific relationship between the two toponyms. Early Nevel' was 'the place of the neva', and the line of lakes was part of the neva itself. If we re-examine the meanings of neva in that light, we must surely come to the conclusion that there was a navigable channel by which small vessels could navigate northeastwards from what is now Nevel' some twenty kilometres. They could also travel southwestwards across Lake Nevel', up the Jemenka to Jemenec, and then onwards up the Jemenka to Lake Jamene - again, a distance of some twenty kilometres. While this channel is not Panama or Suez, it is worth the discovering. Moreover we can conclude that the
keepers of this channel were the Häme, whose ethnonym lines the southern and central parts of the route, while their language named the northern part.

In all probability there was a small settlement on Lake Nevel' at the place where the River Jemenka enters the lake. The populace were known as Häme, and they probably retained their language at least until the arrival of the Kriviči. If we assume that (a) that local toponyms are older than their first written occurrences – a certainty – and (b) that at least in some degree they represent translations of older placenames, we may envisage something of their way of life.

They will have made their living by fishing in lake and river, by hunting in the surrounding forests, and by some agriculture and animal husbandry. Trade too will have been part of their livelihood. Trade activity may have included offering assistance to those who navigated the network of lakes and rivers leading west to the Baltic, south to the Black Sea; exchanging local produce for handicraft goods; and using small boats to travel to points lying directly on international trade routes. The local produce offered by Nevelers will have included products useful for inland navigation, such as aspen wood (VN Osinovka), pitch (VN Djogtevo near Lake Vorotno) and tar (VNs Smol'niki), as well as honey (Čerovjedy, 'those who eat honey-bee grubs', from červa 'honey-bee grub' and the verb jest' (jěst') 'to eat')96, wax (derived from the same hives), beaver pelts (VNs Bobrovo), and iron for boat fitments (cf. the iron implied in VNs Rudicy, Rudnja, and Železnica). Meat from hunting, including beaver, may also have been on offer.

The Peri ἑθνῶν (Περὶ ἑθνῶν, De administrando imperio, attributed to the Emperor Constantine VII, refers to the use in the Baltic-Black Sea trade of monóxyla (μονόξυλα) '[boats made from] single treetrunks'97. One class of vessel used both in such trade journeys and also in hunting and fishing expeditions in remote regions, and perhaps the most important type, was the aspen dugout. The importance of these craft has been brought out by

96. A Nevel' smallholder of Polish extraction, Stanislav Ignat'jevič Kučinski [Kuczyński], still keeps an apiary at his smallholding on the historic Ust'-Dolossy estate. The honey is excellent.
97. The passage in question is in the same Chapter 9 (Κεφόλομαν Θ'). See also Olavi Korhonen, Language contact as reflected in the migration of the Finns, the Saamis and the Vikings in Scandinavian Language Contacts, ed. P. Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, C., 1984 (hereafter Olavi Korhonen, Language contact), 89.
Olavi Korhonen. The prevalence of the aspen in toponyms implies that it had industrial importance. We may also note that the Podosinowik family became important in early modern Newel; their presence is noted from 1636. Apart from the village of Osinovka, noted since 1680, there are many pustosze named after the aspen: among other examples, Asinowicza, Osinnik and Osinowka.

Newel' was at the heart of one crucial area where these boats were used, the watershed between the Dnepr, Western Dvina and Lovat' (which connects through to Lake Il'men and the gulf of Finland). The last of these communicates with Newel's River Jemenka – we should now say that it communicates with the Newel' neva or navigational channel. Newel' is also close to the Western Dvina; in the eighteenth century Newel timber was floated down to Riga in a complex annual operation (to be described in Chapter 6). The headwaters of the Dnepr and Volga are also hard by.

We may now sum up what we have discovered about the ancient origins of Newel' by the careful examination of its toponymy. The earliest ethnus whose presence at Newel' is demonstrable was Baltic-Finnic. The earliest group at Newel' to which we can put a name is the Hämė. They lived in contact with other groups with whom they had a frontier marked by the occurrence of their name, particularly along waterways. Thus they seem to have been the guardians of a navigational route that ran northeast from Lake Newel' and probably also southwest from the same lake, along the bodies of water and watercourses that bear the name of the Hämė, making a route some forty kilometres long as the Newel' swans fly, but considerably longer as the sheat-fish swims. The importance of the route was in all probability local, but the terrain at the time was difficult to the point of impenetrability.

The people who lived by the route may have assisted those using it by supplying or repairing their vessels, and by providing supplies of food and other necessities and local

---

98. Olavi Korhonen, Language contact, 67-96.
99. AR XXV 2614, 10. They lived at Dym No, '55' (the numbering is hopelessly errant).
100. AR XXV 2615/2, 60.
101. AR XXV 2612, 11 (1619).
102. AR XXV 2623/1, 50 (1754).
103. AR XXV 2623/2, 68 (1754).
products. Some at least of those customers were involved in trade. For centuries this would have been trade in kind.

5

It is highly probable that Nevel’s Finns encountered and lived beside a Baltic population — speakers, that is, of a form of the Indo-European Baltic languages. Such a population would have come to the area after the Häme and before the Kriviči. Linguistic analysis can tell us a good deal about the dynamics of their material culture. The point is that the Baltic-Finnic languages adopted words relating to technology, agriculture, and material culture on a very significant scale, as well as some items related to spiritual culture. The major source for such loans at the epoch when Baltic Finns were in the Nevel’ area was Baltic. We are talking of an era centuries before the explosion of Lithuanian statehood.

Loans from early forms of the Baltic languages into Baltic-Finnic languages include examples to do with fishing and navigation (words are nouns unless otherwise indicated)\(^{104}\) such as Finnish laiva\(^{105}\) ‘ship’ (129), orsi ‘spar’ (143), purje\(^{107}\) ‘sail’ (148), terva ‘tar’ (168), karvas ‘coracle’ (109-110), aholas ‘fish spear’ (86), tuulas ‘ditto’ (171-172), tuurra ‘ice-awl’ (172), Estonian vâhi ‘crayfish’ (183), ankerias and variants ‘eel’ (90-91), Vepsä hâhk ‘otter’ (102). From the realm of transport we have rasti ‘way-mark’ (151-152), keli ‘track for sledge’ (114), rata ‘track’ and ratas ‘wheel’ (both 152), silta ‘bridge’ (162), reki ‘sledge’ (153).

There are many examples from agriculture, e.g. sammas ‘boundary stone’ (158), heinä ‘hay’ (99-100), ätelä ‘aftermath’ (183-184), apila ‘clover’, härkä ‘ox’ (103), mäntä ‘churn’ (139-

---

104. The words are specified, with full details of Baltic and Baltic-Finnic reflexes, in Jalo Kalima, Itämerensuomalaisen kielen balttilaiset lainasat, H., 1936, 86-184. Tiit-Rein Viitso estimates that there are 200 ‘absolutely certain’ Baltic loan words in Baltic-Finnic, and in all a probable 400 (see Viitso’s chapter ‘Finnic in the Uralic Languages’ in The Uralic Languages, ed. Daniel Abondolo, London and New York, 1998). Here I give Finnish forms except as specified; all are nouns unless otherwise noted.
105. If the direction of the loan is not the opposite, as might be argued from the fact that it has a reflex in Erzjii (in Russian transliteration, Erzja).
106. To obviate a plethora of footnotes, a page number from Kalima’s book (see above) is given for each word.
107. Again, the direction of the loan is not certain. In any case, the sharing of the word implies what we might call ‘technical intimacy’.
140), *villa* ‘wool’ (178), *jäärä* ‘ram’ (104), *oinas* ‘ditto’ (142-143), *vuon(n)a* ‘lamb’ (181-182), *vuohi* ‘goat’ (181), Estonian dialect *pahr* ‘boar’ (145), *paimen* ‘shepherd/herdsman’ (145), *hanhi* ‘goose’ (96), *herne* ‘peas’ (100-101), Vatja (R. vodskij). Old Russian *vod*) *upa* ‘beans’ (174), *stenen* ‘seed’ (161-162), *vannas* ‘ploughshare’ (177), *vako* ‘furrow’ (176-177), *äes* ‘harrow’ (184), *vaha* ‘wax’ (175). In forestry we find the verb (Estonian) *kärpima* to ‘lop’ (125-126) and nouns such as *kirves* ‘axe’ (118-119) and *vaaja* ‘wedge’ (174). Other loans refer to technology, domestic structures and some items of clothing.

An unusual loan is the word for navel, *napa* (141). We can be confident that all Baltic Finns had navels, so that there was no ‘need’ for a loanword. The higher status of the incomers makes the loan attractive. One can compare English *face*, of French origin, which has replaced Old English words. Useful information can be gleaned from religious loans: *taivas* ‘heaven/sky’ (163), *kurko* ‘devil, evil spirit’ (122-123), *kouko* or *kouki* ‘death; spectrum, spöke [Sw. ‘ghost’]; fera laniams, rifwande djur [Latin, Swedish ‘beast of prey’] (119); and from the vocabulary of social organization, including *heimo* ‘tribe’ (99), *vaikku* ‘power’ (176), Vatja *karissä* ‘punish’ (107), *talkoot* ‘cooperative labour’ (164), *seura* ‘company’ (160), *tytär* ‘daughter’ (174-174), *sisar* ‘sister’ (162-163), *morsian* ‘bride’ (138), Southern Vepsä *kabuta* ‘to cuddle’ (105), *nuode* ‘sister’s husband’ (142), *nepaa* ‘cousins on father’s side’ (a collective noun) (141), *tapa* ‘custom’ (164-165), *tarista* ‘to narrate’ and *taru* ‘tale’ (165-166), *kantele* ‘dulcimer’ (106-107), *olut* ‘beer’ (143), *kina, kinata* ‘[to] quarrel’ (117-118), Estonian *vaidlema* ‘ditto’ (175-176).

This assemblage of words is telling. It recalls an assemblage in the archaeologist’s sense of that word. Firstly, it speaks to us of a way of life that depends on a diverse economy, making use of fishing, agriculture and forestry. It is of a piece with the picture given above of Nevel’ life as implied by its toponymy. Nor is life merely a struggle for

---

108. Kalima prints *käärpima* to denote the palatalization of /r/, although the standard Estonian orthography is as given here.
109. *Napa* may also mean ‘hub’, which fits well with *radas* ‘wheel’ above.
110. The first meaning is attested in a hymn of 1683, the last two in Daniel Juslenius, *Suomalaisen Sana-Lagun Coetus*. The everyday term for death in modern Finnish is *kuolema*, the third infinitive of the verb *kuolla* ‘to die’.
111. The Baltic etyma refer partly or exclusively to the party held after such work.
112. Many Baltic Finns had sisters, so that a native word must have existed. The loanword was useful because of interethnic courtship and marriage (see below).
113. Since the modern VNs were given much later, the way of life was slow to change. Indeed, much of that life survived into historical times.
survival. On the one hand, this is a society that believes in an afterlife and appears to have an animist tendency. On the other, people enjoy music. They have an organized family and social structure. They help one another. They like a drink and, if at times they quarrel, they also like a cuddle.

Secondly, remembering that this is a group of loanwords, we can learn something of relations between incoming Balts and previously resident Baltic Finns. The traffic of technology is from Balts to Finns, save that we do not find any words about hunting technology, e.g. there are no loans for ‘bow, quiver, arrow, spear’. The reason is clear: the Baltic Finns already lived by hunting and possessed refined technology for those purposes.

If we turn to the social picture we find that the Baltic Finns have learned how to talk about their Baltic neighbours’ daughters and sisters. They have learned the word for bride but not for bridegroom. They have learned also how to talk about a bride’s male relations. The adoption of a word for sister also argues that there were conversations of the type ‘Do you think your sister would marry me?’. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the Baltic-Finnic man finds the Baltic maiden very attractive; at the same time these men are aware of the social usefulness of marrying into a kinship network of the culture that brings such useful technology.

We can infer the continuous existence of Nevel' from the very persistence of the name. Nevel' has been a word on human lips continuously since the era before the arrival of the Balts in the last centuries before Christ, when the Baltic Finns lived in the area. Were this not so, the name could not have come down to us. A name is like a gene passing down the ages to us. Before the arrival of writing names could be communicated only from person to person. It follows that people were saying Nevel' to one another for perhaps 1500 years before that time.
Thus we see that the first society about which we can have any knowledge in the Nevel' area was of Baltic-Finnic language. It is probable that they were joined in the meadows and forests of Nevel' by incoming Balts who spoke a language related to modern Latvian and Lithuanian. The transformation of Latvia from a Baltic-Finnic speaking area into a Baltic-speaking one would then be a model for what happened in the Nevel' area when Slavs arrived.

Yet toponymy also tells us that later there must have been extremely radical changes among the population or to the population. The toponymy of Nevel' villages dates predominantly from an era when the populace practised Orthodox Christianity. There are very few names of hamlets or villages that demonstrably antedate Orthodoxy, indeed a well-established Orthodoxy where pagan names are out of fashion. The later Catholic cultural ascendancy has left very little trace in local names.\textsuperscript{114}

The conclusions that we have been able to draw in this chapter are systematic: they hang together, they are of a piece. If we have found the East Slav tribe the Kriviči, we have found them in a Finnic version; and we have found a Finnic tribe forming a border with them. The identification here proposed of the Häme as the Finnic group who founded Nevel', or at least named it, offers an explanation for the otherwise discrepant position of the tribal name \textit{jam'} in the \textit{PVL}, next to \textit{litva}. For the first time in the context of Nevel' history the principle that one ethnic boundary implies the existence of at least one more has been applied, and (if a principle can do so) it has born fruit. Two toponyms new to the study of Nevel' history have also been slotted into the pattern, namely Czuchnowo and Czuchonia, which are geographically close to Worozeyki, bringing out an association between Baltic Finns and shamanism. The shape of the name Worozeyki tells us that it was named by Christian East Slavs; this shows that, long after the Kriviči were converted, elements of shamanism survived where Baltic Finns lived.

\textsuperscript{114} This phenomenon may be ascribed to the superficial nature of that ascendancy, to the Russocentric instincts of government since 1772-1773, or to both.
When we blew on the name of Lake Bol'soj Ivan it disintegrated and reconstituted itself as a term for a navigation channel that crossed most of the Nevel'schina. We have been able to say quite a lot about how people lived at Nevel', 'the place of the neva'. There proved to be a lot in common between, on the one hand, the life represented by Baltic loanwords into Finnish and, on the other, that represented by the Slavonic toponymy of Nevel' village names, although centuries must have elapsed between the establishment of the two vocabulary-sets.

The strength of these arguments lies in their interconnectedness. Any single piece of evidence might be doubted; but, taken together, they create a single self-consistent picture, showing a specific way of life that combined inland navigation, boat maintenance, trade, hunting, fishing, animal husbandry and arable agriculture.
CHAPTER THREE: FROM CONTEXT TO TEXT

Old Man, highest lord above us,  
God who dwell on high in heaven,  
bring peace at last to the border...

_Kanteletter_, Second Book, No. 327

Wang Shu-wên, we are told, held that finance was the key to political power.

_Arthur Waley, The Life and Times of Po Chü-i, 772-846 A.D._

---

1. Oi, Uppo, ylinen herra,  
taivahallinen Jumala,  
tuo kerta rajalle rauha...


About the middle of the first millennium after Christ, Slavs began to enter the regions that later became mediæval Rus'. One of these groups moving northwards along the amber roads was the Kriviči. Their advent was peaceful; they 'lived in unfortified settlements' or added their own dwellings to existing settlements. The Kriviči settled where much later the PVL noted their presence, in Polock, Smolensk and their subject lands. The Kriviči, according to the PVL, settled 'na verx' volgi. a na ver<xs>" dviny i na verx" dněpra' ('the headwaters of the Volga, and the headwaters of the [Western] Dvina, and the headwaters of the Dnepr'). Nevel' is exactly in this tract of country, the watershed (ultimately) between Baltic, Black Sea, Gulf of Finland, and Caspian. From very early times trade passed to and fro between the Baltic, the Volga (e.g. Magna Bulgaria), and the Black Sea (e.g. Khazaria and Byzantium).

Though not yet bearers of mediæval statehood, the Kriviči eventually became important enough to give the Latvian language its name for a Russian (krievs) and for Russia (Krievija). The language of the Kriviči has formed the basis for the western dialects of East Slav, including the modern Belorussian language.

It seems likely, however, that the arrival of Slavs in the Nevel' area was substantially delayed by the difficulty of the terrain. Had this been otherwise, we would expect to find a layer of pre-Christian Slav toponyms. Early Slav village names are limited to one, the Krivicy already noted.

At about the same time as the Kriviči entered the Dnepr-Dvina watershed, the lands to the east and south-east of the Baltic came under the influence of the Varangians, and more
specifically of a group known as the Rus'. They had been resident in Sweden, probably in the Ros or Roslagen area of central Sweden, the area around modern Stockholm\(^8\).

The *PVL* presents a picture of the region to which the Rus' came as a motley landscape of different peoples\(^9\). Some of those mentioned are Slavs, e.g. the Slovène and Kriviči; but the *PVL* also cites *ibid*. the Čjud' [Čud'] and V'sja, i.e. the Vepsii, both Finnic people. Later\(^10\) we hear also of the Merjane\(^11\) and the Muroma,\(^12\) who also spoke Finnic languages.

Modern archaeological evidence confirms this picture of a multiethnic landscape. Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard write:

The chronicle's editors assume that most of the ancient inhabitants of their land were Slavs. But in fact the Slavs were relatively recent arrivals to most areas north-east and north of the Dnieper, and even c. 1100 they probably constituted only a minority of the population in the north-east.\(^13\)

Of the early settlements Staraja Ladoga, reliably dated to c. 750, was apparently founded by the Rus', and the finds recovered from its early days are of Scandinavian type, but from the beginning there were also Balts on the same site. As for local people, 'The indigenous population of the surrounding countryside was Finno-Ugrian, but it was very sparse indeed.'\(^14\) The so-called Sarskij Fort apparently began as a Merja settlement\(^15\) and was surrounded by a Merja population, which was probably also sparse. Thus the initial contacts

---

8. I do not think that the Rus' were Goths, *pace* Stefan Söderlind, who gives an excellent survey of the evidence in *The realm of the Rus': A contribution to the problem of the rise of the East-Slavic kingdom in Scandinavian Language contacts*, ed. P. Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, Cambridge, 1984, 133-170, with extensive bibliography.
10. Ibid., 20,18 (p. 109).
11. The Merjane are identical with the Merja (see below); the form is a mass noun of the same type as *anglicane*. For this ethnos see Peter Hajdu [Hajdú Péter], *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*, translated and adapted by G. F. Cushing, London, 1975 (hereafter Hajdu, *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*), 165, 175-76.
12. For the Muroma see Hajdu, *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*, 172, 175, 176.
15. *Sarskij* presumably derives from a Merja cognate of Finnish *saari* 'island' (the Merja language is largely unattested). This site, like Nevel's, is at the outflow of a river into a lake. See Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence*, map, p. 23.
of the Rus' on arrival in modern northwestern Russia were not with Slavs at all. While the
'patchwork' metaphor is in part appropriate, we should imagine a rather threadbare quilt, in
which the main feature is the scarcity of any population at all.

In the light of this evidence I suggest that the Krivići reached the Nevel' area early
enough to be taken as just another small population group, and early enough to find groups
of Häme in the area, probably after a process of mutual acculturation between the latter and a
Baltic population. On the other hand the persistence of the complex of names based on
Häme and neva argues that there was a settled Nevel' population: otherwise the toponyms
would have been lost.

On the basis of this evidence we may imagine the community at Nevel' as a hamlet
consisting of a few extended families. Similar settlements were probably found
intermittently along the line of the neva from the area of Lake Jamenec through to Lake
Nevan (Bol'soj Ivan). We saw something of their way of life in the previous chapter.

We know of no ethnos, however harsh its living conditions, which is without a
culture beyond the struggle for survival. Nevelers probably sang to the accompaniment of
the dulcimer, which was known to Balts, Finns and Slavs alike. Their songs might have been
an early form of bylina, or else of tetrametric trochaic verses, as sung by both Balts and
Finns. 16

Nor would early Nevelers have been irreligious. The name of the Balts’ thundergod
(Perkūnas, Latvian Pērkūns) became confused with the name of the Slavonic thunder-god
Perun 17 and with the CBF etymon of Finnish perkele ‘the devil’, Estonian põrga ‘hell’ 18.
Thus Nevelers may have worshipped Perun and the rest of a pantheon of deities of mixed

16. For bylina see Bylina. Ed. F.M. Selivanov. M. 1988. For Baltic song see Zinkevičius et al., Where We
Come From, 54 (illustration of kanklės [Baltic dulcimer]), 56, 58. For Finnish song see M. Branch, M. Kuusi,
K. Bosley, Finnish Folk Poetry: Epic, H., 1977, especially the introduction, and in particular p. 63 for an
account of its relationship with Baltic metre. Both Baltic and Finnish song deal with a wide range of themes,
from cosmogony to war, grief and love.
17. See ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, III, 246-247. O.N. Trubčjov’s note in square brackets on p. 247 expands
the Indo-European reflexes as far as Hittite.
18. See Jalo Kalmia, itämerensiomalaisien kielen balttilaiset lainasanan, H., 1936, 147, s.v. perkele. Põrga
may be a backformation. The debasement of the deity is a Christian phenomenon: the heathens’ god is the
Christians’ devil. Cf. what was said above about the derivation of vorozhit’ ‘to shamanize’ from vorog ‘enemy’.
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origin. Indeed, if there were still Baltic-Finnic speakers among them, they probably identified Perun with their own high god Jumala.\textsuperscript{19} We know that his cult survived the conversion of the Rus' to Christianity: his name has been found on what is probably an invocation to or charm against lightning, No. 292 in the corpus of the Novgorod birchbark inscriptions\textsuperscript{20}. This is the oldest piece of writing in any Baltic-Finnic language.

Are there any traces of this old religion in the Nevel' area? We mentioned above three Nevel' toponyms that, taken together, probably recall Finnish shamanism (Czuchnowo, Podczuchonia, Worozyeki). Early religion in north Eurasia had always a strong animistic component. In that unique landscape of forest, marsh, boulder, lake and stream, the forces of nature thrust themselves on humanity’s attention. The Estonians had a reverence for the grass snake, the Saame for oddly-shaped rocks. It is possible that the Nevel’-district village of Dedov Kamen’ (‘Grandfather’s Rock’) represents a memory of some such natural monument, known as a seide. At Plissya, a suburb of Nevel' across the River Jemenka from the main part of the town, there is a spring which has been revered as magically curative for as long as anyone can remember. It rises at the foot of the small hill on which Plissya’s Orthodox church stands. It is ideally clear.

Before the Second World War this spring was protected by a little chapel, but that was demolished after the war. There remained only a concrete ring around the water; people used to throw ‘silver’ coins into it. Perhaps wisely, the present incumbent of the Orthodox church at Plissya has had a new chapel built over the spring. It is a tiny wooden building, solidly built with a shining tin roof. But its style is timelessly Orthodox, that is, it could have been built a hundred or a thousand years ago; it carries an Orthodox cross. It enables those seeking health to collect the water conveniently, and if they continue the old local custom of throwing in a coin to thank the spirit of the spring, the coins can be gathered for the good of the parish. To see that shrine is to be in the presence of a religious observance of

\textsuperscript{19} A byname for Jumala is Ukko or its diminutive Ukkonen; as common nouns the former means ‘old man’ and the latter, a euphemism, ‘thunder [and lightning]’ (see \textit{The Standard Finnish Dictionary}, compiled by Aino Wuolle, Eastbourne and H., 1986, s.v. (414).

considerable age\textsuperscript{21}, and simultaneously to see an example of religious tolerance which Nevel’ and Plissy have often needed.\textsuperscript{22}

From the beginning of the Rus’ historical record \textit{dan’} or tribute is a constant topic. Early Nevelers probably grew accustomed to paying their share of such a tax, and probably as subjected foreigners. Initially this would have been in kind\textsuperscript{23}, most probably in furs but perhaps also in the products of the forest, such as tar and pitch (\textit{djogot’, smola}; cf. Nevel’ VN\textsuperscript{e} Djogtevo and Smol’niki (attested twice)), or of the apiary (Nevel’ VN Červojedy). There is a rough humour in the word for tribute, which means ‘gift’, and also in the early word for money, \textit{bēl’} (‘the white stuff’, i.e. silver), but the joke was probably lost on Nevelers.

We noted above that, while Nevel’ is not attested until 1503, the Jemenka, or the hydronym Jemenec, is attested in 1185, when, according to a terse note in the Novgorod Primary Chronicle, a conflict was resolved there. The three participant powers were, on one side, Novgorod and Smolensk, and on the other Polock.

Polock is the first important town to which Nevel’\textquotesingle s fate is linked, and we need to say something of its early history. From the beginning Polock has a special position among the towns of Rus’, to the point where we might speak of ‘Polockian exceptionalism’. The town was an important staging post on the route from the Baltic to Byzantium, since it was the first sizeable town on the Western Dvina (at its confluence with the Polota).

\textsuperscript{21} Such apparently pagan practices can, of course, arise long after a place has been converted to monotheism. The spiritual impulse seeks the numinous everywhere. Ključevskij long ago christened the coexistence of the old and new religions \textit{pestrota religioznogo soznaniya} ‘the motley nature of religious awareness’. See V.O. Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija. Polnyj kurs lekcij v trex knigax}, Volume 1. M., 1993 (hereafter Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija}, 1), 272; on the following page he notes the colloquial term, \textit{dvojeverije} (‘twyfaith’).

\textsuperscript{22} The history of the chapel over the spring at Plissy was recounted to us by the incumbent, Fr. Vasilij, during an interview with Michael Rose and the author on 27 June 2003. Fr. Vasilij himself was responsible for the reconstruction of a chapel at the same site; the work was carried out by the Nevel’ Town Enterprise, i.e. the town’s direct labour organisation. The description of the spring and chapel is from my own observations during several visits.

\textsuperscript{23} Cf. PG, V, 187: ‘Pervonačal‘ho dan’ nosila natural‘nyj xarakter’ (‘Initially tribute bore the characteristic of being in kind’).
In the second half of the tenth century Polock came under the control of a Scandinavian named Ragnvaldr (Early East Slav Rogvolod"),24 who grasped the importance of the trading centre and entrepôt on the Western Dvina. Rogvolod" allowed himself to be drawn into Kievan dynastic politics. It ended badly for him and his daughter Rog"něd'25 (Ragnheidr); he was killed, she was forced into a ‘marriage by capture’ or glorified rape. Her husband was Vladimir. When after a long and lurid career he was married for the last time (to Anna, daughter of the Byzantine emperor) he released Rog’ned’.

Polock came into violent conflict with Novgorod and Kiev as early as 1021. The prince of Polock, Brjačislaw, marched on Novgorod and occupied it in an attempt to throw off the suzerainty of Kiev26. Kiev sent an expeditionary force and defeated Brjačislaw; but the ambitions of Polock were rewarded: Brjačislaw received the right to the income from Vitebsk and from Usvijaty27. Usvijaty is situated sixty-three kilometres from Nevel’.

Polockian princes were ambitious: that is clear from the dedication of Polock cathedral to St Sophia, Holy Wisdom. For Novgorod and Kiev both had cathedrals dedicated to Holy Wisdom, and the archetype was the great, already ancient, structure in Constantinople, Aghia Sophia (Classical Greek Ηάγια Σοφία).

Even as late as 1021 Nevel’ may have remained isolated in the forest, too insignificant and too far from Polock and Novgorod to attract their attention. If the idea seems far-fetched, let us recall that an entire nationality remained undistinguished by the authorities of Russian, later Soviet, Central Asia until the mid-1950s28.

24. The story is told in PVL, I, 75,23 ff. (pp. 531 ff) and retold in, e.g., I.V. Turčinović, Obozrenije istorii Belorussii s drevneishix vremjov, Mi., 2006 (= idem, SPb., 1857) [hereafter Turčinović, Obozrenije], pp. [25] (39)-29 (43). The first page number cited is from the original edition, printed at the top of the page; the second is that of the modern republication, printed at the bottom (the number on p. 25 (39) is there omitted because this is the first page of a chapter).
25. The princess is usually known to scholarship as Rogneda, before 1917 Rogněda (Rogněda, Rogněda), but Rog’ned’ (Rogněd’) is evidently the authentic version of the name. It is found in the nominative at PVL, I, 79,28 (p. 571).
27. Frojanov, Dvorničenko, Goroda-gosudarstva, 197; PSRL, V, 134; PSRL, VII, SPb., 1987, 328.
28. Namely the Parya. See Bernard Comrie, The Languages of the Soviet Union, Cambridge 1981, 155-166. The Parya are an Indic-speaking people, numbering at the time of Comrie’s research some one thousand persons and resident in the Gissar valley in Tadzhikistan.
The Cathedral of St. Sophia contains, or has contained, two inscriptions which tell us something about the orientation of Polock in terms of where its community stood, not only among the societies of northwestern Rus', but also in the international community of northwestern Europe.

The first of these inscriptions is thought to date from c. 1050 and was found on a stone in the crypt of the cathedral. It says simply: Davyd'. Touma. Mikoula. K"p's'. Touma. These are thought to be the names of craftsmen who worked on building the cathedral29. K"p's' (Къпсь) refers to a native of Kopys' in the Smolensk volost'. Two others are Biblical or Christian (David and Thomas). Mikoula is of Greek origin. The name Mikoula shows the influence of the cult of St. Michael, as a result of which some but not all Slavs confused that name with Greek names beginning with N, such as Nikolaos, Nikēphoros and Nikētēs, giving Mikolai (in later orthography Mikolaj), Mikola, Mikifor and Mikita. Although this ‘mistake’ is often found in colloquial Novgorodian30, it is not typical of formal Rus' texts31. In Polish the phenomenon is universal. One reason for the interference may have been the custom of requiring payment of taxes on St. Michael’s Day. The coincidence of usage with Novgorod is a sign of political realities: soon we will see Novgorodian soldiers in Nevel'.

30. See the glossary in Novgorodskie gramoty, ed. Janin, Zaliznjak, 284, 286. Forms of these names and of their derivatives with initial <M> number twenty-five in all (Mikita (eight examples), Mikitin (1), Mikitca (original Михайла) (1), Mikiforec’ (1), Mikiforko (1), Mikifor’ (5), Mikiško (1), Mikula (4), Mikulino (1), Mikalin (1), Mikulica (1), total 25). There are only three examples with initial N-, all of them forms of the name Nikola (original Никола); one of these is on a rare find from Smolensk.
31. For example, in the Novgorod Primary Chronicle in the younger version s.a. 6694 we find ‘i poslaša s molboju k mitropolitu v Kiev' k” Nikiforu’, while two other major mss., A and T, have the older-sounding ‘nikyforu v“ kyjev”’ (from before the change ky > k) (Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis’ staršego i mladšega izvodov, ed. A.N. Nasonev, M., 1950 [hereafter Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis’, ed. Nasonov], p. 228, including footnote 48). Nor is it characteristic of the PVL; e.g., under the year 6390/882 we find (PVL X 1, 23,20,23,21 (p. 127) (Ostrowski’s own reading)): ‘Na toi mogylě postavil" božnicu svjatago Nikolu’. Examples could be multiplied. Thus at PVL X 1, 55,22 (p. 338), where we find ‘Nikiforov”, the Laurentian, Radziwiłł, Academy, and Hypatian mss. all have N- and only later mss. have M-.
The other inscription from St. Sophia’s was on the cross of Princess St. Jevfrosin'ja. It was written about a century after the stone from the crypt. The princess paid for a precious cross for her monastery in Polock, and on it she had this inscription placed:

+ Въ лъ ь. ь. въ манастиры своиймъ. въ цркви сцто спаса. честное древо: бесцьльно честь. а кованый его злото и серебро и камънья: и живуютъ въ р. гривна... да нь изньсть са из манастьра никогда же...

In the year 6 and 669 [1161] Ofrosin'ja deposits [this] honourable cross in her monastery in the church of the Holy Saviour. The honourable wood is priceless; but its covering is gold and silver and [precious] stones and pearls worth 100 grivna. May it not be carried out of the monastery ever.

One telling point in the inscription is the spelling of the princess’s name: as only an East Slav would spell it, with initial <O>. The influence of South Slav clergy or of one who knew West Slavs, would have given E: where Croats have jezero and Poles jezioro, East Slavs have osepo (ozero). Thus the princess is named as an East Slav. Yet zloto is neither from the colloquial language of early Rus’ (zoloto) nor Church Slavonic (zlato), but a West Slav form. In Polock, and therefore also in Nevel', we are at the boundaries of many spheres of influence.

32. The inscription is given in the original, which uses (as far as we can tell since the the cross was plundered) a mixture of Greek (for numerals) and Cyrillic. Transliteration then becomes pointlessly problematic.
33. The <O> (‘9’), unlike the other three numerals, is not marked as a numeral with ‘
34. The cross was plundered and lost during the German occupation of Polock. The text of the inscription on the cross can be found in Wybör, ed. Lehr-Splawiński, Witkowski, 30. Photographs of the inscription, rather poorly reproduced, can be found in Uladźimir Arloŭ, Edifraščenja Polockaja, Mi., 1992, after p. 64, as also drawings of both sides. Photographs or drawings of the cross, again imperfectly reproduced, can be found also in Polock. Istoričeskij očerk. Ed. P.T. Petrikov et al, Mi., 1987, 41.
35. We must recall that in our transliteration from Cyrillic <I> represents a depalatalized /l/, i.e. a sound like Belorussian- or Lithuanian-Polish /l/ (not [w], in the main a post-war development in modern Poland).
Jefvrosin'ja herself was a woman of distinction, abbess, founder of her own convent and of a monastery, copyist of books and possibly a translator. In later life she travelled to Jerusalem and died there. She was the first female saint of Rus' to be canonized 36.

The names from the crypt of Polock cathedral and the inscription on the cross all testify to the advent of literacy as an adjunct of Christianity. We should note that writing facilitated a major change in land-holding arrangements. Ownership of land other than for the immediate use of the groups of people living on it becomes much easier with literacy. The change did not come immediately. As V.L. Janin reminds us,

Drevnejšiij variant «Russkoj Pravdy», otnošenija ko vremeni Jaroslava Mudrogo, ne znajet častnoj sobstvennosti na zemlju. [...] V severnoj Russi složenije votčinnoj sistemy načinajetsja ne raneje rubeža XI-XII vv. 37

The oldest version of the Russian 38 Lawcode, which dates to the time of Jaroslav the Wise, does not know private ownership of land. [...] In northern Rus' the formation of the patrimonial system begins no earlier than the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

At some moment Nevel' was finally drawn into the orbit of Polock. We may suspect that those who had previously worked the land stayed on, working it still but responsible to incomer-landowners.

As for the trade that was the lifeblood of Polock, there is one concrete piece of evidence that Nevel' participated in international trade at this time, on however modest a scale. One of the most attractive exhibits in the Museum of the History of the Town of Nevel' is a beautiful imported figurine of bronze overlaid with pewter. It represents a girl dancing with arms gracefully raised. The face and hair are vivaciously modelled, the folds of her clothing are deftly sketched in. She wears bangles on her arms (or her sleeves are

38. Janin may have intended 'of Rus', but he did not make the distinction, and I have translated accordingly.
hooped). Her skirt is knee-length with an acutely triangular apron or panel let into it, scored with lines, the apex pointing downwards towards the knees, possibly to hint at fecundity. The piece is of west European origin and is thought to date from the twelfth century.

In 1185 Polock found itself in conflict with Prince Davyd of Smolensk and his son, Mstislav of Novgorod. ‘And towards the winter Davyd advances on Polock with both the Novgorodians and the Smolenskies, and, having made peace, they turned back...’ and the sentence ends na Jemn'ci (на Емныци) in the Synodal ms. of the Older Recension of the Novgorod Primary Chronicle and na Jemnič (на Ёмницѣ) (in the Commission ms. of the Younger Recension). Mss. A and T of the Younger Recension have na jemnici (на ёмници).

Where precisely did they turn back? The traditional answer has been ‘at Jemeneč’. In the nineteenth century Aleksandr Maksimovič Sementovskij-Kurillo stated that version without qualification. This version is given by L.M. Maksimovskaja and in the gazetteer to the standard edition of the Novgorod Primary Chronicle. Jemeneč is now a dying village across the lake from Nevel', perhaps a dozen kilometres away.

I.V. Turčinovič, however, took a different view. He wrote: ‘no Połočane, vstretiv ix bliz nynešnego Nevelja na rečke Jemenke darami, ostanovili groznoje šestvije mirom, na

39. See the illustration at the beginning of the present chapter, which was kindly made available by L.M. Maksimovskaja. The dating and provenance are taken from the caption to the illustration in Nevel'skaja starina, ed. L.M. Maksimovskaja, 20. They were made by a representative of the Hermitage Museum [personal communication from L.M.M.].
40. Year of a solar eclipse and of the raid on the Polovcians by Prince Igor' of Novgorod Seversk.
41. Novgorod Primary Chronicle, Younger Recension, folio 117; see Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis', ed. Nasonov, 228.
42. Ibid., footnote 25.
43. See: A.M. Sementovskij, Nevel' in Pamjatnaja knižka Vitebskoj gubernii na 1864. SPb., 1864, 142.
44. Nevel'skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 185.
46. It still shows signs of former glory, for a branch of the distinguished Jevreinov family lived here in the nineteenth century; but the avenue of lime trees is both gap-toothed and overgrown, and the Jevreinov graves are hard to find amid thick foliage.
uslovljaj nam neizvestnym (‘but the Polockers, having met them with gifts near modern Nevel’ on the little River Jemenka, halted the threatening advance in peace, on conditions unknown to us’). The question imposes itself: where exactly did this encounter take place?

I suggest that the two foreign armies halted, as Turčinović believed, not at the village of Jemenec but on the ‘little River Jemenka’, so that the Nevel’ area is established immediately as a place of strategic importance.

As mentioned above, the two main readings are на йемени and на йемени. In order to choose between the readings we need to decide which reading is preferable from a palaeographic-linguistic point of view. We saw above that East Slav, including Old Russian, changes Common Slavonic initial 'e' to o-. It follows that the initial E- of the reading in A and T is very unlikely to be correct. If, on the other hand, a word began with Ƅ (jê), the change to o- did not occur. In this respect at least, the Younger Recension reading is preferable. Further, as we saw in Chapter Two, if, and only if, we accept that the complex of names with Jemen-/Jamen-/Jann- was borrowed into Krivićian with þës (ь), we can find an enlightening etymology for all these Nevel’ placenames.

If we now go further and take it that the grammatical ending is also preferable, it follows that the noun in question cannot be Jemenec. The nominative in Cyrillic would have been jëmen’c’ (йменьц), which implies that this was a -jo-stem noun. The locative case ending for -jo-stem nouns is correctly -i (Cyrillic -u), i.e. the ending in the rejected reading. The historically correct locative ending for -a-stems is -ë, i.e. ь. When this ending followed an original -k-, the -k- changes to -c-, i.e. Cyrillic -k- becomes -i- (just as -k- becomes -c- in the modern Polish locative). Deviations are extremely rare, e.g. there are none at all in 39 examples of this case ending in the Paleja of the Aleksandr Nevskij Lavra, examined by A.V.

47. Turčinović, Obozrenije, p. 46 (60)]. The first page number cited is from the original edition, printed at the top of the page; the second is that of the modern republication, printed at the bottom. This page carries a citation number (59) for a footnote; but the reference should be to note 95 on p. 267/281. Citing Karamzin, Turčinović reads на Єменці, which is an illogical basis for his interpretation (see below). Annotations by Karamzin have been found in the Academy edition of the Novgorod Primary Chronicle, which here reads на емени (на ємени), as does T (see Novgorodskaja pervaja letozra, ed. Nasonov, 10).
48. Since ь eventually became homophonous with Cyrillic e, it also became pre-iotized. I have transliterated according to the principles set out in the Note on Transliteration.
Dybo⁴⁹. Thus на jëm’nìcë (на тёмныиъ) would be morphologically normal Old Russian for ‘on the Jemenka’, but abnormal Old Russian for ‘at Jemenec’⁵⁰.

From this arises a problem of interpretation. In seventeenth-century texts the river’s name usually appears without the diminutive infix -k-, taking forms such as nad Rzeką Jemieną. We should recall that the hydronym occurs in three basic variants. They are:

(1) Jemenka (Яменка), Polish Jamienka, applied to the watercourse from Lake Jameneck, in the far south of modern Nevel' district, to Lake Jemenec.

(2) Jemenka (Еменка), Polish Jemienka, now the name of two stretches, viz. from Lake Jemenec to the southern end of Lake Nevel' and from the northern end of Lake Nevel onwards. This variant becomes increasingly common in the eighteenth century.

(3) Jemiena (with many variants in early modern Polish orthography), applying to the same two stretches as (2).

It seems that we are faced here with an early example of the diminutive version (2), and that it is applied here to the northern reach, i.e. close to the settlement at Nevel'. Here there would have been some open space, suitable for a confrontation.

Thus in 1185 the armies of two neighbouring princes faced that of Polock across the River Jemenka, most probably at or close to Lake Nevel'. In this part of the Slav lands there is a pattern of battles fought on rivers, from the time in 1018 when King Bolesław the Bold of Poland and his ally Sviatopolk faced Jaroslav on the Bug⁵¹. In the northwestern area that concerns us, we may recall the battles of the Sudoma (1021), Nemiga (1067), Gzen' (1069)

⁵⁰. All who have engaged with Old Russian texts will concur that we can hardly speak of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ forms.
⁵¹. PVL, X 2, 143,3-143,9 (pp. 1138-1140).
Berezina (1119), Dvina (1165), Drut' (1169), Vercha\textsuperscript{52} (1386), Šelon' (1471), Vedroša (1500) and Orša (1067, 1514), all fought on rivers\textsuperscript{53}.

The chronicler chose to identify the location of the encounter without mentioning the settlement at Nevel', most probably because that settlement was unknown to him, whereas the watercourses were known: they were transport arteries through almost virgin forest. On the other hand the Novgorod chronicler seems to take ‘on the Yenemenka’ as a reference requiring no clarification, which would imply longstanding familiarity. In all probability Nevelers had by 1185 lived at the margins of Polock for a century or longer.

The 1185 incident at or near Nevel' was resolved peacefully, but by this time Polock raided some neighbouring community almost every year: for example, in 1201 it was Lithuania, in 1203 Livonia\textsuperscript{54} (an attack on the Knights’ fort at Vekšūll), in 1206 Riga\textsuperscript{55} and in 1210 Ungannia\textsuperscript{56}. Annual raids against one’s neighbours had now become a way of life in this part of northern Europe, and Polock seems to have thrown itself into the practice with a will. Others were raiding their neighbours at the same time. Warfare as an important element in the Lithuanian way of life is particularly well attested. Over the years 1201-1263 Lithuanians made seventy-five forays against other peoples: twenty-six against Livonia, thirty-five against Rus' and fourteen against Poland\textsuperscript{57}. It is significant that the beginnings of

\textsuperscript{52} The name is given here in Latin; see Relationes Status Dioecesium in Magna Ducatu Lithuaniae [Reports on the State of the Dioceses in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania], Volume II, ed. Paulus Rabikauskas SJ, Rome: Academia Lituana Catholica Scientiarum, 1978 (Fontes Historiae Lithuaniae, Volume II), 288.

\textsuperscript{53} See Turčinovič, Obozrenije, pp. 30 [44], 31 [45], 32 [46]; V.L. Janin, Srednevekovoj Novgorod, 144-145 (battle of the Gzen'); Turčinovič, Obozrenije, 38 [52], 44 [58], 45 [59]; V.L. Janin, Srednevekovoj Novgorod, 144 (battle of the Nemiga); Mariusz Markiewicz, Historia Polski 1492-1795, Kraków 2002 (hereafter Markiewicz, Historia Polski), 320, 330. For the slaughter on the Šelon' see Klučevskij, Russkaja istorija, 1, 418.


\textsuperscript{55} Chronicle, tr. Brundage, 62-64.

\textsuperscript{56} Chronicle, tr. Brundage, 95.

\textsuperscript{57} See the table in Žigmantas Kiuapa, Jūratė Kiuapienė, Albinas Kuncavičius, The History of Lithuania before 1795, V., 2000 [hereafter Kiuapa \textit{et al.}, History of Lithuania], 45. S.C. Rowell prints figures for slave-raids over the century 1277-1376: twenty-four of them are mentioned in various sources; the places raided were also numerous, and the numbers captured, where specified (viz. in fourteen cases), vary from seventy to 5000; in nine cases the figure is a thousand or more. See: S.C. Rowell, Lithuania Ascending: A pagan empire within East-Central Europe, 1295-1345, Cambridge, 1994 [hereafter S.C. Rowell, Lithuania Ascending]), 74.
Lithuanian military ambition predate the Mongol invasion by many years. Motives included slaving and response to Christian aggression.

In sum, this period sees a complete breakdown of peaceful coexistence between north-eastern European peoples. Each community became, in Rees Davies’s phrase, ‘a society habituated to war’.\(^{58}\) War was an annual event, and the violence was exacerbated by the arrival of two crusading orders: one in Livonia, one in the lands which became Lithuania. Yet, paradoxically, trade and war seem to have gone hand in hand. Different communities fought their neighbours, then made peace and set up a trade route, with liberties and excise duties specified by treaty. From the treaty of 1229 between Smolensk, Riga and Visby (the ‘Gothic Shore’) we learn that it renewed an existing agreement\(^{59}\).

During the first decade and a half of the thirteenth century Polock had enjoyed internal political stability under its aggressive prince Vladimir Davydovič. He conducted a foreign policy which manoeuvred between German Knights, Hansa merchants, Livonians, Lithuanians and Estonians. In peace and war that policy was directed towards the enrichment of Polock. We may wonder to what extent that enrichment was personal to the prince and to what extent the free population of the town also profited. \textit{A fortiori}, the people of Nevel’ are unlikely to have been beneficiaries.

\textquote{In the same year, for our sins,} wrote the Novgorod chronicler, ‘came heathens unknown, whom no one knows well as to who they are or whence they emerged, or what their language is or of what tribe they are, or what their faith is; but they are called Tatars...’\(^{60}\) The ‘same year’ was 1224. An alliance of Rus’ princes and Polovcians was defeated on the River Kalka.

\footnotesize
59. ‘Iz rigy jëxalu na gochyi ber’go.lamo tverditi mir’ ... \textquote{outv’rditi mir}’ (‘From Riga they journeyed to the Gothic Shore [= Visby on Gotland], there to try to renew the agreement. They did renew the agreement’). See \textit{Wybóir}, ed. Lehr-Splawiński, Witkowski, 31. The spelling of the treaty is notorious, partly because the fall of the jërs was in full swing (on the other hand the Riga ms. of the treaty is a thing of austere beauty).
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by the invaders, who were led not by Tatars but by Mongols. According to Henry of Livonia, who gives the date as 1223,61 ‘the kings of Smolensk, of Polock and of other Russian states sent emissaries to Riga to seek peace after a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Tatars’. The sins mentioned by the chronicler were compounded by the divisions within the Kievan system resulting from the fragmentation of its subordinate principalities. Even before the advent of the Mongol inundation, Suzdal’ had succeeded in shifting the centre of gravity within Rus’. When the nomad wave broke on the lands of Rus’, that process was accelerated, leading eventually to the rise of Moscow. As for Kiev, whose direct influence on Nevel’ can never have been large, ‘podnimajas’ posle tatarskogo razgroma, [Kiev] uvidel sebja pograničnym gorodkom čuzdogo gosudarstva, ječeminutno gotovym razbežat’šja ot nasilija zavojevatelej”62 (‘as it picked itself up after being sacked by the Tatars, [Kiev] saw itself a frontier townlet in an alien state and ready at every moment to flee in all directions before the violence of the conquerors’).

The changes brought about by the Mongol invasion, and the subsequent formation of the ‘Golden Horde’ or Qipčaq Khanate, affected Rus’ for centuries, and have not yet ceased to affect the successor-states.63 The Mongols exercised broad control through their junior allies, the Turkic-speaking Tatars, and it was the latter who held sway over the destinies of Rus’ for some centuries. The destruction of the remaining authority of Kiev created a power-vacuum. Over several generations that vacuum was filled by Lithuania – a power already highly ambitious, as we have seen. For a moment in the late fourteenth century it seemed that Lithuania would even rival Mongolia, until the latter defeated the former on the Vorskla in August 1399.64

‘[T]he circumstances of the Lithuanian invasions remain obscure,’65 and it is not known exactly how Polock came under the ægis of Lithuania. In its time Polock had formed alliances both against and with the Lithuanians. The core of the Lithuanian state was

62. Klučevskij, Russkaja istorija, 1, 298.
63. See: David Morgan, The Mongols. O., 1990, 141-145. One effect in Nevel’ is the posting-station system (Mongolian yum, whence Russian jam, jansčik): the Museum of the History of the Town of Nevel’ is housed in one, and the next is at Doloszy, twenty kilometres to the northwest.
65. S.C. Rowell, Lithuania Ascending, 22.
‘Aukštaitija’ (the term is modern 66). Its elite was astute in sharing and distributing power. Thus important families such as the Radvilai, the eventual lords of Nevel’, were brought into the inner circle of Aukštaitijan power to serve the grand ducal power structure. The Radvilai, who early held land near Nevel (see below), were privileged under grand ducal authority, and in the long run – the same ‘long run’ where we are all dead – that privilege was abused to the ultimate degree, when the Radziwills had at least two armies and the Commonwealth but one. 67 Other instruments were also used, as identified by S.C. Rowell: ‘the familiar processes of marriage, murder and military conquest’ 68.

Lithuania expanded under its only king, Mindaugas, who for reasons of state first adopted and then repudiated Christianity. He made too many enemies and was murdered in 1263, the conspirators including some princes of Rus 69. But Lithuanian expansion was carried forward by Traidenis (c. 1270-1282) and by Vytenis (1286-1316), whose annexations included Polock and its volost’ (and therefore Nevel’), apparently in the year 1307 70. A century or so later the empire reached the Black Sea to the north and west of the Crimean Khanate.

S.C. Rowell warns against ‘the rather starry-eyed notion that Lithuanian expansion was almost thrust upon the Grand Duke by Rus’ cities which preferred incorporation into the Grand Duchy to independence’ 71. Indeed, when we examine the external relations of Polock, we find that the Lithuanian empire was capable of imposing its will very forcefully. On 17 September 1386 Grand Prince Jurij Svjatoslavič of Smolensk was obliged to assent to a treaty 72 under which he was to be at peace with the friends of the King of Poland and his brother the Grand Duke Skirigailo and ‘not at peace’ (не мирень) with their enemies. ‘I so Ondrejem” Polockin” i s Poločany miru ne deržati”; ‘Nor am I to maintain peace with

66. Zinkevičius et al., Where We Come From, 129.
67. Jerzy Łukowski notes that ‘In the 1740s and 1750s, Michael Radziwill probably had more troops than the state in his private army of 10,000’ (see his Liberty’s Folly. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Eighteenth Century, 1697-1795. L. and New York, 1991, 112). At that same time the lord of Newel was Hieronim Florian Radziwill, and he had an army of between 6,000 and 10,000, including an inland naval flotilla. See Hieronima Floriana Radziwilli Diariusze i pisma różne, ed. Maria Brzezina. W., 1998, 8.
68. S.C. Rowell, Lithuania Ascending, 51.
69. Ibid.
70. S.C. Rowell, Lithuania Ascending, 83-84; the date is recorded in footnote 6 on p. 83.
71. S.C. Rowell, Lithuania Ascending, 93.
72. No doubt in the aftermath of the battle on the River Vercha (see above). The text can be found in RIBIAK. Volume II, SPb., 1875, column 7.
Ondrej of Polock or with the Polockers.\textsuperscript{73} Polock had incurred the displeasure of Lithuania, which did not hesitate to impose on others the duty to join in the punishment. Pre-imperial Lithuania's main form of foreign trade had been violent abduction for slavery; it was hardly likely to prove a model of the benign empire.

By the time Lithuanian power had succeeded in spanning Europe from Baltic to Euxine, an event had occurred of the greatest significance for the empire, for central and eastern Europe in general, and for Nevel'. In 1385 Jogaila Algirdaitis decided that Poland was worth a mass. In the end this was to bring Polish speech, faith and culture to Nevel', never indeed (as we will seek to demonstrate) so powerfully as to eliminate Nevelers' native speech, faith or culture, but enough to threaten and compromise them.

There is one piece of evidence that by the second quarter of the fifteenth century Nevel' was a place of some significance, in that it had retained the right to judge its own lawsuits. According to the Charter of Polock, ‘...na Česvěte vojevodnym sluga\textsuperscript{a} ne suditi, suditi\textsuperscript{t} tivunu po staro\textsuperscript{i} poš"line, tak" že na Nevli su\textsuperscript{r}[]ji ne byti i po vse\textsuperscript{i} volosti Polocko\textsuperscript{o} suditi vojevode na gorode\textsuperscript{w} (‘Now at Čersvěta [?]\textsuperscript{y} the palatine’s servants are not to judge[,] the thane [tivunu] is to judge according to the old rate[,] likewise at Nevel' there is to be no judge[,] and throughout the whole volost of Polock the palatine is to judge in the gorod’).

Xoroškevič and Zimin comment:

Osoboje položenije v sudebnom otošenii zanimal Nevel': ‘Takže na Nevli sud'ji ne byti [...] suditi vojevode na gorode’. Ĉeto ustanovljenije, boleje pozdnje sravnitel'no so stat'joj o sude na Čersvjate, prinadležit nesomnennom 30-ym godam XV v.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., col. 8.
\textsuperscript{74} The full text can be found in: PG, III, 85-91, N\textsuperscript{o} 323. The passage in question is on p. 90.
\textsuperscript{75} As usual in the Slavonic languages, the locative or prepositional singular case does not predict unequivocally the nominative singular.
\textsuperscript{76} PG, V, 24.
A particular position was occupied in the judicial respect by Nevel': ‘Nor may there be a judge in Nevel' [...] the palatine is to judge in the gorod [на городе]’. This arrangement, later by comparison with the article about the court at Čersvja[t[a?]], undoubtedly belongs to the 1430s.

If we accept the date suggested, it follows that we have here a kind of reference to Nevel' that is some seven decades earlier than the traditional ‘first mention’ of the locality in the Lithuanian-Muscovite peace treaty of 1503. Moreover we should juxtapose that backward extension of Nevel' history with what Z.Ju. Kopysskij writes about the development of town privileges in twenty-five Belorussian towns:77

V rassmotrennych nami žalovannyh gramotax [...] neizmenno prisustvuyut torgovye privilegii, [...] osvoboždenije iz-pod vlasti i podсудnosti velikoknjažeskoj i častnovладel'českoj administracii, ustanovlenije gorodu prava sobstvennoj sudebnoj i administrativnoj vlasti, t.е. samoupravlenija.78

In the charters we have examined there are always stipulations on trading privileges, [...] exemption from grand-ducal and private power and jurisdiction, [and] the establishment in the town of the right to its own juridical and administrative power, i.e. self-administration.

In the light of Kopysskij’s analysis it seems that as long ago as the 1430s Nevel' not only existed but also enjoyed some privileges compared with the general run of localities within the Polock voïvodstvo. The privilege of being judged by the local thane fits well with the thesis that there was at this time a revival of the powers of thanes in the 1430s – what Xoroškevič and Zimin term ‘vremennym vozroždenijem roli tiuna в kačestve official'nogo lica, upravljajuščego gorodom’79 (‘a temporary renaissance of the role of the tiun (thane) as an official personage governing a town’).

77. Nevel' is not among them – an example of the general historiographical amnesia affecting Nevel', especially after 1924.
Could Nevel' have indeed been something like a town during so early a period as the 1430s? At first glance it seems improbable, given that Zygmunt III Waza granted Newel a Magdeburg charter on 23 March 1623, almost two centuries later. However, that charter was certainly the acceptance of a fait accompli, for, as we shall see when we analyse the first Radziwill inventory extant, Nevel' was already de facto a town, since it had a market, churches, town walls, and an extensive network of streets: not a village. That development must have taken place over a matter of decades at the least. We would need to suggest an alternative explanation for the special status of Nevel' in the Charter of Polock. On balance it seems probable that the town charter of 1623 was, in effect, a renewal or supersession of an earlier document, lost perhaps with so much else when the Polock archives were destroyed (see below).

How, at so early a stage, might Nevel' have merited a degree of privilege? In its later, recorded, history, it is the town's position as a frontier settlement that gives Nevel' such importance as it has. The reasons are both military and economic; the economic reasons include, as we shall see, the export and import of luxury goods across the border, and smuggling. We shall see below that in 1494 the border between (Polock and) Lithuania and Muscovy ran between Nevel' and Velikije Luki, the nearest town, situated some sixty kilometres to the northeast. Further, that treaty defines that boundary as 'the old border'. It looks extremely probable that by the 1430s, when, putatively, Nevel's privileged position had been previously recorded, Nevel' was already a border town. In all probability, then, Nevel' owed its special position in the second quarter of the fifteenth century to its geopolitical position.
Polock had long lived by trade: if we examine extant documents referring to the town and its volost\textsuperscript{80}, we find that, of seventy-two documents reproduced in *Polockije gramoty*, Volume II, from the years 1465-1506, forty-five relate directly to trade, specifically to trade with Riga\textsuperscript{81}. When, however, we turn to Volume III, which covers the years 1506-1511, we find that only three\textsuperscript{82} of sixty-one relate directly to trade. On the other hand the number of documents relating to land-holding, serf-holding, and the like, is now much greater. Between 1465 and 1506 (i.e. to the death of Aleksander) slightly more than one such text per annum is extant; for the period 1506-1511, i.e. the beginning of the reign of Zygmunt I, we have thirty-six examples, about six for each year.

These facts do not mean, however, that Polock was no longer an important trading centre and had become primarily an agricultural town. A good number of the later documents relate to monopolies granted to individuals, i.e. to a controlled type of trade\textsuperscript{83}. Others refer to grants of land\textsuperscript{84}, of serfs with land\textsuperscript{85} or of messengers (*putnyje ljudi*)\textsuperscript{86}, grants made by the Grand Duke of Lithuania to individuals who had deserved his favour. We can conclude, therefore, that trade remained important to Polock; that the Lithuanian government had assumed an important rôle in that trade; that agriculture, including bee-keeping, was still important, perhaps increasingly so; and that land was now held on a feudal basis, serfs being treated as chattels. As the records of land-holding become more frequent, we are brought closer and closer to Nevel'.

\textsuperscript{80} The corpus of extant Polock documents consists of those that were \textit{not} in the Polotsk archives, for those were destroyed during Stefan Batory’s campaign of 1579, during which Nevel’ was captured (again). The thrust of the surviving material is certainly skewed. Much of it comes from Riga, whence in part the emphasis on trade.

\textsuperscript{81} *PG*, II (e.g. nos. 124, 125, 126, 127, 130...).

\textsuperscript{82} *PG*, III, nos. 259, 301 and 309.

\textsuperscript{83} *PG*, III, no. 281, on the Polock wax monopoly; no. 296, where Avraam Jezofowić Rebičković rents the right to run taverns in Polock; no. 300, where we find the same entrepreneur running the wax and salt concessions at Polock (early examples of Jewish enterprise in Polock from the first decade of the sixteenth century; Jews are recorded in Nevel’ only from 1700).

\textsuperscript{84} See, e.g., ibid., nos. 269, 275, 288, 289, etc.

\textsuperscript{85} E.g. ibid., Nos. 273 and 278 (to both of which further reference will be made in Chapter Four), 277, 285, 286, 287, 320, 329.

\textsuperscript{86} E.g. ibid., 310, 316, 326; 327 (to which further reference will be made in Chapter Four); 328.
Thus on 22 April 1475 Grand Duke Casimir of Lithuania granted Pan Ostafej Korsokovič [sic] a putnyj čolovek, named Mjakal, who lived at Lake Jazno ‘in Polock povet’. Jazno is part of the modern Nevel' district, a little less than forty kilometres west of the town. Ostafej was the son of Vasilij (Wasył), for his relative Ivan Zinov'jevič, and for the latter’s grandson Ivan Mixalovič, see next chapter. The Korsakoviči or Korsak were long associated with the Nevel’ area.

To the northeast of Nevel’, the Muscovite Grand Prince, Ivan III, had made raiding an instrument of policy. Over the years 1478-1489 Moscow continued its raids.

By now Ivan had finally settled accounts with Novgorod, enriching Muscovy with all the territories formerly controlled by the old republic, including Velikije Luki, the nearest town to Nevel’. It may be that Ivan III (nicknamed ‘the Great’) found the northern republic a dangerous model and rival to centripetal princely power: as O.V. Martyšin writes: ‘Soxraneënije novgorodskix voľnostej stalo prepjaststvijem na puti formirovanija centralizovannogo Russkogo gosudarstva’ (‘The preservation of Novgorodian liberties had become an obstacle on the path to the formation of a centralized Russian state’). Martyšin adds, however, that ‘sobiratelje Rusi ne sledujet idealizirovat’, takže kak i pravjaščuju verxušku Novgorodskoj respubliki’ (‘the assemblers of Rus’ should not be idealized, just as they are verxušku Novgorodskoj respubliki’).

---

87. PG, II, No. 156, 49-50. ‘u Polockom povete’, i.e. у Полоцком повете (all sic, with y from Common Slavonic i'y, without u' (u') after m' (m'), and with e twice instead of é (é) in povete (п模特ь)).
88. See Krzysztof Pietkiewicz, Wielkie księstwo litewskie pod rządami Aleksandra Jagiellończyka, Poznań, 1995 (hereafter Pietkiewicz, Wielkie księstwo litewskie), family tree, 141.
89. At least six people from this clan are noted in the Nevel inventories. The last is mentioned in the last inventory, which I date to 1767 (see Chapter Six of the present thesis for my re-dating of this document): AR XXV 2631/1. Pan Ignacy Korsak, governor [horodniczy] of Brześć, appears there on p. 1 as the tenant of all Nevel, i.e. he takes part of the income from Nevel town and country and pays the rest to Prince Radziwill.
90. See the map on p. 97 of M.M. Krom, Mež Rus’ju i Litvoj. Pogranichnye zemli v sisteme russko-litovskix otnošenij konca XV–pervoj treti XVI v., M., 2010 (hereafter Krom, Mež Rus’ju i Litvoj).
93. Martyšin is summarizing here, and not necessarily endorsing this view, or indeed its presuppositions.
idealized, any more than the ruling elite of the Novgorodian republic’). This is good advice.\textsuperscript{93}

In reality Ivan III merely remained true to his policy of expansion. What had changed was the nature of the territories he sought to bring under his aegis. Hitherto, as Ključevskij reminds us, the grand princes of Muscovy had dealt with ‘tesnym krugom svojej že bratii, drugix russkix knjazej, velikix i udeľnyx, da tatarami’ (‘the restricted circle of their own ilk, the other Russian princes, grand and appanage, and also the Tatars’)\textsuperscript{94}. Now nothing intervened between the Muscovy of Ivan III and the Lithuanian empire, the greater part of whose population spoke an East Slav language and confessed a religion like those of Muscovy. Before and during Ivan III’s time, numbers of principalities had transferred their allegiance to Muscovy, sometimes voluntarily, sometimes cajoled or in part forced.\textsuperscript{95} Ivan’s raiding policy, aimed at accelerating this process, represents a military extension of diplomacy.

A crucial moment had been reached. During its ascent Lithuania had been able to pick off the cities formerly dependent on Kiev one at a time. Now the empire found itself face to face with a new power. The two began to push at one another, and Lithuania found itself slowly yielding ground to Moscow. For us, though, the issue is that Nevel’ is drawn into the historical record by that struggle, as we shall see.

In 1488 a crisis arose over Velikije Luki. This town, Nevel’’s neighbour, had been jointly administered by Novgorod and Lithuania. ‘Osobyj status imejut [Velikije] Luki, upravljajemyje novgorodskimi i litovskimi velikoknjažeskimi tiunami na paritetnoj osnove...’\textsuperscript{96} (‘A special status applies to [Velikije] Luki, which is jointly governed by

\textsuperscript{93} For a classic expression of the ‘gathering of Rus’ see Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija}, Volume 1, 430. For a rollicking denunciation, see the foreword to the Belarusian historian A.Je. Taraš’s \textit{Vojny Moskovskoj Rusi s Velikim knjazestvom Litovskim i Rečju Posполитoj}. Second edition. M., Mi., 2006 (hereafter Taraš, \textit{Vojny Moskovskoj Rusi}), 3-6.

\textsuperscript{94} Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija}, Volume 1, 430.

\textsuperscript{95} The topic is explored in detail in Krom, \textit{Mež Rus’ju i Litvoj}, 43-153. Ključevskij lists a considerable number in \textit{Russkaja istorija}, 1, on 428-429. Some will be found in Polish transliteration in Grzegorz Błaszczyk, \textit{Litwa na przełomie średniowieczia i nowożytności 1492-1569}, Poznań, 2002 (hereafter Błaszczyk, \textit{Litwa na przełomie}), 22.

Novgorodian and Lithuanian grand-ducal thanes on a basis of parity')\textsuperscript{97}. Muscovy now holding power beyond the border, Lithuanian hopes for a continuation of this arrangement were decisively dashed.

On 18 March a letter from King Casimir (Kazimierz) of Poland was read to Grand Duke Ivan III by the former's envoy, Timofej Mosalskij\textsuperscript{98}. In it the king complained of Ivan's incursions into Velikije Luki. The fates of Velikije Luki and Nevel' were already intertwined, and both would be bones of contention (if we can imagine intertwining bones). The king complained that 'you are sending governors [naměšnikov'] there on your behalf, which governors for a long time heretofore had not frequented the place on behalf of Great Novgorod; and for this reason it is prejudicial [škodno] for our tribute-gatherers and therefore they are not paying in full even that income which was wont to come to our forebears and to us ourselves'\textsuperscript{99}.

No sovereign state can willingly tolerate such interference in its tax-gathering activities; finance is the key to political power, or was in ninth-century China at least, and, we may feel, also in fifteenth-century Eastern Europe. When Ivan enforced what declining Novgorod had been unable to, he struck at a great vein of power, at once empowering himself and disempowering the Lithuanian empire. Nor could Casimir ignore the matter. Small wonder that this grievance and many others culminated in the war of 1493-1494.\textsuperscript{100}

The peculiar status of Velikije Luki is part of a wider problem, which has been analysed in detail by the doyen of Novgorod scholars, V.L. Janin. At one time he considered that some of the lands adjoining Nevel' constituted the core of ancient Novgorod's princely domain.\textsuperscript{101} Later he concluded that he was mistaken. The special status of these lands, whereby they belonged to Novgorod but paid tax to Lithuania, was the result of an earlier

\textsuperscript{97}. The adjectives are plural, so that it is unclear whether successive thanes on both sides are referred to, or pairs of thanes holding office simultaneously on both sides.

\textsuperscript{98}. The transliteration is from the Middle Russian original, as reproduced in SIRIO (citation below), with the anachronistic use of i kratkoie. One would have expected Mosal'skoi [Mosal'skoi]. On Mosalski (Mosal'skoi) and his career see Krom, \textit{Meř Rus'ju i Litujoj}, 64. This family was still important in Belorussia on the eve of the first partition; see Chapter Six of the present thesis.

\textsuperscript{99}. SIRIO, Volume 35. No. 4, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{100}. Błaszczyk sees princely deflections as the immediate cause of the war. See his \textit{Litwa na przełomie}, 22.

special relationship with Smolensk and Polock. 102 That relationship in its turn resulted from the fact that originally Smolensk had granted those lands to the descendants of Prince Mstislav Vladimirovič. 103 When Lithuania became the successor-state to Polock and Smolensk, the arrangement became internationalized. At all events, it is clear that the marginality of Nevel' antedates the period of international boundaries in the modern or even early modern sense. Nevel' was on the edge of two principalities and a republic. Polock had long been marginal to Kievan Rus', and Novgorod became so.

At the end of the war, in February 1494, Lithuania renounced its claim to Vjaz'ma and the lands on the Upper Oka. Among the guarantees sworn by Grand Duke Aleksander of Lithuania was not to interfere with the lands of Novgorod the Great and Pskov. In the treaty of that date the boundary of these lands is given as follows:

A rubez' No'goroč'kim volost'äm, LUkam" Velikiäm, i Ržove, i Xolmskomu pogostu, i Velile, i Lopastice, i BučU, i inyäm volost'äm, vsejč zemli No'goroč'kieje, s Li'voju, i s poločeny, i s vi'bljany, i s torop'any, zemli i vody, po staromu rUbežU

Now the boundary for the possessions of Novgorod, for Luki Velikie, and Ržova, and Xolmskij Pogost, and Velila, and Lopastica, and Bučec, and other possessions, of the whole land of Novgorod, with the Polockers, and the Vi'tebskers, of land and water, [are to be] along the old boundary.

Thus for the moment the frontier between the two states runs northeast of Nevel' (which has still not been mentioned explicitly in any contemporary source).

102. The extent of the lands in question is calculated by Skrynnikov as ‘boleje 2000 obež’ (‘more than 2000 obež’). See R.G. Skrynnikov, Carstvo terrora. SPb., 1992, 70. An obež (either accentuation is possible) was a Novgorodian unit of land measurement for taxation purposes, based on the ploughing capacity of a peasant with one horse. See ESRJ, III, 99, s.v. obėža, obės.


104. This formula occurs passim in the many treaties between Lithuania and Muscovy or between the Rzeczpospolita and Russia, sometimes in this incorrect form (zemli i vody (zemli u vodi)) and sometimes correctly as zemli i vodi (zemli u vodi) ‘on land and on water’. These are forms of the locative case, surviving from before the time when the addition of prepositions such as na (na) and v (v) became universal. As speakers of East Slav dialects forgot the old usage they came to think that zemli (zemll) was a genitive and remodelled the phrase accordingly.
To cement the settlement Grand Duke Aleksander marries Ivan III's daughter; but her father uses the marriage to foment religious dissension in Lithuania\textsuperscript{105}. This may be unfair to the Muscovite princess, for in 1503 Jelena publicly defended her husband from her father's wrath\textsuperscript{106}. Yet the difficulties experienced by Jelena in practising her religion foreshadow a problem that became important in Nevel' and in Lithuania generally.\textsuperscript{107} In the interim another war had been fought. On 14 July 1500 Ivan's army destroyed a Lithuanian force on the River Vedroša\textsuperscript{108} (the student of Nevel' history will note again the strategic significance of rivers in these borderland wars).

In late August of the following year Lithuanian's allies of the Livonian Order under Plettenberg delivered a victory outside Izborsk,\textsuperscript{109} but by then Aleksander had been distracted. On 25 June 1501 he had heard of the death of the Polish king, his elder brother Jan Olbracht. According to Papée, 'Aleksander nic a nie wojskowego poczucia nie miał, nie przypilnował zupełnie szczęśliwie zaczętej akcji na południu i na północy, i zamiast na wschód poruszył się ku zachodowi'\textsuperscript{110} ('Aleksander was absolutely without military instinct, failed completely to attend to the action successfully initiated in the south and the north, and moved off not to the east but to the west').\textsuperscript{111}

Aleksander, rival to his brothers Władysław and Zygmunt in the struggle for the (by now semi-elective) Polish throne, left for Poland\textsuperscript{112}. On 3 October he achieved royal

\textsuperscript{105} Kinaupa \textit{et al.}, \textit{History of Lithuania}, 221.


\textsuperscript{107} On Jelena's problems, see Papée, \textit{Aleksander Jagiellończyk}, 27. On the problem at the end of the fifteenth century see Pielkiewicz, \textit{Wielkie księstwo litewskie}, 152-154. Ključevskij, in the passage referred to above (\textit{Russkaja istorija}, 1, 427-428) links this matter to the defections of the Oka princes to Moscow.

\textsuperscript{108} Fryderyk Papée, \textit{Aleksander Jagiellończyk}, 38-39; Błaszczyk, \textit{Litwa na przełomie}, 2. On the significance of the battle see Krom, \textit{Mež Rus'ju i Litvoj}, 115-116, with further references; Taras, \textit{Vojny Moskovskoj Rusi}, 160-162.

\textsuperscript{109} Papée, \textit{Aleksander Jagiellończyk}, 44. For a map showing military operations in general during this war, see Krom, \textit{Mež Rus'ju i Litvoj}, 114; however, it does not show Plettenberg's victory.

\textsuperscript{110} Papée, \textit{Aleksander Jagiellończyk}, 44. The 'action successfully initiated... in the south' was undertaken by Lithuania's Tatar allies; that 'in the north' is Plettenberg's victory.

\textsuperscript{111} On the subsequent disastrous deterioration of the military situation see Papée, \textit{Aleksander Jagiellończyk}, 61-62.

\textsuperscript{112} Papée, \textit{Aleksander Jagiellończyk}, 44-45.
rank, but at a price: the Union of Mielnik, which stipulated that henceforth the Grand Duchy and the Kingdom would choose a single ruler by a joint procedure; in other words, Jogaila's descendants no longer had an automatic right to inherit the grand ducal title.  

Aleksander’s absence from the front coincided with continued Lithuanian failure on the battlefield. In the same year another Lithuanian host was annihilated, this time outside Mstislavl. By the spring of 1503 Lithuania could fight no more, and a truce was agreed for six years. Under this agreement Ivan III imposed on Aleksander the following condition:

...tebė, Aleksandru korolju i velikomu knjazju, v" tê peremirnyje lēta, v" šest' lēt", našix zeml' [...] ne vojevatì, ni začëpljati ničēm"...

...thou, Aleksander, King and Grand Duke, during these crucial years, to the extent of six years, art not [...] to wage war on or interfere in any way with our lands...

There then follows a list of 127 places off which Aleksander is to keep his hands. The one hundred and twenty-fourth place on this list is occupied by Nevel'. We read: ‘...goroda Ostrea i volostej: Berezaa, Nevlya, Usvaa, Lovca, Vesnëbologa’ (‘the town of Ostrea and its volost’s: Berezaa, Nevle [or Nevel’], Usvaa, Lovec, Vesnëbologo’).

The easiest way to grasp the geographical position of Nevel’ in relation to the other localities specified in the same breath is to consult V.L. Janin’s Novgorod i Litva, and

117. Ibid., 400. In many later treaties and wills Vesnëbologo divides into two parts, Vesna and Bologo, which, like the earthworm of legend, continue separate existences. This must be taken as a reflection of ‘Moscowocentrism’, amnesia touching old Novgorodian possessions.
118. According to the map tipped in after 33 of Krom, Mež Rus'ju i Litvoj, Ostrea (Ostreja) was situated perhaps one hundred kilometres north-northwest of Nevel’. It is not listed in Vasmer und Bräuer, Geographisches Namenbuch. It also appears in Drawing No. 8 of V.L. Janin, Novgorod i Litva, 162 (see below).
119. At this date Nevel (Hene), is more likely than Nevel' (Henebë), at least in Muscovite sources.
120. Novgorod i Litva. Pogranînîje situacji XIII-XV vekov. M., 1998 (citation repeated for convenience). An integral part of this publication, acknowledged in the foreword although not mentioned on the title page, is a supplement: L.A. Bassalygo, V.L. Janin, Istoriî-geografîeskî obzor novgorodsko-litovskoj granicy. Bassalygo is a feminine surname, as is clear from instrumental Bassalygoj (p. [3]).
most specifically the supplement written jointly with L.A. Bassalygo. Here\textsuperscript{121} we find a map (modestly termed ‘drawing’) that shows ‘Vesnebolog’\textsuperscript{122} in the far north, pinched between the territories of Pskov to the west, Pustaja Ržiova to the north, and [Velikije] Luki to the east. Ostrijé\textsuperscript{123} is a little to the southeast. Well to the south-southwest is Lake Berjozno. Nevel’ (‘Nevle’ on the map) is as far again to the southeast, i.e. south-southeast of Ostrijé. ‘Usvaa’ is Lake Usvoje, about twenty kilometres west of Nevel’. The area was a dziesiątek in the seventeenth century; it is found in Newel inventories under such forms as Vsway\textsuperscript{124}. Lovco is surely Lovec; it figures under the latter form in many later documents. The location is perhaps ten kilometres west of Usvoje.

All these identifications seem quite certain, with the exception of Lake Berjozno. At that point in the catalogue there seems to be a direction of travel from east to west. It is possible that ‘Berjozaa’ at the head of the list is the village of Berjozovo, east of Nevel’; but places named after the birch are not unusual in Russia\textsuperscript{125}.

Under the same treaty Ivan III had been persuaded to hand over six pieces of conquered territory. Two of them, Usvjaty and Ozerišče (Jezerišče), border on Nevel’ to the southeast and south respectively. This is a crucial event for the future of the town. Had Ivan resisted the pressure – from the Lithuanian envoys, from Jelena, from the papal representative and from Bohemia-Hungary\textsuperscript{126} – and retained Usvjaty and Ozerišče, Nevel’ would have ceased to be a frontline borderland community, as it had long been, perhaps since 1185 and before.

Here in the treaty of 1503, then, we have Nevel’ at last. Save for its exempt position under the Charter of Polock, the place could hardly be more insignificant. Within eighty years messengers were posting across Europe to bring news of Nevel’ to some of the

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 162, drawing 8.
\textsuperscript{122} I take the toponym to mean ‘vernal grace’; ‘Fairspring’, as it were. I think, therefore, that the nominative was originally neuter, like OCS blago, here in its colloquial Russian reflex; hence I have spelt Vesnébolo in the translation.
\textsuperscript{123} As a common noun this word is end-stressed, so that the change /jɒ/ \(\rightarrow\) /jɒ/ is triggered. Vasmer and Bräuer do not give accents. The spelling ‘Ostria’ in the treaty argues for initial stress, Ostrije.
\textsuperscript{124} E.g. in AR XXV 2615/2 (1684), 56: ‘Dziesiątek Vswayski’ (\textlangle V\textrangle \equiv \textlangle U\textrangle).
\textsuperscript{125} In Vasmer und Bräuer, \textit{Geographisches Namenbuch}, they begin on p. 352 of Volume I with Berjoza and finish on p. 372 with Berezjata.
\textsuperscript{126} See Fryderyk Papée, \textit{Imperial Expansion and the Supremacy of the Gentry, 1466-1506} in \textit{The Cambridge History of Poland from the Origins to Sobieski (to 1696)}, ed W. F. Reddaway \textit{et al.}, C., 1950, 269.
continent's most powerful people: to Stephen Batory, Hungarian King of Poland; to Ivan IV; to Elizabeth of England; to the Papal Secretary of State Cardinal di Como, and to His Holiness Pope Gregory XIII\textsuperscript{127} himself. Our next chapter will deal with the matter of how Nevel' came to have its first hour upon the world's stage.

\textsuperscript{127} This is the pontiff who gave the world the Gregorian Calendar.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE SHUTTLE PERIOD

The loom goes click and the loom goes clack.
The shuttle flies forward and then flies back.

Anonymous Northamptonshire Weavers’ Song

Primæval Chaos comes roaring again.

Eino Leino, Invocation, l. 1, from ‘The Songs of Count Johan and Katarzyna Jagiellonka’

On Saturday morning there was a great fight
From when the sun rose till the onset of night.

Taliesin (sixth century), The Battle of Argoed Llwyfain²

---

1. Taas karjuu Kaos ikivanha.
   Eino Leino, Invocatio, l. 1, from Juhana Herttuan ja Catharina Jagellonican laulut, H., 1919, 7.

2. Bore duw Sadwrn cad fawr a fu
   O'r pan ddwyre haul hyd pan gynnau.
   Taliesin, Gwaith Argoed Llwyfain

In this chapter we will see how Nevel' grew in importance during the sixteenth century. As we follow that story we will touch on various topics: how king and tsar bequeathed the skin of the bear before it was killed; how Nevel' acquired a name in Latin and Italian; and how the English first learned of Nevel"s existence. We will also introduce the first Jew whose name can be linked with Nevel', a town that eventually had a Jewish majority. We will see how Nevel' drew the attention of grand duke and king, of cardinal and pope. We will look at Nevel' as the instrument of espionage and as the object of espionage. The threads of this tapestry pass back and forth, back and forth around the red warp of war.

In 1504, Ivan III wrote his will. To his eldest son Vasilij he bequeathed a litany of places large and small, pages of them. Among all the rest Vasilij is to receive also Moscow's Novgorodian lands, acquired by Ivan III some three decades earlier. They include Velikije Luki and Pskov. Then:

And to him likewise I give the town of Ostreje with its possessions and all that has gravitated thereto, and the possessions are Berezai, Nevel [sic], Ustvai, Lovco, Vesněbologo...³

Already Nevel' is an object of action, property that can be bequeathed like any other piece of property.

In 1505 Ivan Vasil'jevič died; in 1506 Aleksander followed him from the world. In 1507 the new Polish king, Zygmunt, alias Sigismund, alias Žikgimont, renewed military operations against the Muscovite state. He was fulfilling an old plan devised by Aleksander or by his entourage.⁴

---

3. DDGVUK, 357.
At first fortune favoured the Lithuanians. Certain texts support the argument that almost immediately they occupied Nevel', which, we should remember, was the last place in Muscovy. The three texts in question are as follows:

1. In June the king granted a certain Ensign Aleksandr Pētux lands at Plisa [Plissy]⁵, referred to in the grant as a ‘little estate’ (imenice). This estate had formerly been granted to Zof'ja Mikolajeva Radivilova, Princess Žeslavskaja.⁶ The property had reverted to the king and grand prince after her death because she was without heirs. The document makes it clear that Ensign Pētux was being rewarded for military service: he served ‘nam gospodarù i celoi Reči Pospolitoi služēčy v voisku stalogo [=ju?] veroju...’ (‘us as lord and the whole Commonwealth in the host with constant loyalty...’).

2. In a document dated 22 August 1507 we read: ‘We Zhikgimont himself [sic], by grace of God king and grand duke, do make known by this our letter [to] whoso shall look thereon or hear it reading, for those today or who shall be hereafter, to whom it shall be necessary’ that the late King Aleksander had given a certain Pan Ivaško⁸ Zenov’jevič Korsak ‘three služby in the name of Simon Sidorovič, and Semen[e]c Ionič, and a man with land in Nevel’, Sysoic⁹, and confirms that these people are to remain in the possession of Pan Korsak.

---

⁵ The name of this village vacillates until well into the twentieth century, appearing now with one s, now with two, and now in the singular, now in the plural.
⁶ PG, III, No. 273, 8-9, of 27 June 1507. This date is suspiciously similar to 29 June 1507, given by Piekiewicz as the latest possible date for the death of the second wife of Mikolaj Radziwiłłowicz, chancellor and wojewoda of Wilno (see Piekiewicz, Wielkie księstwo litewskie, 84-84). Piekiewicz says that this second wife’s given name is unknown, and that he was obliged to return her dowry on her death, because they had no issue together. One wonders whether Zof’ja Milolajeva was not this second wife (Mikolaj’s first wife’s father was Jan Moniwidowicz). The Žeslavskij family ruled Mstisław. See Krom, Meł Rus’ju i Littoj, 120.
⁷ There is some error in the case ending. Most probably it may be written in error for staloju (сталого), which for archaeographical reasons looks very similar to stalogo (сталого).
⁸ Ivaško’s name appears hypocoristically because he is a petitioner (we referred to this practice above, in Chapter One).
⁹ PG III, M., 1980. № 278, 14. ‘Sysoic’ is a patronymic (for Sysoic’, with local cokan’je (pronunciation of č as c).
3. On the same day another Korsak, Ivan Mixalovič, obtained the use of properties in Nevel', Sebež and Sjagika,\(^{10}\) apparently on the basis of a previous grant by Grand Duke Aleksander. Ivan Mixalovič was the nephew of Ivaško (Ivan) Zenov'jevič Korsak\(^{11}\); the latter's grandfather was the uncle of the 'Ostafej Korsokovič' who in 1475 was given land at Jazno (see previous chapter).\(^{12}\) The Korsak clan will long be associated with Commonwealth-ruled Newel\(^{13}\).

The first document grants a 'little estate' to a military man. The second restores property (human beings and land) to its rightful master. The third seems also to restore land held by a Korsak in Nevel' and other borderland territories. Zygmunt must have believed that he was in a position to encompass these promises. This in turn implies that his forces were in possession of Nevel' and its suburb Plissy, whose centre is situated twenty minutes' walk from the town. We must conclude that by June 1507 Lithuanian forces had reoccupied Nevel'.

Since when had the 'little estate'\(^{14}\) at Plissy been in the possession of Zof'ja Radivilova? She cannot have acquired the land over the years 1503-1506, when Nevel' had been \textit{de jure} Muscovite. But the treaty of 1503 concluded a war begun in 1500, and it is unlikely that the grant was made during that war. Hence we can trace the princess's possession of the estate back into the fifteenth century. Indeed, her title was probably older still, in that there had been fighting along the border in this area since Novgorod had finally fallen to Muscovy in 1478. It is improbable that a Grand Duke would grant land in a dangerous frontier zone to a princess. Hence it is likely that the Radivil connection with Nevel' began before the fall of Lord Great Novgorod.

Similarly, the lands at Newel, Siebiež and 'Siahiki’ were, it appears, originally granted by Aleksander Jagiellończyk, which means in or before 1506; but again, that takes us

---

10. See Pietkiewicz, \textit{Wielkie księstwo litewskie}, 140, and footnote 156, which refers us to \textit{KWML}, Book 194, pp. 318-321 and gives the date as 22 VIII 1507. Vasmer und Bräuer, \textit{Geographisches Namenbuch}, have no Sjagika, nor yet Sečika (if -ja- had been a Belorussianism); Pietkiewicz adds a question mark after the name ('w [...] Siahikach (?)').
11. See the genealogical diagram given by Pietkiewicz in \textit{Wielkie księstwo litewskie}, 141.
13. Cf. the VN Korsakovo (see Chapter One).
14. The estate, as emerges from the document, was in fact very extensive, with productive amenities of all kinds. The litotes underscores the king’s wealth and generosity.
back before the loss of Newel in 1503. We do not know if the earlier grant was made by Aleksander during the time when he was the king of Poland (1501-1506) or the longer period when he was grand duke (1492-1501). It is possible that Aleksander made the grant during the brief success of Lithuanian arms in 1500, or at an even earlier date. At all events, it seems that the grant was made at a moment when both Newel and Siebież was in Lithuanian hands. Further, the association of those two localities is probably not a coincidence. The first Newel inventory extant, of 1619, deals with Newel, Siebieża and Nowogrodek Siewierski (Novgorod Seversk); the second, of 1629, with Newel, Siebież and Krasne. We may therefore wonder whether Ivan Mixalović Korsak was not being appointed as governor of Newel.

However, in September the Muscovite vojevoda Davydov-Čeljadnin advanced on Polock from Velikije Luki, so that Zygmunt’s grants were frustrated. In the following year, 1508, the military prospects of the Polish-Lithuanian interest were seriously damaged by the defection to Moscow of Prince Mixail Glinkij. Another peace treaty was agreed; both sides had to make concessions. Nevel returns to Muscovy: won by warfare, lost by diplomacy. The frontier of ‘the whole land of Novgorod’ would run where it had run since 1503:

16. 2612.
17. 2613.
18. Since the name occurs in the genitive, the toponym may be Krasny.
20. His defection was part of a long process whereby princely families transferred their allegiance to Moscow. The subject is highly controversial. There are good summaries in Pietkiewicz, Wielkie księstwo litewskie, 113-124; Krom, Mež Rus’ju i Litvoj, pp. 139-153. The details of Glinkij’s rebellion or uprising will be found in Błaszczyk, Litwa na przełomie, 50-53. Prince Mixail took with him his niece Jelena, who became the second wife of Vasiliy III and mother of his heir, Ivan Vasil’jević. The Glinkij were of Tatar extraction (ibid.); so was the Moszczeny family, who defected in the other direction and played an important role in Nevel in the early seventeenth century (see next chapter of the present thesis).
21. Several more treaties will be quoted hereafter. They are difficult to follow but of a standardized format, which it may be helpful to describe. There are usually two texts, one known as ‘the Grand Duke’s word’, the other as ‘the King’s word’. Either sovereign is represented as addressing the other, undertaking not to interfere in certain territories and specifying other territories where his ‘brother’ is not to interfere. The boundaries between the states are then given, on the basis of the boundaries between feudal properties. This section runs according to a varying formula on the lines: “Now the boundary to A, B, C, D [all the place names stand in the dative case] and to the possessions [volostem, et sim.]... is on land and water according to the old boundaries’. We will quote mainly from this last section of each treaty, because that is where Nevel (Neve) is to be found.
‘...And the Novgorod possessions, Luki Velikiye, and Pupoviči,\textsuperscript{22} and Ržova, and the town of Ostrje, and the possessions [which are] Berezaj, Nevel, Usvaj, Lovec, Vesněbologo, and Xolmskij Pogost, and Velila, and Lopasticy, and Bujec and other possessions, of the whole land of Novgorod, with your land, with Lithuania and with the Polockers and with the Vitebskers, on land and water, is according to the old boundary...\textsuperscript{23}

This time the catalogue of possessions following the mention of Ostrje has expanded; there are now nine of them. Nevel’, as previously, occupies second place after Berezay. The king had been hasty in parcelling out Nevel’ lands among his supporters.

Aleksander’s successor Zygmunt – not yet ‘the Old’ – was obliged to accept the loss of Nevel’. On 12 July 1511 he wrote to Stanisław Glebowicz, namiestnik of Polock. The Polock bojare Mixajlo and Ivan Nevel’skije (no patronymics are given) have petitioned for eleven putnyx.

...i prosili v na\textsuperscript{b} [v na\textsuperscript{b} (v na\textsuperscript{b}), a localism] ljud\textsuperscript{e} naši\textsuperscript{x} putny\textsuperscript{x} polockogo pověta v Kublič\textsuperscript{x} na imja Ivana Mařejeva, Oxrema, Jermola, Davyda, Rysja, Fedota, Makara, Ivana Jermoloviča, Ofonasa, Nefed’ja, Matščaka. A povědali nam, čto\textsuperscript{b} očina i\textsuperscript{x} otošla v storonu velikogo knjja mosko’škogo, ne maju’šja, na čo\textsuperscript{m} poživi\textsuperscript{ii}.

...and they asked of us our putnyje [ljudi] of the povět of Polock at Kubliči by the name of Ivan Matfejev, Oxrem [local version of Efrem], Jermol, Davyd, Rys’i, Fedot, Makar, Ivan Jermolovič, Ofonas [hypercorrect version of Afanas[ij]], Nefed’, Matščak. And they told us that [since] their patrimony has gone away to the land of the grand prince of Moscow, they have no wherewithal to offer them a livelihood.

\textsuperscript{22} Pupoviči was situated to the north of Nevel’, between Sokol’niki and Novosoko’niki, of which the latter is not in modern Nevel’ district.
\textsuperscript{23} See: AOIZR, Volume the Second, 53-56.
\textsuperscript{24} PG III, No. 327, 97.
This document offers confirmation that at least some landowners left Nevel' when Moscow took over, as with Ivaško Korsak above. Such is the meaning of the phrase 'не маху'ся, на чо́м позивио' ('They have no wherewithal to offer them a livelihood').

'Nevel'skoj' marks the two men as having been the holders of the settlement at Nevel' and its immediate surroundings. If we take it that the Nevel'skie were requesting 'like-for-like' compensation, their original holding was such that eleven households could farm it, so that it was not a huge parcel of land.

Why were there two petitioners? The likeliest explanation is that they were father and son, though we can imagine brothers who preferred not to divide their patrimony (which for the moment was but noetic).

What is certain, however, is that the Nevel'skoj (Newelski) family went on to notable and even distinguished service in Poland-Lithuania and in Russia. Two later members of the family served in various Sejms. Jan Newelski, a clergyman in Żmaitija, took part in the Sejm of 1648, which elected Władysław IV. In the same year Michał Newelski was made lowczy (master of the hunt) of Polock; he too was an envoy to the sejm of that year, and later to those of 1669 and 1674. Michał was a member of the Polock judiciary and married the daughter of the chief justice of Polock, a member of the Tyszkiewicz clan. Jan Władysław Newelski was treasurer of Brześć Litewski, responsible for its fortifications. He died in battle against Russia in 1660.

Thus displaced nobles from the Nevel' area could and did go on to make new lives in the Commonwealth. Those lives were as successful, their careers as distinguished, as they would have been at home, had home been a more stable place.

---

25. It is possible that the -sja of 'не маху'ся, на чо́м позивио' is a 'double-reference' reflexive pronoun of Polish type; 'they do not have themselves the wherewithal to feed themselves'.
26. The details offered here are taken from A.A. Bovkalo. Nevel'skiye in Nevel'skij sbornik, 8, ed. Maksimovskaja, 125-128.
27. Perhaps the most distinguished scion of the family was the Russian Admiral Nevel'skoj, an explorer of the far eastern territories of the Russian empire. After the partitions of the Commonwealth the Newelscy or Nevel'skie were hard put to it to prove their right to be considered dvorjane.
In 1512 war broke out again between Lithuania and Muscovy. The Lithuanians occupied the territories previously lost, apparently including Nevel. At the end of July 1514 Prince Ivan Čeljadnin and his force took Smolensk. They moved on quickly to Mstislavl', but on 8 September were caught outside Orsza (Orša) by a joint Lithuanian-Polish army of some 35,000 troops of various kinds, including a služba ziemska of 15,000 ‘Lithuanians’. Some 5,000 men were captured, including Čeljadnin; a number were sent hither and yon through Europe as part of a propaganda operation. The victory was also publicized by the papal nuncio to Poland. This Catholic interest in the Lithuanian-Muscovite border adumbrates that taken by Rome six decades later in Nevel' itself, when once more Rome’s ultimate aim was the destruction of Turkish power by a reunited Christendom.

It is instructive to compare the fine illustration given by Markiewicz on the same page with the cruder illustration (from Marcin Bielski’s Kronika) printed by Taras. Both illustrations make clear the importance of artillery in the Polish-Lithuanian victory. As for the difference in quality, one example will suffice: in the Bielski illustration the horses are shown as horses were represented by artists in the middle Ages: those facing the viewer have two eyes completely visible. But herbivores, ever ready to flee, have their eyes on the side of the head, for all-round vision; the forward gaze is limited to predators, such as human beings.

As both Lithuania and Muscovy failed to conquer, the conflict spread wider, involving the Crimean Tatars and the Knights of the Cross. But no military advantage accrued to Lithuania, and in 1522 a five-year truce was concluded. Apart from the cession of

28. See Krom, Mež Rusju i Litvoj, 213-222. The map on p. 215 implies that Prince V.V. Šujskij passed through Newel in 1513, Gasztołd counterattacked in 1514, and Šujskij returned the same way in 1518. This makes three more instances of Newel-Nevel’ changing hands.
29. Taras, Vojny Moskovskoj Rusi, 185-187. The cross of Princess St Jevfrosin’ja, which had been captured at some stage by the princes of Smolensk, was now removed to Moscow (Ulazimir Arlo, Edfrasinnja Polockaja, Mi., 1992, 134-135). For the next stage in its peregrinations see below. Smolensk, after its recapture by the Commonwealth in the seventeenth century, became the seat of a Latin-rite Catholic diocese that included Newel.
30. Taras, Vojny Moskovskoj Rusi, 188-196; Markiewicz, Historia Polski, 330.
31. Ibid.
33. Zygmunt Woyciechowski, Zygmunt Stary (1506-1548), W., 1946, 43.
Smolensk, the details of the frontier remain essentially unchanged. This meant that Muscovy now had a salient protruding into Lithuanian territory. The details concerning Nevel' remain unaltered.

In 1526 the truce was renewed. After this we lose sight of Nevel' until 1533, when it is mentioned in the Pskov Chronicle as ‘the gorod Nevel’. Henceforth we must think of Nevel' as fortified. This gorod is not an isolated trading post that must be defended, as in the earliest days of Rus', but part of a system of strategic defence.

Late in 1533, Vasilij died and the throne passed to his three-year-old son Ivan. He for the moment was not Majestic (groznyj); Zygmunt (born 1467), however, was getting towards being Stary. He was inclined to attempt the recovery of lost territories. Lithuania was dilatory in assembling its forces, and launched its attack only in August 1534, by which time the regent, Jelena Glinskaja, had gained control over the politics of Muscovy. ‘[P]ravitel'stvom byla Bojarskaja duma vo glave s Jelenoj Glinskoj’ (‘[T]he government was the Boyars’ Duma headed by Jelena Glinskaja’)

The military operations that ensued were inconclusive, but we should note that the Russians now constructed a fortress at Sebež, close to the Livonian border, and this became Nevel’s twin, glowing over the border at Lithuania. The war was renewed in 1536, when Moscow’s armies retook all the places in the Novgorod Seversk area captured by Tarnowski, save only Gomel.

34. SIRIO, Volume 35-1, 639.
36. Ibid., 347-348.
37. A.L. Jurganov, quoted in Skrynnikov, Carsivo terrora, 81. On the regency see also S.N. Bogatyrev’s chapter ‘Ivan IV (1533-1584)’ in The Cambridge History of Russia, C., 2006, 240-242, where the author adds a balanced assessment of Jelena’s early demise. The same chapter is an excellent introduction to Ivan’s reign in general.
39. As suggested by the archaic form of its name (with the lacustrine hydronymic suffix -ež, as in Kitež), the settlement at Sebež already existed; see V.L. Janin, Novgorod i Lήva, 164.
With that hostilities ceased for the moment, and negotiations were renewed. The treaty of March or April 1537\(^1\) adds mention of the volost’ of Dolysa (Dolysy), which is twenty kilometres northwest of Nevel’. Nowadays, like Usvai and Lovec, it is part of Nevel’ district.

...a rubež [...] i volostem" Dolysë i Berezaju, Nevlju, Usvaju, Lovecu, Vesnë, Bologu, i Xolmskomu pogostu, i Velilë, i Loposticam", i Bujecu i inym" volostem" vsej zemlë Novgorodskije s" tvojeju zemleju s" Litvoju, i s" Poločjany i s" Vitbljany, zemlë i vodë, po starym" rubežom".\(^2\)

...and the boundary [...] also of Dolysa and Berezaj, Nevel’, Usvaj, Lovec, Vesna, Bologo, and Xolmskij Pogoost, and Velila, and Loposticy, and Bujec and other possessions of the whole land of Novgorod [, the boundary] with your land of Lithuania, and with the Polockers and Vitebskers, on land and water, [shall be] according to the old boundaries.

Nevel’’s strategic position is now much more secure than under the previous treaties. Yet, treaty ink scarce dry, on 23 December 1537 an embassy in the name of Ivan IV set off to meet Zygmunt I Stary\(^3\). Its leader, Savin Mixajlovič Oljab'jev Omel'janov, was to complain of incursions by Vitebskers into Velikije Luki, [U]svjackaja volost’, Ozereckaja and Pupoviči (respectively to the northeast, southeast and north of Nevel’). Moscow’s namestniki and government officials are writing from frontier strongholds [gorodov] to their lord to say that King Zygmunt’s people are entering Muscovite territories and settlements. They are ploughing the earth intensively [zemlju silno [sic] pašat’], and they fish the waters. From Polock they enter our lands by Sebež castle.

What are we to make of these charges as they relate to Nevel’? It seems clear that all along the newly established frontier local people had simply continued to plough where they had always ploughed, fish where they had fished, mow where they had mown. Under the

---

1. The treaty, says Zygmunt Wojciechowski (see Zygmunt Stary (1506-1548), W., 1946, 262), was valid from 25 March 1537. SIRIO, volume 59-II, dates the treaty to April. These dates are several decades earlier than the introduction of the Gregorian calendar, which cannot therefore be the cause of the discrepancy.
2. SIRIO, volume 59-II, 127.
frowning battlements of Sebež and Zavoločje scythes flashed in the summer sun, and our prikaznije ljudi did not know what to do: turn out the garrison and cut them down as they cut the grass? The embassy was meant to push Zygmunt into laying down the law himself. Once again, as in 1511, he would need to find land to compensate feudal landholders, land on which their peasants might work in order to feed themselves, their masters, and their masters’ appetite for cash.

It is noticeable that the Muscovite diplomatic bombardment hits targets on three sides of Nevel’ – Sebež about fifty-five miles to the west, Luky Velikije sixty versts to the northeast, Uszvaty (‘Svjackaja volost’) about the same distance to the southeast⁴⁴ – and closer still: Dolysa (Dolussy), Lovec and Pupoviči, which in the following century were part of Newel’s official territory. The last-mentioned lay between twenty and thirty kilometres (or versts) from Nevel’ town, more or less due north. Nevel’ itself is not mentioned.

Does it follow that Nevel’ has become an island of tranquillity in a sea of border incursions? Between the lines we read that Nevel’ (like Smolensk) constitutes a dangerously exposed salient, an untidy appendix that the powerful will want to consolidate or to amputate, whichever brings advantage. At all events, the position is not to the advantage of Nevelers, for they will be in the position of expendable pawns.⁴⁵ This can be seen on the exemplary map tipped in at the end of Andrej Januškevič’s Vulikaje Knjastva Litoškaje i Infljanckaja vajna 1558-1570 (The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Livonian War).⁴⁶ At top left we see Sebež, a little finger pointing south; then the Polock hinterland bulges northward into Muscovy. Next we find Nevel, thrust well southwestwards from the bulk of Muscovy, with a narrow isthmus behind it, a convenient ‘neck’, just asking to be chopped through between Usvai and Lake Nevan’ (not yet ‘Bol’Soj Ivan’). Eastwards from Nevel’ another Lithuanian bulge pushes to the northeast beyond Uszvaty. To the southeast beyond that protuberance the Muscovite fortress of Sebež guards the way to Smolensk. Incursions have taken place on three sides of Nevel’, yet Nevel’ itself is not mentioned.

---

⁴⁴. The exact distance is sixty-three kilometres.
⁴⁵. We shall return to the topic of the salient in the Conclusion.
In this three-pronged fork Nevel holds the centre. Moscow seems to be saying aloud ‘Keep your people out of the specified territories’ and mentally adding ‘because they almost surround a border stronghold that is more important than they are’. We shall find that by the beginning of the 1580s Nevel is attracting considerable international attention. Nevel’s strategic importance has grown since it was fortified in or shortly before 1533. Half a decade later Ivan’s counsellors, like so many chess-players, shuffle pawns to guard a rook and to distract their opponent’s gaze from it.

The truce was renewed for six years in 1543 and six more in 1549. There are no substantial changes in either text. The same could be said of the treaties of 1553 and 1556. Something like mature relations seemed to have been established between the two states. Zygmunt I’s foreign policy was oriented mainly southwestwards and southeastwards: the Czech lands, Hungary, relations with the Holy Roman empire and with the Sublime Porte. It may be that Zygmunt’s residence at Kraków played some role in that orientation. His son, however - officially co-regent since 1530, when he was still a child – lived mainly in Lithuania and understood the advantages to be gained from a policy aimed towards the Baltic. The collapse of the Hansa, the weakness of the old crusading orders, the division of the eastern Baltic littoral among various bishops – all these created a power vacuum. The Lithuanian aristocracy remembered how to rush into a vacuum; after all, their empire had been formed in one.

Lithuania’s foreign trade, particularly that of Polock and Vitebsk, required the use of Baltic seaports. The Hansa was dying. Trade imperatives, if mixed with territorial ambition in a vacuum, may lead to an explosion. Ivan IV’s situation mirrored the Polish king’s. He

47. SIRIO 59-II, 191.
48. SIRIO 59-II, 304.
49. SIRIO 59-II, 409.
50. SIRIO 59-II, 512.
52. This unusual arrangement, made for dynastic reasons, proved expedient, in that after his father’s death Zygmunt August was to confront the formidable Ivan IV, also a monarch since his infant years. Zygmunt I died in 1548.
53. Januškevič, Infljanckaja vajna, 22.
too felt the need of a window on the Baltic. He too feared that if he did not act the Pole would. His troops occupied Jur'jev (Tartu) and approached Riga. His diplomacy secured alliances with both Sweden and Denmark.

Zygmunt August, too, sought allies. He encountered a cool reception from Erik of Sweden but enthusiasm from the king’s brother Johan, viceroy of Finland, husband of Katarzyna Jagiellonka and brother-in-law of Zygmunt himself. Erik imprisoned Johan and Katarzyna in grim Gripsholm,54 but his mental health collapsed and Johan replaced him as king.

On 28 November 1561 Zygmunt August took control of Livonia, anticipating that open hostilities would commence on the expiry of the latest truce in 1562. The main Muscovite force, led by Prince Kurbskij, reached Vitebsk on 20 May 1562. After a desultory three-day siege the army fired the posad (the settlement outside the castle) and laid the surrounding country waste. It then marched back to Muscovite territory at Velikije Luki, on the way destroying the posad of Suraž. Kurbskij’s aim, according to Januškevič, consisted ‘ū spustaščennį parežnyų rajonaŭ VKL į vyniščennį mjascovagų nasel’ničtvą’ (‘in the devastation of the borderland regions of the G[rand] D[uchy] of L[ithuania] and the extirpation of the local population’). Zygmunt August’s instructions in reply were equally ruthless55.

Since Prince Andrej will be an important figure in this chapter, we should characterize him more definitely. Kurbskij was active in the conquest of Kazan’ and in Livonia.56 He was a trusted officer of Ivan IV. That is not a guarantee of good nature. When he fled from Muscovy he neglected to take his wife with him, which some will find discourteous. Kurbskij murdered the servant who helped him to escape from Jur’jev. In

54. In 1566 Katarzyna gave birth, confinement in confinement, to his son Sigmund Wasa. Many years later, in 1623, it was he, as Zygmunt III Waza, who granted Nevel’ its Magdeburg Charter. For Johan’s purported independent foreign policy (which included marrying Katarzyna), cause of Erik’s wrath, and Ivan IV’s role in Erik’s downfall, see Bodil Naadž-Larsen, *Erik XIV, Ivan Groznij og Katerina Jagellonica*. Uppsala, 1983 (= Studia historică Upsaliensia [one <p>], (129)) (in Norwegian; English summary 89-91), especially Chapters One and Two (4-28). Because Johan was viceroy of Finland, the imprisonment of Johan and Katarzyna is now part of the Finnish national myth (see the second epigraph to the present chapter).
1565 he took part in the razing to the ground of Nevel’s ‘twin town’, Velikije Luki. He raised revenue by placing Jews in pools alive with leeches and keeping them there until they bled money. He was, in Vasilij Pushkin’s phrase, a dangerous neighbour: he would raid your estate and help himself to your property. It is at least possible that his negotiations with Count Artz, the Swedish representative in Livonia (an attempt to suborn him into defection to Muscovy), led to the latter’s arrest and execution. Kurbşkij was, it appears, widely read in religious and historical literature, or at the least he knew people who were.

On 16 May 1562 Hetman Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red led off his forces to raid the environs of Smolensk; then he moved on to attack the fortifications of Veliž. Also in mid-May another force, probably of Polish mercenaries, devastated the areas around Sebėž and Opočka and burnt down some monasteries. Nevel’ was now under threat as its salient became more isolated, with hostile forces to east and west. Since a little later a Muscovite force recaptured Nevel’ castle, Lithuanian or Polish forces must have taken taken it at about this time. Thus was the Muscovite protest of December 1537 vindicated.

Moscow responded by attempting to outflank the Lithuanians on a grand scale, defeating the Lithuanian defenders of Mstislavl’ (well south of Veliž) and attacking Drissy on the River Dvina, well to the southwest of Sebėž. Logic foretold a third, frontal expedition.

57. Ibid., 222.
58. These details from Skrynnikov, Carsto terrors, 185. Skrynnikov disagrees, however, with Keenan’s view that Kurbškij’s abandonment of his wife was voluntary. He gives details in R.G. Skrynnikov, Velikij gosudar’ Ioan Vasìl’jevič Groznyj, Tom 1, Smolensk, 1996, 308.
61. The OED lists ‘Hetman’ without comment as an English noun, and it will therefore not be italicized, except in technical expressions such as hetman polny litewski (‘Field Marshal of Lithuania’).
The Battle of Nevel': objections to its historicity

In August 1562 this third Muscovite force, under the command of Andrej Mixajlovič Kurbskij, may have fought a battle outside Nevel', and lost it. There are objections of two kinds to the authenticity of the Battle of Nevel'.

a) Are there authentic early accounts of the battle?

Firstly, according to the late John Fennell,63 apart from Ivan IV's first epistle to Prince Kurbskij, Marcin Bielski is 'the only other source to mention the battle of Nevel'64. The same claim is made in Ja.S. Lur'je's and Yu.D. Rykov's edition of *Perepiska Ivana Groznogo s Andrejem Kurbkim*: 'O poraženii Kurbskogo pod Nevelem, krome kommentiruemogo poslanija, soobšajet toľko pol'skaja xronika Martina Bel'skogo, kotoryj privodit drugije cifry, čem car' (1.5 tys[jač] poljakov i 40 tys[jač] russkix65 ('Apart from the epistle here annotated, only the Polish chronicle of Marcin Bielski mentions Kurbskij's defeat outside Nevel', which adduces figures other than the tsar does (1.5 thou[sand] Poles and 40 thou[sand] Russians')). In his letters Kurbskij himself does not mention it.

Since Fennell’s edition is older than that of Lur'je and Rykov, the latter editors and he must have taken their view from some common earlier source. In point of fact the claim is unfounded, because there are other sources for the battle. A letter from Florian Zebrzydowski to Mikolaj Radziwiłł the Red, sent two days after the battle, is extant. There is an account in the Second Pskov Chronicle (see below). The chronicles of Stryjkowski and Górnicki give accounts of the battle. King Zygmunt August himself mentions the ‘manly feat’ in a letter to Mikolaj Radziwiłł ‘Czarny’ of 16 November of the same year66.

---

64. M. Bielski, *Kronika*, ii (Sanok, 1856) 1151-1152.
b) Ivan IV’s reference to the battle and its authenticity

The other objection to the authenticity of the Battle of Nevel', at any rate as something more significant than an insignificant clash, arises from doubts cast on the authenticity of the correspondence between Ivan IV and Prince A.M. Kurbskij. In recent times E.L. Keenan put those doubts in a consistent form, denouncing the Correspondence as a seventeenth-century imposture, ascribed by him to Prince S.I. Šaxovskoj-Jaroslavskij.\(^67\) The Ivan of the correspondence makes rather a significant point of Kurbskij’s defeat before Nevel'. If Ivan’s first letter is spurious, then the significance of the battle is largely lost.

It seems to me that the crucial argument against Keenan’s position is the same as that which establishes the authenticity of the Slovo o pl"ku Igorevê. We can conceive of a modern forgery of either. Either might have been faked in 1980 by a scholarly criminal mastermind familiar with the Junggrammatiker, de Saussure, Roman Jakobson and the computer. One cannot believe in an eighteenth-century forger of the Slovo or a seventeenth-century forger of the Correspondence. In the latter case, the differences between the two correspondents are too blatant. These are two men who will never agree on anything significant. Their styles differ accordingly; and faking styles is very difficult. The piety of Kurbskij and his countenance more in sorrow than in anger are unconvincing, but one does believe in the authenticity of his mask. Such a posture is appropriate for the man whom we described above. As for the Ivan of the Correspondence, his barking aggression is consistent with much in the behaviour of the historical Ivan.\(^68\)

---

\(^67\) E.L. Keenan, The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha. The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the 'Correspondence' Attributed to Prince A.M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV. Cambridge, MA., 1971. Such was the impact of Keenan’s book that previous doubts have been forgotten. But I remember myself how, long before Keenan published his work, A.P. Vlasto introduced the subject in lectures at Cambridge: he told students immediately that some people considered the work apocryphal.

\(^68\) As far as I am aware, no one has commented on one extreme oddity of Ivan’s language in the first of the letters to Kurbskij. He makes repeated use of three explanatory particles, all translatable into English as ‘for’ (conjunction). They are ibo, bo, and ubo. He uses the first on 8 occasions, the second on 72, and the third on 364 occasions respectively in this relatively brief text (for ease of comparison I have employed ‘Arabic’ numerals). In Fennell’s edition (The Correspondence between Prince A.M. Kurbskij and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia 1564-1579, Ed. and trans. J.L.I. Fennell. C., 1955), the First Epistle has one of the three particles for every 5.03 lines. The ratio in the Second Epistle is one for every 25.8 lines. Neither Ivan’s letter to Ivan Grjaznij (1567; see Wybór, ed. Lehr-Splawiński, Witkowski, 195) nor that to Queen Elizabeth I of England (1570; Poslanija Ivana Groznoего, ed. D.S. Lixačov et al. M.-L., 1951, 139-143) contain any of the particles. The topic needs further examination.
The Battle of Nevel

The battle did take place, and we must consider it in detail. Firstly, how large were the forces engaged on the two sides?

Were there indeed no earlier mention of the battle of Newel than those in the Kurbskij Correspondence and in Bielski, a major difficulty would arise. This difficulty has not, to the best of my knowledge, been mentioned hitherto in the historiography. The problem is that the two accounts are clearly dependent one on the other. That this is so will be clear from Table 4.1 below.

**TABLE 4.1: NUMBERS ENGAGED IN THE BATTLE OF NEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVAN IV’S FIRST EPISTLE TO KURBSKIJ</th>
<th>THE BIELSKI ACCOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>POLES^{69}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4,000^{70}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a rare beauty in the symmetry of this table. Ivan’s tally of Russians is exactly ten times Bielski’s figure for Poles. Bielski estimates the Russians at ten times Ivan’s total for Lithuanians. One must needs be very trusting to consider these ratios coincidental. Further, we should note Kurbskij’s claim to have achieved in one of his ‘victories

---

69. Ivan does not specify the nationality of either side. I have used ‘Poles’ as shorthand, although it seems likely that the vast majority engaged on the Commonwealth side were indeed Polish.
70. M. Bielski, *Kronika* ii (Sanok, 1856), pp. 1151-1152. The figure of 40,000 is also cited in *Correspondence*, ed. Fennell, 139, note 6; and in the *Komentarij in Perepiska*, ed. Lur’je, Rykov, 401.
71. 1,500 is also Januškevič’s estimate of Muscovite *casualties* (as opposed to troops engaged) in the battle at Nevel: Januškevič, *Infljanckaja vajna*, 56.
transluminous' ['pobědy ž' presvětly[ja]']\textsuperscript{73} a mighty slaughter of Tatars in which there were engaged on the Russian side, once again, 15,000 troops\textsuperscript{74}.

It results from all this that, at the least, the author or authors of one of the two early accounts of the battle of Nevel' was aware of the work of the other. This implies that the later author was primarily concerned, not with establishing the truth about the numbers engaged, but with the politics of the battle, the incompetence of a general, or of the Commonwealth’s enemies. So we must ask: which author or authors had read the other’s or others’ account of the Battle of Nevel’?

We must now consider the representation of number in our text\textsuperscript{75}. Instead of using the customary system of written numeration derived from Greek practice, Ivan’s epistle spells out the words in full: ‘p’\textsuperscript{j}at’j\textsuperscript{u}n\textsuperscript{a}des\textsuperscript{j}at’ tys\textsuperscript{ja}č \textsuperscript{c}etyrex tys\textsuperscript{je}č ne mogoste pobediti’, literally ‘with five-onto-ten thousands four thousands you could not conquer’.

Now if the Bielskis derived their figures from Ivan’s epistle, they did well to perform so tricky an arithmetical operation on them, dividing one figure by ten and multiplying the other by the same quantity, and reversing the attribution of them to the two armies. It is highly improbable that a writer would do this on the basis of words, especially in view of the rather impenetrable form Ivan’s epistle gives the numbers. Far more probable that someone in Ivan’s entourage saw the Arabic numerals in Bielski and saw the opportunity for some sleight of numbers. He could both soften the blow to Muscovy’s reputation and deride the scoundrel Kurbskij.

Stryjkowski states the composition of the Lithuanian-Polish force as being 1000 Poles (cavalry and infantry), two hundred Lithuanians, and the remainder Cossacks and men from the court of Stanislaw Dowojna, wojewoda of Polock. They had between ten and twenty small field-pieces. This force, commanded by Stanislaw Leśniawski, was

\textsuperscript{73} Skazani\’ja kniazja Kurbskago, ed. N. Ustrjalov, 14-15. See also Correspondence, ed. Fennell, 138. Fennell translates ‘brilliant victories’, which glosses over the sarcasm of the original.

\textsuperscript{74} The same figure is given as the Lithuanian contingent in the služba ziemska of 1512 (see above, Subchapter 4).

\textsuperscript{75} For the sake of clarity and comparability, in the discussion that follows I have departed from standard academic practice by representing figures of less than 1000 with ‘Arabic’ or Indic numerals.
despatched by the crown hetman, Florian Zebrzydowski, who was ill at 'Jezierysc[a]'.

Stryjkowski's account continues:

Na tych przyszło wojska Moskiewskiego 45000, a Polacy zastanowiwszy się w 
błotnym, w ciasnym i z przyrodzenia obronnym miejscu i działa porządnie 
rozsadziwszy, stoczyli bitwę z onym wielkim wojskiem Moskiewskim, która trwała 
od poranku až do wieczora, gdzie Moskwy więcej niż trzy tysiące na placu poleglo, a 
naszych tylko piętnaście lekkich osób zabito.76

Against these there came 45000 of the Muscovite host, but the Poles, having 
stationed themselves in a marshy, confined and naturally defensible place and having 
set out the guns in good order, joined battle with that great Muscovite host, which 
battle] lasted from morning right until evening, where [i.e. in which battle] of 
Moscow more than three thousand fell on the spot whereas of ours only fifteen minor 
persons were killed.

According to Bielski, the Lithuanian force was located in a narrow, marshy isthmus between 
two bodies of water. There are many such places in the Nevel' area. A force advancing from 
Jezerišče, the last settlement in Lithuania, would find itself in marshland between Lake 
Nevel' on the left and Lakes Zaverežje and Čerstno on the right; it is highly likely that the 
Lithuanian forces were disposed somewhere in that area. From this position of strength they 
made daylong sorties against the opposing superior Muscovite force. Finally the 
mercenaries took advantage of a favourable moment to make an orderly retreat.

The Second Pskov Chronicle preserves an early Russian-language account of the 
battle:

Togo že lěta avgoustia prixodili litov'skia ljudi pod Nevlju77 gorodok" velikago 
knjazja, i volosti vojevali, i pošli proč'. I xodil" za nimi knjaž’ Andrei Kurb’skoi i s

76. Kronika polska, litewska, żmódaska i wszystkiej Rusi Macieja Stryjkowskiego. Wydanie nowe, będące 
dokładnem [sic] powtórzeniem pierwotnego królewskiego z roku 1582. Tom II. W., 1846., 413.
77. From a nominative 'Nevlja', otherwise unattested.
In August of the same year Lithuanian soldiers came to the walls of Nevlja, a small fort of the grand prince's, and they made war on the countryside, and moved on. And Prince Andrei Kurbskoi, accompanied by other vojevody, went after them, and their help was too small; they tangled on both sides, and our men captured informants from them.

Retreats do not win wars. To represent the Battle of Nevel' as a famous victory is to go too far; and if it is not a famous victory for one side, it may not necessarily be an infamous defeat for the other. Zebrzydowski gives the figure for Lithuanian-Polish losses as sixteen, a figure that Januškevič accepts without question. As for Muscovite losses, the 'most realistic figure', Januškevič tells us, is 1500 (that magic number). Other sources cite figures from 7000 to 8000. One cavalry captain, M. Alašnicki, was lost on the Polish side. Januškevič comments that 'Paražēnone maskoškaga vojska stala adnoj z galožinyx pryčyn pagaršennja ūzajemadačynennja pamâž Ivanam Groznym ù Andrêjem Kurbskîm ('The defeat of the Muscovite force proved one of the main causes of the deterioration in mutual relations between Ivan the Terrible and Andrej Kurbskij').

The nineteenth-century Belorussian-Russian historian Turčinovič dismisses the whole affair in his main text with the words '...tol'ko pod Nevelem' 'Poljaki imēli uspēx' protiv' Kurbskago' ('...only outside Nevel' did the Poles have a success against Kurbskij') True, in a footnote he gives a little more detail:

79. The weather had been difficult since the previous winter, which was 'dobra snėžna' ('well snowy') (ibid.); the spring flooding had destroyed many mills, and rain had spoiled both haymaking and harvest.
80. I take this to mean that Kurbskij's force was too small.
81. The verb поперуюсь appears to be a hapax legomenon. The Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI-XVII vv., Volume 17 (M., 1991), 288, gives the meaning as 'engaged', presumably on the basis that it derives from the word tern ~ tijorn 'thorn' (i.e. they 'tangled').
82. Januškevič, Inflianckaja vajna, 55.
83. M. Bielski, Kronika, ii (Sanok, 1856), p. 1152; Łukasz Górnicki, Dzieje w Koronie Polskiej w r. 1538 do r. 1572 (Sanok, 1855) 129.
84. Januškevič, Inflianckaja vajna, 56.
85. Turčinovič, Obozrenije, p. 142 (156).
86. The citation number (159) in the main text, on p. 142/156, actually refers to endnote '204' on p. 286/300.
Lěšnevol'skij s' 1,500 poljakami [sic], ukrěpivšis' v" nepristupnom" městě, celyj den' vyderžival' attaku [sic] 45,000⁸⁷ voska, kotoryje poterjav" 3,000 ubitymi, nakonec" otstupilo. Ėto immeno to samoje dělo, kotorym" Ľoann", v" pis'max" k" Kurbškomu, poprekajet" poslědnjago.

Lěšnevol'skij with 1,500 Poles, having fortified himself in an inaccessible place, bore the daylong attack of a force of 45,000, who, having lost 3,000 killed, finally retreated. This is that very affair with which Ioann, in letters⁸⁸ to Kurbškij, upbraids the latter.

Thus for Turčinovič the significance of the defeat is its role in relations between tsar and vojevoda. In our own time R.G. Skrynnikov writes:


Soon, however, in the environs of Nevel' the first major field encounter occurred. Having under his command a force of 15,000 men, Kurbškij attacked a 4000-strong detachment of Lithuanians, which disposed of some ten field-pieces. The battle had

---

⁸⁷. This figure is evidently a version of Bielski's '40,000' contaminated by Bielski's '1500' for the number of the Polish-Lithuanian force.
⁸⁸. Although there are two letters from Ivan IV in the Kurbskij correspondence, only the first of them mentions the engagement at Nevel'.
⁸⁹. On потерноулися see above.
⁹¹. Ne tokmo = ne tokmo ne ("...not only did you not...").
⁹². Skrynnikov, Carstvo terrora, 154.
an indefinite issue. ‘They tangled [?] on both sides,’ observes the chronicler, ‘and informants were captured from them by our men.’ Being wounded, Kurbskij refused to renew the attacks on the day after the battle, and for this, allegedly, he incurred a rebuke on the part of the junior vojevoda Pr[ince] F.I. Trojekurov. Moscow took the issue of the Nevel’ battle ill. ‘For how is it that outside our stronghold of Nevel,’ the tsar wrote to Kurbskij two years later, ‘with fifteen thousand to beat four thousand you were unable; for not only did you not conquer, but, wounded yourself [or ‘yourselves’], you scarcely returned from them.’

Thus for Skrynnikov too the importance of the battle is in its effects on relations between tsar and general.

We should note immediately the second person plural forms of the original: ne mogoste, ne tokmo ubo pobediste, jazvleni jedva vozvratistesja. The criticism here is not only of Kurbskij. We may take it as a criticism either of both vojevody, Kurbskij and Trojekurov, or of the whole Muscovite force. Against the idea of a rebuke to the entire force we may argue that the historical Ivan IV believed firmly in the answerability of his officers. If the reproach applies to both Muscovite leaders, then it seems that both were wounded, and not only Kurbskij.

The battle of Nevel’, then, is represented as a latterday Thermopylae: a force vastly outnumbered outfought its enemies in a narrow place. Unlike Thermopylae, Nevel’ did not lead to the extirpation of the smaller force; unlike Thermopylae, it was not a tactical defeat leading to a strategic victory. Only an incapacitating wound could have justified Kurbskij’s refusal to renew the battle on the morrow.

The Polish-Lithuanian success outside Nevel’ was the result of Leśniawolski’s shrewd exploitation of his position between two waters. The terrain was difficult for cavalry movement. The most probable site of the battle was on the isthmus between Lake Nevel’ and a string of smaller lakes to the east. Muscovite commanders were used to deploying troops and guns by water. Even if it was impossible to outflank the Polish-Lithuanian forces, they could well have been taken in the rear by a resourceful and energetic commander. The
infiltration even of infantry, if marsh and forest were too obstructive for cavalry deployment, should have bottled up Leśniawolski’s force.93

Even by the lowest estimate (Ivan’s), Kurbskij had almost four times as many men as his opponents. If the latter contrived to escape the trap, the Muscovite commander cannot escape a charge of dereliction of duty; unless perchance his wound was more serious and he was unconscious. In all probability Kurbskij, knowing his vulnerability, in fear for his future in Ivan’s Muscovy because of his closeness to boyar frondeurs, was already contemplating departure. The defeat marks another stage on the way from the death of the tsaritsa Anastasija to the introduction of the opričnina.

Ivan’s reaction to the news of the opprobrious Muscovite defeat at Nevel’ is recorded in a document sent by the tsar on 19 October to the vojevoda of Jur’jев [Tarttu], the boyar Ivan Petrovič Fjodorov, to all Ivan’s vojevody, and to his d’jak Šemet Šelepин. In it Ivan cites a letter from Grigorey Xotkev[ič], castellan of Troki, in which the latter expresses a desire that ‘Christian lords should be in amiability and not shed human blood’94. In the same document Ivan gives detailed instructions of the kind normally sent by a head of state to a diplomat. On the one hand, Fjodorov was to respond positively to any request from ‘Xotkejevič’ to prevent military operations based on Smolensk, Veliž, Nevel’, Zavoloč’je, Opočka, Sebež or other frontier towns. On the other hand the vojevoda was to order the messenger delivering his (Fjodorov’s) reply to perform the following diplomatic tasks:

...provědývati gdě Grigorej stoit i mnogijе li s" nim" ljudi, i narjad" bolšej [sic] s" nimi jest' li, i čto ix" stojan'je, i kudy ix" čajati poxoda, i s" svejskimi ljud'mi, kotoryje stojat" pod'' Pajdoju, ssylki mež" imi o miru jest' li; i čto provědajut", i vy b" ix" o vsem" podlinno vyprosili i k" nam" otpisali95.

93. Muscovite commanders were capable of real tactical skill that could turn a losing tactical position into a strategic victory: such was the result when the vojevody Vorotynskij and Xvorostinin burst from a trap at Molodi on the Rožaj in 1572, routing a Tatar army (see the account in Škrynnikov, Carstvo terrora, 449-450).
94. SIRIO, volume 71-III, 80.
95. Ibid., 81.
...to try to discover where Grigorej is encamped and are there many men with him, and is there much artillery with them, and what is their condition, and whither to expect their march, and whether between them and the Svea [=Swedish] people stationed outside Paida there is correspondence about a peace; and you should interrogate them [= the messenger] about everything at length and write to us accordingly.

No evidence here that defeat at Nevel' had inclined Ivan to abandon his claim to Livonia. As for Ivan’s honeyed snarl about the avoidance of bloodshed, less than three months later his forces were again en route for Nevel'. And as for the defeated general, shortly afterwards Kurbskij was sent to Jur’jev as vojevoda. The appointment is a piece of demonstrative political theatre. Ivan says ‘Lose a battle at Nevel’? I’ve just told the vojevoda of Jur’jev that Nevel’ is important. Now you go and sit in Jur’jev in his place’. However, the affair at Nevel’ was not the main item on Ivan’s list of charges against the prince. ‘Car’ Ivan ne raz zajavljal, čto rassmatrivajet ssylku Kurbskogo [v Jur’jev] kak nakazanije za soglasije jego s izmennikami” (“Tsar Ivan stated more than once that he viewed Kurbskij’s exile as a punishment for his Kurbskij’s accord with traitors’), that is, in the boyar fronde.

On his way to his new appointment Kurbskij called in at the Pečora Monastery, west of Pskov, and in the spring of 1563 he wrote to a starets there, Vas’jan, with whom he had a close relationship.

I mnogoždy mnogo vam čelom b’ju, pomolitesja o mne okajannom, poneže pakı napasti i bedy ot Vavilona na nas kipeti mnogi načinajut.98

And I beseech you many and many a time, pray for me, accursed that I am, for again woes and troubles in plenty begin to boil upon us from Babylon.

96. Had the tsar uttered these words, he would, no doubt, have larded them with his usual dogs, hounds and snakes.
97. Skrynnikov, Carsto terrora, 158.
98. Quoted in Skrynnikov, Carsto terrora, 158.
The reference to Babylon is particularly pointed. R.G. Skrynnikov points out\(^99\) that in the *Skazanije o Vavilone-grade* (‘Tale of Babylon the City’) currency had been given to the idea that the power of Byzantium derived from that of Babylon. But if Muscovite readers were aware of the ‘Tale of Babylon the City’, they were much more aware of Biblical texts and the view of Babylon presented there, whether in the tale of Balshazar’s feast\(^100\) or in the Apocalypse.\(^101\)

Kurbskij may possibly have been aware that Ivan was moving towards new repressive measures, though he can hardly have foreseen the *opričnina* as such. ‘Nado dumat’, čto i zamysly Ivana o podgotovke kakix-to novyx reform ne mogli ostavat’sja neizvestnymi bojarstvu’\(^102\) (‘One must think that Ivan’s initiatives for the preparation of some kind of new reforms could not have remained unknown to the boyarate either\(^103\)’). At all events, the prince, according to Sadnikov, seems to have operated a double policy for a while. He tried to exculpate himself to the tsar concerning his failure at Nevel’ (‘opravdat’sja pered carjom v svojej oplošnosti’), but simultaneously he was in negotiations with Zygmunt August about defection.\(^104\) On 30 April 1564 Kurbskij left Jur’jev (Derpt, Tartu) for Lithuania.

At the turn of the year Ivan set about regaining Nevel’ as a *point de départ* for a stategic attack on Polock. The supplement to the Nikonian Chronicle tells us that Ivan’s forces foregathered at Velikije Luki by 5 January 1563:

> ...a pod narjad" po rěkam" mosty dělati k" gorodu k" Nevlju [gosudar’] velēl" že, kak" emu gosudarju močno itti mnogimi polki i za nim" narjad" provaditi, a ot" Nevlja i do Polotska [sic], poneže bo ta doroga lēsna i tēsna.\(^105\)

---

\(^99\) Skrynnikov, *Carstvo terrora*, 158-159.
\(^100\) Daniel, 5, 1-31.
\(^101\) 17, 5.
\(^103\) ‘Either’ (‘i’) because these possible initiatives followed a dénarche by Metropolitan Afanasij (ibid.).
\(^105\) *PSRL*, Volume the Thirteenth. VIII. *Lètopisnyj shornik*, imenuemyj patriaršeju ili Nikonovskyju lètopis’ju, SPb., 1904, 348.
...and [his majesty] likewise ordered the making of bridges across the rivers for the artillery towards the gorod of Nevł', so that his majesty might go in his many regiments\textsuperscript{106} and get the artillery through behind him, and from Nevł' to Polotsk, inasmuch as the way was through forests and fastnesses.

There is more detail in the \textit{Kniga Polockogo poxoda}. On 14 January 'the tsar and grand prince set off from Luki Velikije towards Nevł'”. On 15 January Ivan camped on Lake Nevan’. The next entry in the book runs:

Genvarja v 15 dn' car' i velikij knjaz' dneval na Nevane ozere [...].

Genvarja v 17 dn' kak car' i velikij knjaz' pošel k stanu k Zelencu...\textsuperscript{107}

On the 15 dy of January the tsar and grand prince spent the day on Lake Nevan [...].

On the 17th dy of January when the tsar and grand prince set off to the camp at Zelenec...

Since there is already an entry for 15 January – the one mentioning his arrival at the Lake Nevan' camp – I suggest that the second occurrence of ‘Genvarja v 15 dn” should be read as ‘Genvarja v 16 dn”. That would explain where Ivan was on 16 January, a matter otherwise absent from the record.

The tsar's personal regiment (polk) left Zelenec for Nevel' on 18 January. The tsar stayed at Nevel' on 19 January, and held a council of war, at which it was decided to hold a review of forces outside Polock. The tsar’s regiment remained at Nevel’ on the following day, and left on 21 January.

Kurbskij’s \textit{History}\textsuperscript{108} differs on the dates of this royal visit. According to Andrej Mixajlovič, Ivan spent two days at Nevel’, namely 19 and 20 January 1563. He took the

\textsuperscript{106} The sense is instrumental, not comitative.
\textsuperscript{108} [I.M. Kurbskij,] \textit{Istorija Ioanna Groznago in Skazanija knjazja Kurbskago}, ed. N. Ustrjalov, 84.
opportunity to execute Prince I. Šaxovskoj-Jaroslavskij with his own hand. This developing brutality marks a deterioration in Ivan’s regime, a new direction perhaps dating from the defeat at Nevel’.

On 15 February Polock surrendered. Ivan agreed to a truce (until Dormition Day (15 August)), 1563. On 3 March Ivan was at Nevel’ again, and appointed Prince Jurij Tokmakov vojevoda of Nevel’, jointly with Fjodor Šafer Borisović Čjoglokov. Military operations in the Lithuanian-Muscovite borderlands were characterized by rapid advances and countermarches and attacks on exposed strongholds. Garrisons were often too small, defence works too weak, to resist a long siege. The capture of Polock, however, was an extreme example. In the following winter attacks on Lithuania were launched from both Nevel’ and Polock.

A letter from Ivan IV to Metropolitan Makariy describes an expedition of July 1564 by his Nevel’ vojevoda Prince Jurij Tokmakov from Nevel’ to Jezerišče (S of Nevel’). The letter does not tell the whole story. Turčinović tells us that in July 1564 a 13,000-strong detachment of Russians led by Tokmakov appeared outside Ozerišče [Polish Jezeryszce] and laid siege to the stronghold, which was famed at that time for its considerable [neposlednimi] fortifications. The garrison commander, however, had time to inform the wojewoda of Vitebsk, Stanisław Pac, who, having sharked up a scratch force of 2,000 troops, entrusted the command of them to Jan Šnieporodo, an experienced warrior.

---

109. Not to be confused with Prince V. Šaxovskij-Jaroslavskij (note difference in spelling, for what that is worth), arrested at Gorodišče outside Novgorod Veliki in 1570 and executed in Moscow in the same year; still less with Prince S.I. Šaxovskoj-Jaroslavskij, who lived in the seventeenth century and to whom Keenan ascribes both sides of the Kurbskij Correspondence. On the other hand, he may be the father of the vojevoda of Nevel’ in the year 1602, Mixail Ivanovič Šaxovskoj.
111. And, in a symbolic public gesture of transformation, St Evfrosin’ja’s cross was returned from Moscow. See Uladžimir Arloŭ, Efrosinja Polackaja, Mi., 1992, 43 (Belorussian text), 134-135 (Russian).
112. Kniga Polockogo pospoda. Ed. Petrov et al., 79-80, 84. On 13 March of the following year new appointments were made, viz. Osip Mixajlovič Ščerbatoj and Nevzor Čoglokov (no patronymic). See Razrjadnaja kniga 1475-1605. Volume II, Part I. Comp. N.G. Savić, ed. V.J. Buganov, M., 1981, 176. Two years later, in 1566, a new appointment was made, namely that of Mixajlo Borisov syn Čoglokov; ibid., 215. It appears that three members of one family, possibly three brothers, served as vojevody of Nevel’ in rapid succession. From 1566 it seems likely that two Čoglovks served together.
114. Quoted in Nevel’skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 22.
115. Turčinović, Obozrenije, p. 149 (163). Many, if not all, of the details are confirmed in the supplements to the Nikonian Chronicle, 384-385.
116. By which time Moscow had suffered a major defeat at Ula (26 June 1564).
Tokmakov got his artillery away by water to Nevel' and readied himself for battle, but was utterly defeated. At this Tokmakov ordered the slaughter of all the Lithuanian prisoners whom he held. He noticed that, on Śnieporodo’s return to Vitebsk, the garrison had given itself over to uninhibited carousal. Tokmakov attacked the stronghold, captured it and extirpated the whole garrison.

Such were the heroic battle honours of Prince Tokmakov, vojevoda of Nevel', such the heroic flight of his artillery, such his slaughter of prisoners and of drunken soldiery.

The political life of the era was such that both Lithuania and Moscow had concerns in number other than each other. In 1564 the Opričnina was launched; the boyar opposition was attacked, accused of plotting with Zygmunt August, and decimated. In 1565 Mikolaj Radziwiłł ‘Czarny’, a consistent opponent of union with Poland, died, and the way was open for the unification of the Two Nations; given how weak the Lithuanian position appeared in the war with Moscow, that prospect seemed very attractive. In that same year ‘...wojsko polsko-litewskie odniósło kilka sukcesów, niszcząc okolice Newla, Wieliza i Wielkich Łuków’¹¹⁷ (‘A Polish-Lithuanian host brought off several successes, destroying the neighbourhoods of Newel, Wieliza and Wielkie Łuki’).

Newel had probably not recovered when in 1566 a ‘fell humour’ (līxaje povētreje [sic]), i.e. a contagious disease, struck Velikij Novgorod, Polock, Ozerišče (Jezerszcze), Nevel', Luky Velikije and Toropec. Nevel' was less scathed than its neighbours to north and south:

...v" Polotceu [sic] že i v" Toropeč' i na Lukax" na posadex" i v" ujēzdek popy pomerli¹¹⁸ i ne było komu i mertvyx" pogrebatii; a posylany popy v" tē gorody iz" ynymx" gorodov".¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ In the phrase v" ujēzdek I have preferred the reading of ms A to PSRL’s v" ujēzdē. It seems more likely that the hinterlands of all the towns mentioned were affected.
¹¹⁹ PSRL, Volume the Thirteenth. VIII. Lētopisnyj sbornik", imenuemyj patriaršeju ili Nikonovskoju
...now at Polock and at Toropec and Luki [Velikije] in the settlements and the hinterlands the [Orthodox] priests all died and there was no one even to bury the dead. The priests had been sent to those gorody from other gorody.\textsuperscript{120}

This story of priests tending the sick, according to the gospel injunction, is noteworthy. The natural interpretation is that Nevel', too, benefited from a visit by one or more priests. An Orthodox hospital is recorded from the later seventeenth century. Now, given the incompleteness of records from the earlier part of that century, it is worth considering the possibility that the hospital, as an institution if not as a building, was founded by clergy visiting Nevel' to minister to the sick.

In July of the same year, 1566, Ivan IV 'zawarł rozejm na dwa lata'\textsuperscript{121}, made a truce for two years, confirmed by Muscovy’s ambassadors in July 1567. To that truce we now turn our attention; in it, we find, an important corrective is introduced. The name of Nevel' is no longer to be found among the volost’s of the towns of Ostreje and Zavoločje.

A rubeż" [...] gorodu Ostreju, i gorodu Zavoločju, i volostem" Dolysě i Berezaju [\textit{this is where Nevel"s name formerly stood}], Usvaju, Lovcu, Vesně, Bologu, i Xolmskomu pogostu i Veliilě i Lopasticam" i Bujcę i inym" volostem" našim", kotoryje sošlisja s" tvojeju brata našego s" Litovskoju i Vitebskoju zemleju, i tem" volostem" rubež" zemlé i vodě po starym" rubežem"; goroda Nevlja i Pupovskije volosti vseje.\textsuperscript{122}

Now the boundary [...] to the town of Ostreje, and the town of Zavoločje, and the possessions of Dolysa and Berezaj [\textit{this is the point where Nevel' stood hitherto}], Usvaj, Lovec, Vesna, Bologo, and Xolmskij Pogost and Velilla and Lopasticy and Bujec and other possessions of ours, which have marched with your, our brother’s, Lithuanian and Vitebsk land, and the boundary of these possessions on land and

\textit{lětopis’ju}. SPb., 1904, 404.
\textsuperscript{120} Since gorody seems to contrast with na posadex" ('in the extramurine settlements'), I have left the term untranslated, in the sense of a stockaded fortress.
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Kronika Polski}, ed. Andrzej Nowak, Kraków 2004, 195.
\textsuperscript{122} SIRIO, volume 71-III, 479.
water is according to the old boundaries; of the town of Nevel' and of all the volost' of Pupoviči [my italics].

The anomalous of (‘of the town of Nevel’ and of all the volost’) reproduces the anomalous genitive in the original.

In other words, Nevel' has been transformed from a possession of Ostreje's into an independent town with its own possession, Pupovicy, an area in the far north of the modern Nevel' district. But this correction was evidently introduced at the last moment, and therefore stands out of place (according to geographical logic) and even in the wrong grammatical case.

Two years later the permanent union of the Lithuanian Empire with the Polish state finally came into being. It persisted for two centuries. Although borderland instability persisted for half a century longer, until 1619, after that a certain degree of stability came to Nevel', and that may in some part be attributed to the existence of the Rzeczpospolita. The motivation of the Lithuanian side in the negotiations at Lublin was certainly to ensure increased military security by virtue of the strength and growing reputation of Polish arms. Yet the post hoc is too long to give assurance of propter hoc. A young Neveler in 1569 would have been old before security arrived, and with it rule by a foreign state. Of that state's two capitals it was Kraków that gradually became the more influential, and that entailed an increasing remoteness of Nevel' from the centre of power (in time Warsaw grew in importance, so that the Sejm often met there).

In the following year (1570) Nevel' is mentioned in yet another peace agreement. Now Nevel' is found earlier in the list than Ostreje, to which at one time it belonged. This is part of a pattern, connected with the increased fortification of the borderlands, and it is to this that Nevel”s new importance must be ascribed.

123. The nominative form of the noun (Pupowicy) is found passim in the Radziwill Archives. The Old Russian text has an adjectival form.
124. SIRIO, Volume 71-III, 727.
In 1572 Ivan IV wrote his will. As his grandfather had, he bequeaths the lion’s share of his patrimony to his eldest son, the heir to the throne. He was that Ivan Ivanovič whom Ivan Vasil’jevič murdered some years later. For the moment the loving father left his son a multitude of towns, villages, lands and amenities of all sorts. Among other things the document mentions ‘gorod Popovič’ na Nevle, i volost’ Popovskuju vsju’125 (‘the town of Popovič’ on [Lake] Nevel’, and the Popovskaja volost’, all of it’).

Nevel’ is here named rather oddly. The unfamiliar name Pupovicy has been adapted to have meaning for Russian-speakers: it appears to betoken a place belonging to the son of a priest – ‘Holy Russia’ is being created before our eyes. By the same action the Muscovite bureaucracy has also removed the oddity of a place named after the navel (R. pupok).126

This was to count eggs as chicks. Ivan IV had dreadful trouble clinging on to Nevel’. During that struggle he would call in aid the Pope and his representative, a member of the recently founded but already prestigious Society of Jesus. Nevel’ would become the concern of the great and (perhaps) good, people powerful in the secular world and the spiritual.

On 7 July 1572 Zygmunt August died. After a lengthy electoral process, disagreements, the flight of a king, and other vicissitudes not relevant to Nevel in themselves, Stefan Batory became monarch, having a certain claim to legitimacy through marriage to Anna Jagiellonka (the sister of Zygmunt August and Katarzyna). In 1579 he led an army of 41,000 to besiege Polock.127 The town surrendered on 30 August128. Batory’s army burnt the city’s archives129, to the great detriment of historiography in general and of Nevel’ historiography in particular. As the recapture of Nevel had enabled

125. DDGVUK, 438 (in the original folios 28, reverse – folio 29, obverse).
126. Later treaties gradually return to the traditional name, e.g. in 1601 (SIRIO, Volume IV, 60-61 (Nevel’ exclusively on 61) and in 1608 (‘goroda Nevla’ and ‘i gorodu Nevluj, što [sic] u Pupovičax’ (SIRIO, Volume IV, 702). The Tsar’ and Grand Duke’s version (Vasiliy Ivanovič) has ‘goroda Nevla’ and ‘gorodu Nevluj, čto v Pupovičax’ (SIRIO, Volume IV, 714-715.).
127. On the balanced nature of Batory’s force see Frost, The Northern Wars, 59, where tribute is also paid to the effectiveness of the Muscovite strel’cy.
128. Taras, Vojny Moskovskoj Rust, 315-320; Markiewicz, Historia, 407.
129. Stephen Rowell, Lithuania Ascending, 179, n.
Tokmakov to launch his not unsuccessful raid on the next town to the south, so Polock retaken served as a staging post on the road north. In the following year, 1580, Batory laid siege to Velikije Luki.  

The hardest part of the campaign was the advance through trackless forests allowed to grow up by the Russians, 'ljubivšix v to vremja takim obrazom obespečivat' svoi predely i okružat' pogranicnje kreposti podobnymi pusty njami' ('who loved at that time thus to ensure their bounds and surround borderland fortresses with such wastes'). Unsporting Russians, to imagine in this paranoid fashion that the Rzeczpospolita had designs on their marches. Veliž was surrendered.

Ivan wrote to Stefan proposing new negotiations; the king responded by sending his army, in full view of Ivan's errand-rider, across the Dvina (a river much more impressive than the ditch-like Rubicon). The tsar was desperate to avoid further defeats. His ambassadors accompanied Stefan as the countryside burned.

Luki proved less oppugnable than Veliž. Stefan settled down to a prolonged siege. From Usvjaty he had already sent the wojewoda of Polock, Mikołaj Drogostajski, to neutralize a threat from the westward: the castle of Nevel', defended like Luki by lake and river. Mikołaj chose to attack on the side where the defences were strongest, says Turčinovič, and the garrison made frequent and effective sallies. 'The siege prolonged itself and the besiegers turned at last into the besieged amid their own trenches.'

The king therefore despatched five hundred elite troops to Drogostajski's aid. This reinforcement proving inadequate, he sent Jan Bornamiszsa with Hungarian troops. As a final expedient he sent Jan Zamoyski, his right-hand man, to guarantee his left flank. On the way, however, Zamoyski learned that Nevel' had at last fallen, on 29 September 1580. Clack,
goes the shuttle. Bornamisza’s first action had been to bottle up the Nevel’ garrison’s sallies. Then he had trenches dug farther forward, bringing the castle within closer range of his siege guns, and set fire to the castle with red-hot shot. The Muscovite vojevody were unable to prevent their alarmed soldiers from laying down their arms. The fire was extinguished; the castle fell, armed and unharmed, into Commonwealth hands.\footnote{Ibid.}

In exchange for the surrender of artillery and smallarms, the population of Nevel’ was to be allowed to leave freely, taking valuables. Drogostajski detained them while the armoury was checked, and discovered some derelictions. He therefore rescinded his terms and turned adrift those who wished to leave adrift wearing only smocks.\footnote{Działyński, quoted in Nevel’skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 18. Działyński attributed the surrender of Nevel’ to lack of powder (ibid.).}

Stefan sent Zamoyski on northwards to attempt Zavoločje, the last stronghold before Pskov, on which the king already had designs. Meanwhile Ivan’s itinerant ambassadors had caught up with the royal progression, reaching Nevel’, where Stefan lingered. Ivan’s new proposal was an exchange: he would cede four Livonian castles to the Commonwealth in exchange for the return of Luki, Veliž and Nevel’\footnote{Turčinovič, Obozrenije, pp. 194-195 (208-209).}. When this temptation proved insufficient, the ambassadors added more Livonian castles. This version, too, was declined, and the ambassadors wrote to Moscow requesting new instructions. Zamoyski captured Zavoločje. The king had returned to Polock, where he fell dangerously ill with an illness, hitherto unknown, that caused violent fever and other unpleasant symptoms. It killed huge numbers and caused widespread panic, as new illnesses did in those medically unsophisticated times. It was influenza.

Despite himself, Tsar Ivan turned to Pope Gregory XIII for help; and the latter passed on the task to a Jesuit named Antonio Possevino. Possevino is a striking personage even by the standards of the sixteenth century, which hardly lacks for colourful figures. Author of numerous religious works, the publisher of, among other things, a book by his brother on honour and duelling, the friend and correspondent of important figures of both sexes in Italy and the Holy Roman Empire, Possevino belonged to the second generation of Jesuits, which lived to see the triumph of the Counter-reformation. \textit{Inter alia} his works include an
important book on contemporary Muscovy, whose political and religious life he knew well.\textsuperscript{137}

Possevino's own motivation is, to my mind, fairly clear. Thus in a memorandum on the state of the Catholic hierarchy in Livonia, he writes:

\textit{...sed dexterā Domini Catholicissimo Regi assistente propitia, speratur, totam Livoniam brevi cessuram, et tunc non esset negligenda occasio restaurandae inibi Catholicæ religionis...} \textsuperscript{138}

But if the propitious right hand of the Lord helps the most Catholic of Kings [i.e. the Hungarian king of Poland], then there is hope that all Livonia will shortly be returned, and then the opportunity ought not to be missed to restore the Catholic religion there.

Similarly, when Possevino leaves Moscow for the front, where peace talks are being held, he leaves his assistant, another priest, in the capital; and Possevino leaves him detailed instructions as to what he should say during any religious debates with the tsar or his courtiers. This document is the longest in Possevino's Russian archive. Ultimately, Possevino undoubtedly dreamed of an end to the Great Schism and of the recapture of Constantinople.

Possevino encouraged the tsar and the king. He sought the mediation of the Emperor Rudolph. He wrote to King Johan III of Sweden to encourage him to join the negotiations. At the beginning of his correspondence with Stefan, in June 1581, Ivan IV makes concession after concession. He writes that he will gladly surrender Sebež, Veliž, Usvjat and Jezerišče, and will pay 400,000 Hungarian florins to boot, although he 'humbly requests' to be allowed to keep Velikiye Luki and Zavoločje\textsuperscript{139}. Let us pass over in silence the idea of a 'humble'

\textsuperscript{137} Possevino would not be known to Russian historiography without the heroic labours of Aleksandr Ivanović Turgenev, who toiled away in the Vatican library, copying out document after document from secret archives. Through those documents one can follow in detail Possevino's activities during the negotiations.
\textsuperscript{139} Supplementum, ed. Turgenev, III, p. 3.
Ivan the Terrible. One town is missing – for the moment. But, as Nevel' remained unmentioned in the démarche of 1537, the silence speaks the name.

It is December. Possevino has long ago left for the ‘field’, as he himself calls it. From Kiverova Gorka he writes to the King of Poland. In the backwoods of Belorussia the Italian must have felt pretty uncomfortable, but he does not complain. As yet, he says, the negotiations have not given the result that ‘we want’ [optamus]. The Muscovites are apparently insistent that all the fortresses [arces] which Your Majesty has won from them be returned, with the exception of Polock ‘and what has gravitated thereto’ [et quae ad eum attinrent]. This formula fits snugly enough into Latin, but we can feel the Russian behind it – ‘i čto jemu potjaglo’: and that is a sign of how intimately Possevino was involved in the accurate representation of Ivan’s position.

The papal representative has every hope, he says, that in the end all the towns of Livonia will be given back to the king. The text continues:

De Nevelia quantumcumque difficultatis, ac deinceps de Velisio, Velicoluco et Zavolocia, privatim illis objecerim, quod nulla ratione restituenndae sint: numquam tamen, aut colloquuis multis inter nos habitis, vel quantalibet industriia uti potui, elicui, fore, ut eas vestrae Majestati relinquuerent, si arcibus omnibus, quas habent in Livonia, cesserint.¹⁴⁰

However much I put to them privately the difficulties over Nevelia, and then in turn over Velisium, Velicolucum and Zavolocia, that in no wise would they be given back [to Moscow], yet never, despite the number of our conferences and the assiduousness of my efforts, was I able to convince them to surrender them [these places], given that they were to cede all the fortresses they have in Livonia.

Nevel’’s stock has risen. Now it is worth the whole of Livonia, and it has acquired a Latin name: Nevelia.

¹⁴⁰. Supplementum, ed.Turgenev, XXVII, p. 69.
Moscow’s approach to the question is easily understood. If Livonia was to be surrendered, as was hardly to be avoided, then let the Poles’ lines of communication be maximally extended, let their right flank be under constant threat.

Possevino wrote of ‘the difficulties over Nevelia’ on 17 December 1581. But on 13 January he wrote to the papal Secretary of State, Cardinal di Como, this time in Italian, that the Muscovites have now agreed to surrender 31 towns in Livonia, while the King of Poland—

Il Re parimenti, siccome scrissi, restituisce Vielkiluchi, Zavolocia, Nevelia, Chelma et alcune piccole fortezze di legno, [...] prese questa estate passata.  

The King likewise, as I wrote, is restoring Vielkiluchi, Zavolocia, Nevelia, Chelma and certain other small fortresses of wood, [...] which were captured this past summer.

At the end of his letter Possevino adds a postscript, in which inter alia he transmits a strange rumour, which has now been confirmed by captured Novgorodian soldiers.

Già sono alcuni giorni che si sparse romore della morte di Giovanni primogenito del Moscovito...

A few days ago now a rumour spread about the death of Ivan, the first-born of the Muscovite. Then the Lord Chancellor [Jan Zamoyski] wrote to me about this, and finally, now that three Novgorodian defenders have been taken prisoner, they have confirmed that it is true, that he has died and been buried in Moscow. He was twenty years old, and the [Grand] Prince has no other son left, apart from one, about whose qualities I have written to you on other occasions...

141. Di Como was a title rather than a name. He took it from the name of the Italian lake and town, near which he lived. His name was Tolomeo (or Bartolomeo) Gallio (other variants are Gallo and Galli). Di Como (1527-1607) adopted a position on worldly goods which was not unknown among Renaissance prelates; he built at least two villas near the lake, including one known as the ‘Villa d’Este’ because of its scale (after the better-known building at Tivoli).
142. Supplementum, ed. Turgenev, XXX, 71.
143. Supplementum, ed. Turgenev, XXX, 72.
The reference is to Fjodor Ivanovič, the mentally handicapped son of Ivan the Terrible.

And so, although Nevel' stayed in the hands of Ivan Vasil'jevič, the son to whom he had wished to leave Nevel' and a couple of hundred other places, was no more. The sixteenth century was to end with the fall of the Rjurikids and the ascent of Boris Godunov; the seventeenth would begin with the descent of the Poles upon Moscow.

On 14 January 1582 the talks were concluded; on the thirty-first of the same month a letter was written from faraway Wilno to a Mr. L. Thomson in London. It reads, in part:

On the fifteenth inst. I wrote to you in my last [letter] to your Grace of the course of the war this year, and now I have occasion to acquaint You with the fact that agreement has at last been reached between our envoys and those of the Grand Duke of Muscovy; the Muscovite is to return to the king all Livonia without the exclusion of any part thereof [...]. All that the king has already taken back of his own he will keep for himself, and in addition thereto he will receive Veliza and Suraza [i.e. Veliž and Suraž], places taken since the recapture of Polock; and the Muscovite is to have surrendered to him Veliluchi [sic], Zavlogia\textsuperscript{144} and Nevelia, places which were occupied last year...\textsuperscript{145}

Two questions arise: who was Mr L. Thomson? And who was the author of the anonymous letter from Wilno?

Whoever he was, L. Thomson had the ear, or rather the eye, of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth (sometime hearer of a marriage suit from Ivan IV), inasmuch as this letter was found among her state papers. And, given that he was wont to receive anonymous letters

\textsuperscript{144} That is, Zavoločje.
\textsuperscript{145} This translation is surely not contemporary. It will be found in Addenda: Miscellaneous 1581-1582, Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth: January-June 1583 and addenda, Volume 17 (1913) (Poland 1.14), p. 628. I am sorry that I have been unable to find the translator’s name.
from overseas and pass them on to the royal court, it is easy to draw conclusions about Mr Thomson’s profession. It was a trade common enough in Elizabethan England: he was an intelligence agent, for whom Nevel’s fate was a dainty dish to set before the queen.

Who was Thomson’s correspondent in distant Lithuania? This person was resident in Wilno. His knowledge of Slavonic languages was weak: he had seen, or perhaps heard, the genitive cases of Veliki and Suraž and taken them for nominatives. He wrote in Italian and fails to distinguish ę from ę (xo)\textsuperscript{147}. A Jesuit school had been founded in Wilno in 1569; it was later transformed into a college – in effect, a university, the forerunner of the present Vilnius University. The author of the letter must have been associated with the school. It seems to me unlikely that Possevino sent the letter himself, firstly because the errors in perception of Russian placenames are not Possevino’s, and secondly because a few weeks later, on 21 February 1582, Possevino was already in Moscow and plunged into theological debates with Ivan the Terrible. Even for the energetic Possevino it is perhaps a little too brief an interval to cover the journey westward from Jam Zapol’skij to Wilno and back eastward to Moscow.

At the end of this section dealing with Fr Antonio Possevino’s diplomatic activity we should mention that this Jesuit was the first person of Jewish origin who is known to have been connected with Nevel’. At the least it probable that this convinced Catholic, scholar, and embodiment of the spirit of the Counter-Reformation came from a Jewish family. Here is the evidence accumulated by the scholar Fr John Patrick Donnelly, SJ\textsuperscript{148}.

(a) Possevino’s father was a goldsmith who, after leaving Mantua, had fled from Milan, probably in 1526, after the occupation of that city by Spanish forces; ‘fled’ because of the attitude of the Spanish authorities to Jews after the completion of the *reconquista* in 1492.

\textsuperscript{146} I put the chances that the spy in the field was a woman at practically zero, although such a premise would make the basis of a splendid adventure story.

\textsuperscript{147} His own pronunciation of ę would have been [ts] or [dz], depending on context. Central Italian dialects have [2] but lack a way of transcribing it.

(b) Possevino’s brother Giovanni Battista, who before his premature death had been making a reputation for himself as a scholar, knew not only Latin and Greek but also Biblical Hebrew.

(c) The family surname had been changed from Caliani to Possevino.

(d) On several occasions Possevino was ‘accused’ of being a Jew. Throughout his professional career Possevino defended the rights of Christians of Jewish origin. In his old age he faced the same ‘reproach’ again. He wrote a circumstantial letter in which he catalogued the achievements of converted Jews in Catholic religious life. At the end of the letter he adds a list of his own achievements in the furtherance of the Catholic religion, as if he too were one of the ‘new Christians’.
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The year is 1591. Ivan the Terrible is no more (d. 1584); nor is Stefan Batory (d. 1586). The Russian throne is occupied by ‘one about whose qualities I have written to you on other occasions’. From now until the second decade of the seventeenth century we see Nevel’ only occasionally and usually in a lurid light, a distant castle fitfully illuminated by lightning.

Tsar Fjodor Ivanovič has an astute adviser. This emerges from the logbook of the Department of Envoys (Posol’skij prikaz):

I marta v 6 den’ pisal ko gosudarju carju i velikomu kniazju v Velikij Novgorod s Nevija gorodovoj prikazščik [sic] Grigorej Mjakinin, čto prijexal na Nevij iz Litvy litovskoj torgovoj čelovek Ivan Žolob. A s nim pisal iz Litvy gosudarev gonec Ondrej Ivanov vojevode nevel'skomu, xto nyne jest na Nevele, ili prikaznym ljudem...

And in March on the sixth day the town steward Grigorey Mjakinin wrote from Nevl' to the lord tsar and grand duke at Great Novgorod, [saying] that a Lithuanian trader named Ivan Žolob had arrived at Nevl'. And with him a royal messenger, Ondrej
Ivanov, wrote from Lithuania to the vojevoda of Nevl', who is at Nevl' at the moment, or to the servants of the Department.\(^{149}\)

The tale runs as follows. A Muscovite royal despatch rider, Ondrej Ivanov, had been sent on official business from his majesty's boyars to the lords counsellors\(^{150}\). He was under instruction from the tsar's marshal \([\text{konjušej [sic]}]\), Boris Fjodorovič Godunov to purchase for him 'certain goods that he needed'. He had passed the goods to a Lithuanian trader named Ivan Žolob and remained in Wilno. Žolob had set off to cross into Muscovy with the goods. Ondrej Ivanov wrote to the vojevoda of Nevl', asking that Žolob be let pass from Nevl' to Luki [Velikije] with an escort, \textit{en route} for Moscow. The goods were urgently needed by Boris Fjodorovič.

When Žolob reached Nevl', Mjakinin interrogated him. It turned out that the 'goods' were actually a sealed document. Žolob explained that this document constituted a matter of state. Ivanov had passed the document to Žolob, first sealing it with his own seal. Mjakinin took charge of the document from the Lithuanian and sent it on to the tsar. He did not release Žolob, however, because he had no royal order to allow Lithuanian merchants through\(^ {151}\). Instead he kept him in Nevl' in the settlement [i.e. outside the castle walls] at his majesty's pleasure.\(^ {152}\)

\(^{149}\) \textit{R-BS}, No. 26, p. 26; the story continues on p. 27. The messenger had sent a letter with Ivan Žolob, evidently an East Slav resident in Lithuania. The letter was for the vojevoda if he was in residence, or otherwise to the 'foreign ministry'.

\(^{150}\) The Grand Duke of Lithuania's advisory council.

\(^{151}\) Cross-border trade was evidently hamstrung by bureaucracy.

\(^{152}\) \textit{R-BS}, No. 26, p. 27.
This tale is revealing, and not a little sensational. Ondrej Ivanov is sent on a diplomatic mission to the highest state body in Lithuania. He is also to act as a spy, arranging for the delivery to Moscow of some espionage material, information gathered either by him or by Moscow’s man in Wilno. He cannot carry compromising material, so he passes it to Žolob. This sympathizer’s fate is unfair. He acts in Moscow’s interests, against those of the Rzeczpospolita, either as a way of improving his position as a foreign trader in Muscovy or possibly because he sympathizes with the Orthodox state across Lithuania’s eastern border. Unrewarded, he is left kicking his heels outside Nevel’ castle, spy unable to come in from the cold.

Trades are practised at the times and in the places appropriate to them: coals were once exported through Newcastle, samovars came from Tula. Nevel’ is situated on a border, dangerous, sensitive. The trades that thrive in such places thrive in Nevel’: espionage and smuggling. On the other hand, more everyday forms of trade are discouraged. The treaties normally guarantee trading rights, but there was no royal order to allow Lithuanian merchants through. The absence of an order to admit traders from the Rzeczpospolita is close to a ban on admitting them.

In May of the same year (1591) Tsar Fjodor’s younger half-brother Dimitrij assassinated himself, so it appears, when he fell on his own dagger during an epileptic attack. Rumours began to circulate immediately to the effect that this accident was the work of Boris Godunov; according to other contemporary tales, Dimitrij survived.

In October 1596 the Posol’skij prikaz (Department of Envoys) wrote to the Polish envoy Ja. Korsak in reply to a list of offences committed against Belorussian and Lithuanian traders. The tone of the reply is that pots should address kettles with circumspection. Muscovite traders are being robbed of their trade goods, forced to trade at a loss, and otherwise insulted. One of the many places where this happens in Nevel’.

153. Graham Greene’s novel was first conceived in Estonia; Wormald was to have been ‘our man in Tallinn’.
154. R-BS, No. 26, p. 27.
155. For details of the death see S.F. Platonov, Boris Godunov, Petrograd, 1921, 98-101.
156. R-BS, No. 33, pp. 49-56. The specific mention of Nevel’ county is on p. 51.
CHAPTER FIVE: NEVEL’ AS MAGICAL DEVICE

And what do our fine fellows do meanwhile?
Stand before Kromy, where a Cossack handful
Mock them below the rotten palisade.¹

A. S. Pushkin, *Boris Godunov* (‘Moscow. The Tsar’s Chambers’)

Disgrace and death, dishonour and taxation,
And toil, and hunger – you’ve suffered them all.²

A. S. Pushkin, *Boris Godunov* (‘The Heading Ground’)

Get you a copper kettle,
Get you a copper coil.
Cover with new-made cornmash,
And never more you’ll toil.

Albert Frank Beddoes, *Copper Kettle*.³

Bright mead was their drink, but it proved poison.

Aneirin, *The Gododdin*⁴

---

1. Ч то дел ают м еж т ем геро и наш и?
   С тоят у К р ом е, г де к у ч к а к а з а к о в
   С м е ё т ь с я и м из - п од г и л о й о г ра д ы.
   А. С. П у ш к и н , Б о р и с Г од у н о в ( с ч е н а ‘М о с к в а . Ц а р с к и е п а л а т ы ’)

2. О п а л у , к а з ь , б е с ч е с т и е , н а л а д ы ,
   И т р у д , и г л а д – в о ё и с п е т а л ь н ь е.
   А. С. П у ш к и н , Б о р и с Г од у н о в ( с ч е н а ‘Л о б н о е м е с т о ’)

3. Said to be from a book entitled *Bexar Ballads from Bexar County, Texas*, of which, however, neither
   the Library of Congress nor the Library of Texas State University have any record.

4. Glasfedd eu hancwyn, a gwenwyn fu.
   Aneirin, *Y Gododdin*.

The spring thaw of 1619 had come early.5 On 9 March two Muscovite officials, Maksim Radilov6 and Filat Domašnij,7 were expecting, rather uneasily, the arrival of a group of representatives of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations.

What had befallen Neverť during the the Time of Troubles? On 25 November 1606 Tsar Vasilij Šujskij issued an ukaz with information about the course of the struggle against the invasion.8 Contingents have arrived (alleges the tsar) from various towns to relieve the siege of Moscow: from Smolensk, Dorogobuž, Belaja, Neverť [s Nevľja"], Tver', Toržok [iz Toršku [1]], Novgorod, Bežeckij Verx, Kašin, Dmitrov, Klin and other towns beyond the Moscow’.9 (In point of fact the relief followed three days later.10)

Unwilling to submit to Griša Otrep'jev, Neverť seems to have changed its allegiance with the advent of False Dmitrij II. On 12 July 1608 Velikije Luki, Neverť and Zavolščje swore allegiance to the pretender.12 The leader of this rebellion was F.M. Pleščejev, which False Dmitrij II created boyar and namešnik of Velikije Luki. Unfortunately it is quite unclear by whom the oath was taken: the incumbent vojevoda, representatives of the landed gentry, of burghers or (most unlikely) the peasantry. At this time, however, False Dmitrij II was gaining support in the borderlands.

5. That is my conclusion from the closing words of the 1619 inventory of Neverľ, 2612, 68. The inventorist, Jerzy Siwicki, wrote that it was impossible to inventorize the area completely because the peasants had been taken away. He writes ‘jakoznam / pewną wiadomosc Ze nadz chłopi / pewnie będą, tylko czekał pokr / wodny spadną’ (‘However, I have certain information That back the peasants will certainly be, only they are waiting for the waters to abate’). This mass evacuation was not unprecedented.
6. 2612, 37. In this inventory Radilov’s name is spelt Radilow. This may be interpreted as either a Polonism or a Belorussianism, with a slight but diagnostic difference in pronunciation.
7. 2612 provides only Filat’s given name (p. 37). I have restored his surname on the basis of published Moscow archival records, cf. SIRIO V, 19-20, where we read: ‘Jurij Sivitkoj received Nevel from Maksim Radilov and the assistant secretary [pod’jačego] Filat Domašnij’.
9. Here the form without -e- is still in use, and Neverť is still treated as a hydronym (whence s = ‘from’).
10. Narodnoje dvijenje, ed. Rogožin et al, 116. Information about these contingents may, perhaps, be found in N.V. Lixačov, Razrjadnije d’jaki XVI v. SPb., 1888. Appendix, 32-33, which I have been unable to see. See: I.O. Tumensnev, Smutnoje vremja v Rossi načala XVII stoletija. Dvijenje Lžedmirija II. M., 2008, 43 and 78, note 30.
13. Ibid. Although the surname is common, one may wonder whether he was connected with Ondrej Vasiljevič Pleščejev, vojevoda of Neverľ in 1576. Cf. the case of Valujev, below.
The pseudomonarch fell out with the Commonwealth authorities once Władysław (later Władysław IV of Poland) became their preferred candidate for the Muscovite throne. In 1610 Ivan Saltykov, who supported the Polish claim to the throne of Muscovy, was on his way back from Moscow. He wrote from Novgorod to Zygmunt III Waza about his success in persuading various towns to declare for Władysław, the king’s son, as the next tsar. Among the towns to which he sent messages ordering them not to trust ‘treacherous rebellion’ (vorovskoj smuty) was Nevel’ (each side referred to its enemies as ‘robbers’ (vory), in the then-current sense of ‘traitors’). With him were noble representatives of many towns, who were used in the embassies: from Toropec, Luki Velikije, Nevel’ and Pskov. It seems, then, that some Nevel’ noblemen were prepared to accept Władysław.

In fact, however, these peregrinating noblemen are squires without estates. They, Nougordecy, gosudar’, i Pskovichi, i Lučane, i Nevljane (the Novgorodians, sire, and Pskovians, and men of [Velikije] Luki, and Nevelers), – believe that many towns are in revolt because of events in towns that have submitted. Toržok, Tver’ and Toropec submitted alliteratively, but it did them no good: Polish, Lithuanian and Ukrainian forces stationed there are laying the land waste, torturing and killing boyars and minor boyars and townspeople. They will not let boyars and minor boyars enjoy their landholdings (poměst’jami). It is evident from this account that Newel, too, had refused to submit to such treatment.

At this moment, then, it seems that there was a division between the unnamed Nevel’ landholders accompanying Saltykov and the Nevljane, which in this context evidently refers to the burghers; for it is the plight of the towns that concerns them. Moreover the grounds of their complaint concern also the landholders, who are not allowed the enjoyment of their land; thus even that group was divided.

The social base of resistance to intervention in Nevel’ was broader than has yet appeared. When in the same year instructions were prepared for an embassy to Zygmunt

---

14. SIRIO 142-V, 118.
15. Among them was a vojevoda named Grigorij Levont’jevič Volujev (Valujev; his patronymic is given ibid.); in Polish recension Wolujew et var., of whom more below.
16. Ibid., 120.
17. They are dated 17 August 1610 (OS).
and Władysław led by Metropolitan Filaret and Prince V.V. Golicyн, one of many complaints to be raised was the matter of violent annexations. Places mentioned in this context as having suffered include Putivl', Černigov, Smolensk, Belaja, Toropec, Nevel', [Velikije] Luki and Pskov: ‘многими землями завладели насильством" k Litovskoj zemlē čerez staryje rubeži, i mnogije obidy těm gorodom ot Litovskix ukrainnyx gorodov" činjatεn"18 (‘many lands have been annexed to the land of Lithuania across the old borders, and many offences are committed against these towns on the part of Lithuanian border towns’). Although towns are specified here as the offended parties, which may or may not imply the support of the burghers, it is clear that it is the question of Lithuanian land-hunger that is to the fore. This implies that the complainants are landholders, and possibly also peasants.

In 1612 Zygmunt III granted a dower to a widow named Tat'jana Bibikova, of Velikije Luki, the widow of a certain Buslav (she was not his first wife, as will emerge). Her husband had been killed by ‘traitors’ or ‘rebels’ [vorovskije ljudi] outside Belevo19 in 1606. Buslav had had the use of six hundred četverti of land in two places: outside Pustaja Ržova20, and in Nevel' ujezd three hundred četverti.

I tem vsem muža jejo pomest'jem vladejet syn ego Oleksej, a jej pasynok, jejo ne kormit, voločitsja ona meži dvorov; a nyne de on nam [= korolju] izmenjajet, sidit na Nevre; i nam by jejo požalovati iz muža jejo pomest'ja na prožitok...21

And the whole of that estate of her husband’s is in the possession of her son Oleksej, who is her stepson. He does not provide for her, she drags herself between manor houses22; and now, she says, he has betrayed us and is at Nevel'; and would we grant her a dower from her husband’s estate...

18. SIRIO 142-V, 167.
19. The text, whose orthography has been modernized in part, is in the language of the Lithuanian grand-ducal administrative service, a western dialect of East Slav. I have transliterated her name accordingly: Bibikov has initial accent, which cannot be Polish, and Tat'jana is an Orthodox and East Slav name. It follows that Tat'jana, and probably her late husband, were local people, though of the nobility.
20. The occasional spelling of this toponym as <Ržova> implies that <> here is to be understood as <ə>.
22. That is, she moves between the various manor houses of her late husband’s estates.
So the king in his mercy granted her one hundred and twenty cetverti from her late husband’s estate, to be designated by agreement between her and her son and held by her at the king’s pleasure.

A kak milost’ju Božijeju my, velikije hospodary, budem na Moskve na svojom carskom prestole, i jej toje pomest’je za soboju sprawiti na Moskve v Pomestnom prikaze v knigax.23

And when by God’s mercy we, the great lords,24 are in Moscow on our royal [carskom] throne, she is to confirm that estate to her name in Moscow in the Department of Estates in the registers.

Kak – when – proved a very long word. No Bibikovs are found in the Newel inventories of the seventeenth centuries. Oleksej, if he survived, must have withdrawn with other pro-Muscovite Nevelers at some time before the transfer of the town in 1619. Tat’jana disappears without trace. However, it seems that a trend is emerging in our account of Nevel’ at this time: an important body of local people no longer found their historic links with Lithuania attractive. This body included both landowners and burghers.

In 1613, the year when Russia found its own solution to the dynastic crisis in the person of Filaret’s son Mikhail, Nevel’ was in the hands of the Muscovite defector to the Commonwealth whom we met above, Grigorij Valujev (or Grzegorz Wołujowy, in Polish recension). The Commonwealth was making use of local connections; and Valujev was prepared to cooperate. Refugees, women and children, had fled to Newel through the forests from Zavoloč’je. His position there was absolutely uncertain. ‘A słychać że ciż worowie chcą przyść na nas do Newła. A ze mną na Newlu ludzi niewiele, a w chłopach boję się zmiany’25 (‘And one hears that these same traitors wish to come against us at Newel. But here with me at Newel there are few men, and I fear treachery in the peasants’).
At this date ‘Newel’ is in the hands of the Commonwealth, but its allegiance is in great doubt. At one stage some nobles may have transferred their allegiance to the relatively new state. Possible reasons might include the survival of a tradition that Nevel’ was a Lithuanian town, not a Muscovite, and the threat to nobles’ position presented by the failure of the Rjurikoviči. But the people of the Nevel’ countryside still feel, apparently, that their loyalty lies with Moscow, with Orthodoxy and their East Slav mother-tongue, even if the last-mentioned is no longer identical with that spoken in Novgorod or Moscow. The burghers have been alienated by Commonwealth depredations in other towns, and the landholders no longer feel that their land is protected. Furthermore there was extremely violent military action in Velikije Luki in 1613. Nevelers must have known about this, and it probably affected at least the northeastern parts of the Nevel’ hinterland. We shall return to those events below.

Two years later there are rumours of a large force commanded by a certain Pan Xorvatecki, which ‘vojeval de v gosudareve zemle pod Nevlem’26 (‘is said to have been fighting outside Nevel’), and is now moving down the River Dvina. It consists, allegedly, of about ten thousand ‘volnyx [sic] ljudej’ (‘free people’), perhaps meaning Cossacks, rebellious peasants, or a combination of these and other elements. In the same year there is a complaint from the Rzeczpospolita about Moscow’s vojevody and men from the frontier towns of Nevel’ (first in the list), Seběž [sic], Opočka and Krasnyj. They are said to have broken their oath to the king, attacked many villages in the Polock and Vitebsk districts, and killed or taken prisoner.27 In short, Nevel’ changed sides twice over these years. It is very probable that social stratification was important here. Landholders had one attitude – they were favourably disposed towards the idea of a Polish-Lithuanian prince on the throne of Muscovy. The townspeople were unconvincing, and in the end withdrew their support for a foreign solution to Muscovy’s dynastic problem. Lastly, the peasantry seems unconvincing by the Commonwealth’s pretensions to rule, and some members of that group may have taken their chance to run away as freebooters.

26. Letter from Nečajev to the Lords the Council, SIRIO 142-V, 640.
27. SIRIO 142-V, 693.
In 1619 Newel, as we must call now call it, comes back into focus, through the lens of the inventories in the Radziwiłł archives. At some time on 9 March the delegation rode splashing into Newel' from the south through slush and mud. It was led by Jerzy Siwicki, the vice-castellan of Witebsk, and a certain Captain [rotmistr] Meszczeryna, Mieszczeryn or Meszczeryn. We may be sure that their dignity was enhanced by a detachment of cavalry: horses sweaty, muddied to the thigh, their riders, no doubt, looking round haughtily but not without a certain apprehension. Under the terms of the Truce of Deuliino or Dywilino, the Muscovite state was to surrender the town of Newel' with its castle and its whole hinterland to the Commonwealth. Hence Siwicki and Meszczeryna were important but not particularly welcome visitors. They had already begun to catalogue all the property in the Newel' hinterland, and would do as much more of that work as could be contrived in the conditions of the polovod'je, the flooding consequent on the spring thaw.

...kiedy z nieg° zbieży / j wody opadną, iezdzac powlosciach / opiszą sie dostatecznie Ateraz zadną / zywą [= żadaną żywą] miarą opisac sie niemogło, bo / ý chłopi niewiedzą, A ci co byli wia / domi zwiedzijono ých jakozman / pewną wiadomosc Ze nazad chłopi / pewnie będą, tylko czekają pokí / wody spadną.

There is a problem with the understanding of this passage, namely the absence of a masculine or neuter antecedent to z nieg°. I suggest that the correct reading is ‘kiedy sneg zbéezy / j wody opadną’. The erratum is probably the result of the copying up of hastily scribbled notes, or of dictation misheard. We may now translate:

---

28. From the history of portents; as the confrontation on the Jemenka in 1185 was preceded by a solar eclipse, so the surrender of Smolensk and another dozen towns was preceded by a comet in 1618. Yet in Moscow it was regarded as a good sign. See PSRL, Volume the Fourteenth. First half. II. The New Chronicler, 146.
29. The captain will be referred to hereafter as Meszczeryna, the version of his name that occurs most often in the 1619 Inventory.
30. The Polish term for the Newel' hinterland, Newelszczyzna, is found for the first time in 2612, on p. 19, in the form wNewelszczyz / nie. The Russian version of the term, Nevel'sczina, is still in daily use in Nevel'.
31. Hence the anomaly that the description of the castle and town appears in the middle of the 1619 inventory.
32. 2612, 68.
...When the snow runs away and the waters abate, riding\textsuperscript{33} around the wiosce\textsuperscript{34} they will be inventorized adequately, but for the moment it could not be inventorized by any living measure, for not even the peasants know, while those who were [well-] informed have been taken away[...]. Nonetheless I have certain information that back the peasants will certainly come, only they are waiting for the waters to abate.

How did they look, the town and castle at which Siwicki and Meszczeryn arrived on that morning? On the basis of the 1619 inventory, supplemented with a little information from later inventories, we can for the first time paint a picture of Nevel', indeed build a threedimensional model of both castle and town. And from a distance the place appears not unimpressive. The whole complex, castle and town, is surrounded by a stockade\textsuperscript{35}. ‘Zamek newel z miastem wesołek ostrogem / nowym mieścym obwiedziony, A mieścym starym / tak zamek iako y miasto Ziedne\textsuperscript{2}...’ (‘Newel Castle and the town in common is girt with a stockade, in places new, And in places old, both the castle and the town Together...’).

Above the stockade rise the roofs of some notable structures. Before us stands a tower, from which the River Jemenka\textsuperscript{36} is diverted to provide a moat for the eastern wall of the castle. (The line of the ditch is still (July 2011) easily visible at its eastern end, where the ground drops away sharply to the Jemenka.) Perhaps we can just make out the tops of other towers: the one above the bridge\textsuperscript{37} from the town over the moat into the castle; the one beyond that, where the moat flows back into the river; and the one in the middle of the stretch of wall along the river back to the Water Gate\textsuperscript{38}.

---

33. The pendant participle represents the pendant gerund of the original.
34. The seventeenth-century inventories make no consistent use of diacritics (with the exception of $<$-$>$). Many dashes, accents, apostrophes and curlicues can be found above, below, between, before or after letters or words; but they have no special meaning (they do not, for example, represent the centring tendency of the vowels known in Polish as pochylone). Since such questions as that of cokanie in the Nevelszychyna (replacement of $c$ with $c$, etc.) must not be prejudged, I have not added modern Polish diacritics, even in the translations.
35. 2612, 37.
36. The early inventorists do not usually give the river's name a diminutive -ka termination. Of the early variants nadzrekaj ymienia [sic] (2612, 37) is the most psychologically revealing: here there is confusion with Russian inenieje having, estate, property).
37. The 1629 inventory (2613, 3) tells us that ‘$<$W$>$ Przekopie Most porzedny’ (‘In the Moat [there is] a Bridge in good order’). It is safe to conclude that it was in good order in 1619, too, because the inventory of that year states the contrary passim.
38. The reasoning necessary to locate the towers will be set out below.
Closer to us the town stockade stretches from west to east. It too is defended by water: at first by the river, then by its own moat\textsuperscript{39}; ‘A od / pola zedwustron miasta przekop wielki / y pali ostrých nabito’, i.e. ‘But on the side of the open country on two sides of the town there is a large moat and sharpened stakes have been hammered in’\textsuperscript{40}. A plan of Nevel’ made for Catherine II in 1772 has recently been published\textsuperscript{41}. It shows the course of the town moat, which leaves Lake Nevel’ at the place where the northern stretch of the Jemenka leaves the lake. The moat flows southwards, then southeastwards, before finally turning northeastwards to rejoin the Jemenka. The same map makes it clear where the castle moat ran, too; but by 1778 it had silted up completely. To some extent we can follow that dessicating process in the inventories. It was referred to in 1754 as ‘Fos[s]a Stara mało Co Znacza’ (‘Moat Old Meaning Little’). The land thus gained was let to town burghers for a payment to the Radziwill owner of Newel. It is difficult to see any military advantage here: in English a dry moat is also known as a \textit{haha}.

The palisade has in all three towers. The one to the east looks across a bridge towards Velikije Luki, whither the road winds through virgin forest kept as a hunting reserve and as a defence. ‘Puszcze borowe od uswiata od połocka / od pusto Rzowy, odzawlocza od łuk wielkich wktorzych puszcach ’ łos j y niż zwierz býwa\textsuperscript{42}, i.e. ‘Coniferous forests in the direction of Usvjaty [SE of Nevel’], Polock [S of Nevel’], Pustořova, Zavoločje [N of Newel] and Luki Velikije, in which forests there are wontedly elk and other game’.

Another tower fends off attacks along the road from the southeast, from Smolensk. And at the southern corner the road from Jezeryscze enters the town beneath yet another tower.

We can know the locations of these towers by collating information from the inventories. The 1619 inventory tells us: ‘wiez Wszytkich\textsuperscript{43} koto zamku ý miasta . 8.’\textsuperscript{44}, ‘of towers in All around the castle and the town . 8.’. From the 1629 inventory we

\textsuperscript{39} 2612, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} See: Putešestvije v Nevel’, ed. Maksimovskaja, 7.
\textsuperscript{42} 2612, 67.
\textsuperscript{43} The older form, without \textit{<s>}, is found \textit{passim} in the inventories. Hereafter we shall comment only when the form with \textit{<s>} is found.
\textsuperscript{44} 2612, 36.
learn that ‘Od tey bra= / [M.] Ostrog także nad wodą dowieze miedzy tym Ostrogiem wiedną [......] d[o]dowaneý...’45. Although the page is partly obliterated by a blot, and although a hole has been cut in it, customary palæographical procedures46 can be used to reconstruct the text: ‘Od tey bra= / [M.] Ostrog także nad wodą dowieze miedzy tym Ostrogiem wiedną [scianę] d[o]dowaneý’, i.e. ‘From this gate [the Water Gate] a Stockade also above the water to an additional tower with one thickness [of wall] amidst this Stockade’. This sentence is part of a complete list of the castle’s towers, which in 1629 numbered six. If we subtract the new tower (placed on the south side and perhaps therefore built by the Russians when they reoccupied the town), we reach a total of five castle towers in 1619. If in 1619 there were eight towers in all, then three of them were ‘town towers’. As for the gates, we are told:47 ‘Abram [= A bram] wszystkich 4.’, ‘of Gates [there are] in all 4.’. These include the Water Gate; the names of the other three are established in the records only later: Brama Łucka, that oriented on Velikije Luki; and the Spaska and Jehorowska gates, named after churches of St Saviour (within the town) and St George (outside) (1681)48. Thus Newel-Newel defends itself on all sides, because two states have played their parts in its defence works.

Above the town walls rise the roofs of significant buildings: some of the castle towers, or the largest construction in the castle, the Cekawz, as the term is spelt in the 1619 inventory49. The term derives from the German Zeughaus, meaning ‘storehouse’, from Zeug ‘stuff, rubbish’. We can also see several Orthodox churches. Somewhat closer are those of the town: ‘Wmiescie cerkwi .2. Jedna spasa. A druga bla / Howieszczenia’50, i.e. ‘In the town there are churches .2. One of the saviour. And the other of the anNunciation’. At the least these will have domes; possibly one has a bell tower. In the castle there were no fewer than three churches: ‘wzamku cer / kwi : 3 : Mikoły, Rozestwa, j trzecia Mikoły’, i.e. ‘in the castle there are [Orthodox]51 churches : 3 : of St. Nicholas, of the Nativity, and the

45. 2613, 3.
46. Thus the double dash after bra means that the rest of the word is on the following line; an M is legible through ink and there is then space for one letter. Thus Bramy is the obvious reading. The phrase wiedną scianę [i.e. ‘w jedna...’] is found passim in the inventories and corresponds to the number of illegible letters.
47. 2612, 38.
48. 2615/1, 17.
49. 2612, 38.
50. 2612, 39.
51. Implied by the use of cerkwi. For reasons stated hereafter, this is much too early for any Uniate church in Newel.
third of St. Nicholas. Here it seems very likely that there was a campanile. In the 1629 inventory we read that ‘przy tey Cerkwi [one of the St Nicholas churches] na dz[wonicy w niej dzwon[...] wiek oliowany a / trzy rz[je]yszcyw[h]’ i.e. ‘by this church in the belfry at it there is a large leaden bell[...] and three lighter ones’. Why a leaden bell? When the inspector (a royal secretary, Jan Marinkiewicz) enquired he was told in a local variety of East Slav that the bell was made of ołowo (ołowo), a word used for pewter and various other alloys, and applied here to some kind of bell-metal. The Polish reflex, ołowo, means ‘lead’ (Pb). Perhaps this deep-voiced bell and its four companions are ringing as we ride towards the town, not in the mathematical patterns beloved of Lord Peter Wimsey, but in the Russian style, joyous and anarchic, and to some ears a little cacophonous.

In Chapter Four above we gave details of the extensive network of streets catalogued in the 1619 inventory. In large part those streets were grouped around the market. The marketplace was probably the site of the town hall. The 1636 inventory tells us: ‘W tym ze Rynku Za Kramami Ratusz Stara nadgniła’, i.e. ‘In this same Market Beyond the Shops a Council House Old partly rotten’. I suggest that if the Ratusz had been new-built, this rot would not have begun. Admittedly, the town stockade rotted away between 1619 and 1629, for in the inventory of the latter year we read ‘OstroG ktory był koło miastawzytek zgniły nimaszgonic’. I read ‘miastawzytek’ as ‘miasta w[estytek]’, the latter being an archaic masculine short form, and ‘nimaszgonic’ as ‘ni[e] masz go [= od niego] nic’: ‘The Stockade that was round the town has all rotted and you have nothing of it [left]’. However, that stockade was in places old even in 1619, and those places were probably around the town rather than the castle.

Thus it is quite clear that from afar Nevel’ already looks rather impressive. The town is girded round with walls and towers. There are bridges, portals, vernacular church domes, and other important buildings such as the Cekawz and the town hall: something of a

52. Ibid., p. 38.
53. 2613, 5.
54. Certainly in 1636 a man called Wołodzko Dzwonnik (‘Little Vladimir the Bellringer’) lived at Dym No. 69 in Newel (the numbering is erroneous; his house is actually No. 74 in the list). On the corner of the next street lived a priest, and it seems certain that this is not a coincidence. See 2614 (of 1636), 10.
55. 2614, 8.
56. 2613, 6.
57. 2612, 40.
minor kremlin, in fact. Outside the stockade stand the merchants’ guesthouse and the dwellings of the posad. Through this countryside and into this townscape Siwicki and Meszczeryn ride with their cavalrmen. From the treetops magpies cackle and scoff at the troopers’ uniforms, confident that nothing can rival their own dark viridian tailcoats and dazzling white shirts.

Such was the panorama Nevel’ presented in the second decade of the seventeenth century. The town’s skyline, seen thus from afar, recalls, as a forebear foreshadows a descendant, the descriptions of Nevel’ in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Alas, this beguiling prospect of the town is largely specious.

wiesz Wszystkich koło zamku ź miasta 8. / rąbione iuz zgniłe
(‘of towers in All around the castle and the town 8. / the cut ones [= the timber ones] are now rotten’)

wzamu cer / kwi : 3 : Mikoły, Rozewsta, j trzecia Mikoły dwie nowych, A trzecia Zgniła
(‘in the castle there are Orthodox churches : 3 : of St. Nicholas, of the Nativity, and the third of St. Nicholas, two new, But the third has Rotted’)

58. Ibid., ‘dom goscinny’.
59. In my experience little can be done in Nevel’ without a magpie chorus. That this was so in the past is shown in the toponymy (Soroki, Soročino). Some (including the author) may prefer a more detailed picture. Sparrows chatter by the roadside. Wading birds large and small patrol the lakeshore. A dipper, white-bellied, stands on a rock, waiting to take his next underwater walk. Various Nevel’ birds can be heard calling or singing: blue tits, thrushes, even crossbills. Unseen woodpeckers drum the riders onward. All these birds have left their names on the Nevel’ landscape (at, e.g., Aljablovo, Vorobjovo, Drozdovo, Zuji, Kljastica, Kulići, Siničino; for the woodpecker, cf. 2612, 32, the pustosz of Dziattowo).
60. See, for example K.K. Slučevskij, Nevel’ (an extract from his book Po severo-zapada Rossii) in Maksimovskaja, Nevel’skaja starina, 47.
61. 2612, 38.
62. Ibid.
Abram wszystkich 4. tak / ze spróchniałych
(‘of Gates [there are] in all 4. al / so gone to pownder’)

Za ostrogiem od miasta nadzieziorem newem / Te domy wszystkie puste
(‘Beyond the stockade away from the town above lake newel / Those houses are all empty’)

Zamiastem tuz mlýný .2. narzece ýmienie zep / sowane odwu koł (‘just Beyond the town mills .2. on the river ýmien[a?] wre / cked with two wheels’)

Here are the results of year after year of warfare. There had been fighting in the area after the accession of Mikhail Romanov to the Russian throne. That fighting followed seamlessly from the Time of Troubles, which in turn succeeded fighting in the 1580s, 1570s, 1560s. There seems to have been some lull in the 1540s and 1550s; before that there was fighting in every decade back to the 1480s. Neither the gates nor the towers can assure the safety of the townspeople; nor can they guarantee the integrity of the border. The town and castle stockade is partly new, but it is partly old. The damage to the mills must have been the result of enemy action. Living outside the town is no longer safe, as it once was (why else would there be houses there?). If the mills are not working, then grain must be ground in a hand-quern. For those condemned to do this work (most probably poor women), their task will grind every day away to nothing. Even eternity is compromised: one of the garrison churches has rotted away.

Yet what faith Nevelers must have. Faced with change and decay in all around, they restore, not the fortifications that once defended their bodies, but the church that offers salvation. This daily piety is borne out also by the name of the ‘Rozdestwa’ church – the Nativity. The official name will have been cerkov’ Rozdestva Kristova or similar, i.e. ‘of the Nativity of Christ’, where the combination /žd/ is a Church Slavonicism. Pan Siwicki asked

63. Ibid.
64. 2612, 40.
65. Ibid. The two mills were restored and figure passim in later inventories. As will emerge, they were located close to a bathhouse, and it is perhaps possible that one of them was a fulling mill (there is no other evidence on the point).
someone for the name of the church, and the reply was not ‘Roždestvenskaja’, in the official ecclesiastical Church Slavonic language, but a colloquial version, unofficial rose. So for his informant this church was something that was close to him, to be referred to in everyday language, not in some special tongue reserved for Sunday use only.\(^{66}\)

Similarly, too, with the Mikola church.\(^{67}\) The substitution of initial <M> for <N> is not only a popular form but a local one, found in the inscription from Polock Cathedral mentioned in Chapter Two. In passing it is worth explaining the trinity of churches within the castle. The new Mikola replaced the rotten one, of course. Both of them were wooden, for the third (of the Nativity) is a stone\(^{68}\) church. The point is that the stone church is for use in winter – it can be heated; the unheated wooden church is for summer services.\(^{69}\) It is possible that one of the two town churches was also a heatable winter church.

Even if we discount one of the two Mikola churches, in 1619 town and castle between them possessed four active churches. For this reason and the others outlined above we can be sure that for Nevelers religion was an everyday matter. This is not to bid up their piety or their theological sophistication. Nor is there any reason to suppose, on the basis of the 1619 inventory, that they were more religious than people in other Orthodox towns. But the sound of the bells was in their ears and the smell of incense in their nostrils, and their view of the afterlife was no doubt shaped by the icons that they saw in church.\(^{70}\)

\(^{66}\) A recent article makes the case that, even in Macedonia, Church Slavonic was always and for all church-goers an alien language. It was meant to 'defamiliarize' (as the Formalists would have said) the liturgy and scriptures, thereby raising their prestige (or 'sacralizing' them). See: William R. Veder, 'Dead on Arrival. Why Church Slavonic Would Not Be Reanimated' in Speculum Slavica Orientalis, ed. Ivanov and Verkholantsev, M, 2005, 222-231. The Anglican prayerbook and the 'King James' Bible are directed towards the same purpose.

\(^{67}\) 2612, 38.

\(^{68}\) 'Stone' buildings in the East Slav lands are often of brick; 'stone' churches are of brick covered with whitewashed plaster. Given, however, the scarcity of clay in Nevel, it is possible that the stone church really was built of stone.

\(^{69}\) This pattern is common in Russia. It was found again in Nevel in the eighteenth century. 'Then to replace the church of the Annunciation, which had burnt down in 1725, the temple of the Transfiguration of the Lord [...]. The church is unheated [xolodnyy]. All along the south side the church abuts the heated church of St Nicholas the Thaumaturge.' See: Vseobchey illjustrirovannyj putevodiitel po monastyrjah i svyaym mestam Rossijskoj imperii, Nižnij Novgorod, 1907, 544; Nevel'skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 84.

\(^{70}\) Direct evidence of icons in Nevel is sparse. The 1629 inventory (2613, 5) tells us: 'Poszrod Zamka Cerkwi dwie [...] druga za- / lozen[i]ja S. Mikolo pusta obrazy w niey' ('Within the Castle Churches two [...] the other dedicated to St. Mikola empty icons in it'). I suggest that the church was empty at the time because it was the summer church and temporarily unused. But in 1636 it is specified that the Nativity church is without icons (2614, p. 4): 'Polewey ] ironic Cerkiew Zadozenia NaRodzi / nia Panskiego bezobrazow y dzwonow...' ('On the left-hand side the Church of the Nativity of the Lord without icons or bells'). The indication of their absence seems to show that other churches had them. It is even possible that the icons migrated according to the season.
Within the castle, the main building was the Cekawz, of which more will be said later in the chapter. Apart from that and the three churches, there were various other structures, including thirty-six houses, described as ‘pospolticych’ (‘communal’). The inventory does not specify who lived in them. They may have included a gubernatorial house; this was certainly the case later. It was probably in one of these dwellings that the four men sat down to discuss the details of the handover of Nevel to the Commonwealth. It is clear that the tsar’s representatives cooperated fully, because they gave details of how tax had been levied in Muscovite times, giving values in roubles, which the inventory cites, giving also equivalents in złote. Thus, for example, Siwicki and Meszczeryn learned that the residents of the posad (the area outside the walls, where the houses were for the moment empty)

only served [did labour service] and had no [tax] liability only from the merchants’ hostel, and transport tax on goods at 250 Roubles, which will make złote 866/20 [grosze] From the mills per annum at two Roubles which will make złote 6/20 From the bathhouse at two Roubles per annum which will make złote 6/20.

This throws a brief flicker of light on Muscovite taxation policy in Nevel. What is necessary for local life is taxed at a reasonable rate – turning grist to flour and dirt to cleanliness. But a swingeing tax (the myto) is imposed on the movement of goods for trading purposes and on the merchants’ hostel. This was probably a very basic facility, in that when eventually we find a new hostel described in some detail, it is frankly primitive. It is ‘black’, i.e. treated

---

71. 2612, 38.
72. Some were probably in a poor state, for in the 1629 inventory only a score of them survive; see 2613, 5-6. That inventory lists the names of the residents, most (probably all) of whom had specific roles in the life of the castle – canoneurs, officers of the hayduks (mobile frontier defence forces), etc. Several of them are there characterized as ‘zdrayca’ (traitor), and the name of a new incumbent given. The loss of sixteen houses may also have been the result of military operations.
73. From Old High German mütta ['customs'] duty’, cf. ĖSRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, III, 26, s.v. *mút*; Wiesław Boryś, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego, Kraków, 2005, 345, s.v. myto. To Slavs this sounds like being ‘washed’.
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with tar. It has three ‘black’ benches for traders to sleep on, and small, unframed windows. Outside there are two sheds for storage of merchants’ trade goods, a stable for their horses, a hay store. Gallling, to travel in difficult territory and then find ourselves overcharged for inferior accommodation. This fiscal framework must have had an inhibiting effect on trade, although the Commonwealth too imposed its own _mirt_ or _myto_ (both forms are found in the inventories).

The 1619 inventory contains other hints about the economic system in the Russian Nevel’schina at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The _strel’cy_ were entitled to a great deal of agricultural produce, and indeed of money, but ‘at the moment not even a sixth part has been given’. To this we can add that the _strel’cy_ were also entitled to quantities of honey, but ‘of the honey none has been given’. Again, local taxes offset local expenditure, in this case on defence. Below we shall mention a little more information about the Nevel’ economy as it operated under Muscovite rule. We shall also see the radical changes made to fiscal policy under the Commonwealth.

If there is polite cooperation across the table, relations between the two Commonwealth delegates are cooler. _Pan_ Siwicki is a well-established member of (so to speak) the Commonwealth’s middling leadership. His assistant, Captain Meszczeryn, is a rising star. He already has solid military achievements behind him. The contrast in itself might have caused some friction between the two. But Meszczeryn is not a distinterested party. We turn now to his origins and his career.

74. 2614, p. 13 (numbered ‘7’).
75. [S]trzelcom [dative], here with -rz-, elsewhere in the document with -r-. The former is a clear Polonism.
76. 2612, 55.
77. Ibid. Honey (not from Nevel, in all probability) was required by the central authorities: it was used in contemporary Muscovite diplomacy as a sign of high favour. ‘Hunajan tai hunajaviinan tarjoaminen ja niiden lähettiläimen juhlallisen päivällisen jälkeen lähettiläiden majoituspaikalle kuului venäläisen diplomatian etikettii ja tärkeisiin pöytäloipoihin; se oli erityinen kunnian osoittamisen muoto’ (‘The serving of honey or mead and the sending thereof after a formal dinner to the envoys’ lodging was part of Russian [sic] diplomatic etiquette and one of the most important customs at table; it was a special way of demonstrating honour’) – _Ruotsin ja Venäjän rauhanneuvotteluui 1557_. _Mikael Agricola Ruotsin lähetystön jäsenenä_. Toimittanut ja ruotsinkieliset asiakirjat suomentanut Kari Tarkianen. Venäjäiset asiakirjat suomentaneet ja kommentoneet Gennadi Kovalenko ja Nina Kovalenka [sic], H., 2007, 184, note 17.
78. Perhaps the result, not of opportunism among beekeepers, but of ‘sudden hive collapse’. This phenomenon is sometimes associated with persistent military action.
79. Later inventories often give details of the very basic furnishings in the castle’s official houses, and tables are noted _passim_.
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A word about his name. In the 1619 inventory the captain’s surname appears in three variants: Mesczeryn (once in the preamble, which is in the hand of a later archivist, and twice on p. 19); Mieszczeryn (p. 32, once only); and Mieszczeryn (p. 37, one occurrence only). All show the depalatalization of earlier soft /ʃ/ that demarcates Belorussian and Polish from Russian. The second and third variants show the initial as soft /mʃ/, a feature that unites all three of the modern languages. The third variant shows the spirantization of the hardened Belorussian and early Polish /mʃ/ via /ʃ/ to /ʃ/ (spelt <rz> in modern Polish and identical in sound with <ź>). In other words, this third variant is a Polonizing version.

However, the captain is difficult to Polonize, because of his given name, stored hitherto in my sleeve.

Aodebra
ne przez nas Jerzeº Siwickiego Woyskieº
Witebskieº Ajwana Mieszczeryna Rot
mistrza Jego K: M.:80

And they [Newel castle and town] were accept
ed by us Jerzy Siwicki Vice-Castellan
of Witebsk Andjwan Mieszczeryn Cap
tain of His R[oyal] M[ajesty]

Once we introduce modern word spacing it is clear that the captain’s first name is Iwan. Some Pole.

The Meszczeryn clan has rather an intricate history. Iwan’s father was Jurij Semjonovich Meščerinov, a servant of Ivan IV’s81. The Meščerinovs’ forebears were Tatars. Meščer-girey82 was a grandson of the Khan of Kasim, whose support at Kazan’ was

80. 2612, 37.
81. My account of the Meščerinov family and of Iwan Mesczeryn’s career is based in part on the article by Tadeusz Wastlewski in the PŚB, Volume XX, 469-470, with additional material, some of it at odds with the PŚB, from other sources, which are indicated ad locum.
82. The origin of the name is perhaps to be sought in a Tatar word for ‘a wood, a grove’ (cf. Turkish meşcer ‘idem’ from Arabic). Russians would naturally associate the name with the ethnonym meščera, referring to a Finno-Ugrian ethnos important in early Rusian history. That name is completely unrelated.
of great help to Ivan IV. The family was granted pomest'ja, first in the principality of the Bel'ski family, and later in the Smolensk region. But the Meščerinovs abandoned the Muscovite state, defecting to the Commonwealth. Ivan Jur'jevič Meščerinov or Mieszczeryn (etc.) was born in or about the year 1588.

During the struggle for Smolensk (1610-1612) Meszczeryn led a detachment of jaegers in frontier raiding. According to the PSB, he took part in the destruction of Velikije Luki, the capture of Toropec, and the military occupation of Nevel', Sebež and Krasnyj.

The events at Velikije Luki can be summarized as follows. In 1610 local cooperation between the Swedish and Commonwealth troops who had occupied the place broke down completely. The Commonwealth troops had withdrawn their support from False Dmitrij II as claimant to the throne of Moscow to transfer their allegiance to Władysław, son of the Polish king. The Commonwealth troops, 'led by the wojewodowie Alexander Lisowski and Andrzej Prosowiecki, and also by the Russian defector Grigorij Valuiev, expelled the Swedes'. In the process Velikije Luki suffered terribly: the fortress 'was razed to the ground'; the houses built after the Livonian War were put to the torch. The events at Velikije Luki lit the fuse of Meszczeryn's brilliant career. We remember that a century earlier, in 1507, Plissy, the rich estate on the outskirts of Nevel', was awarded to another military officer, Ensign Pétux.

For his actions in the frontier zone Meszczeryn was generously rewarded by the Polish king (Sigismund III Vasa, Zygmunt III Waza) with lands in the Newel area. In 1613 the king appointed Meszczeryn to the starostwo of Newel. In the same year Meszczeryn acted as an intermediary in negotiations between the then wojewoda of Newel, Valuiev, and Alexander Gosiewski or Gonséwskij. Valuiev opposed the elevation to the Russian throne of

83. Previously destroyed by Andrej Kurbskij (see Chapter Four).
84. The 1619 inventory is entitled (by later archivists) 'Inwentarz Newela, Siebieża i Nowogrodku Siewierskiego'. That of 1629 (2613) is 'Inwentarz Newela, Siebieża i Krasnego'.
86. P.Je. Ivanova, Velikije Luki. Ld., 1978, 23. As a result of these depredations Velikije Luki 'during the seventeenth century Velikije Luki, without losing its military significance, failed to restore its economic.' See S.F. Platonov, Očerki po istorii smutny v Moskovskom gosudarstve. XVI–XVII vv. M., 1937, 55.
Mikhail Romanov. It follows that in 1613 the Commonwealth controlled Newel, but at some stage between then and 1619 it lost the town to Russia, since in March of the latter year Meszczeryn together with Jerzy Siwicki received Newel in the name of the king. This establishes two more occasions when control of Newel changed hands.

Tsar Mikhail could not remain indifferent to the fact that Newel was now controlled by his personal enemy, a scion of defectors. Mikhail issued his envoys with instructions for the negotiations at Poljanovka. In them he characterized Meszczeryn as a ‘state traitor’ and insisted that the envoys register a protest against his being granted the starostwo of Newel. The protest remained without effect. In 1620 Meszczeryn exchanged letters – we might say insults – with the Muscovite vojevoda of Velikije Luki. Meszczeryn refused to refer to Mikhail Romanov as ‘tsar’; in reply the vojevoda called Meszczeryn ‘little man’ and ‘traitor’.

Meszczeryn survived the Russian verbal onslaught and retained the starostwo of Newel until 1634. The remaining phases of his career do not relate particularly to Newel, but it remained highly successful. King Władysław IV created him a gentleman of the bedchamber and cupbearer of Smolensk. Iwan Jurjewicz Meszczeryn died in 1653.

Before the party reached Newel Siwicki had already made the following entry in the inventory:

Pokazuje sie zInwentarza ze Pan Meszczeryn wNewelszczyz
nie trzyma Derewien albo Sioł iako tam piszą N° 42. A pusto
szy N° 22 A jezior N° 13 Wkrokotańskię włosći

87. PSB, Volume XX, 470. ‘Little man’ is mażik in the original. Although the modern sense of ‘peasant’ may already be present, the literal sense is also important. The use of vor to mean ‘traitor’ has already been mentioned.
Toiest Sioł
(Wstanie Pupowskim N° 10
(Wstanie Rabczynskim N° 4
(Wstanie Wszczenskim N° 3
(Wewłosci Czaszubskiey N° 18
(Wkrota'yskiey N° 7

Pustoszy
(Wstanie Rabczynskim N° 14
(WCzaszubskiey N° 8

W regestrze zas od Pana Meszczeryny przysłanym na'yduie sie
Derewien 34 A pustoszy 18 Naktore o Przýwileý prosi wrož
nych azgoła wtychze wyszeý mianowanych staniech

It is indicated from the inventory that Pan Meszczeryn holds in the
Newelszczyzna, villages, or, as they write there, settlements, 42 in number.
And wastelands, 22 in number. And lakes 13 in number In krotokayskaya
wło'sć...

That is Settlements
(In Pupowski domain N° 10
(In Rabczynski domain N° 4
(In Wszczenski domain N° 3
(In Czasubskia wło'sć N° 18
(In Krotayska [wło'sć] N° 7

Wastelands
(In Rabczynski domain N° 14
(In Czasubska wło'sć N° 8

Whereas in the register sent by Pan Meszczeryn there are 34 Villages And
wastelands 18, for which he requests a document in the same stany mentioned
above.

---

88. 2612, 19. The passage ends thus, without punctuation. The line breaks are as in the original; the apparent
'nice trzyma' is an unfortunate consequence of a haphazardly chosen break.
89. Generally in the inventories this wło'sć is known as Kratayskaya or sim. Even in the next paragraph we
find Wkrota'yskiey (i.e. w Krotayskiey).
The ‘inventory’ mentioned here is certainly not that of 1619. True, when this present inventory reaches włośc Czasubska, it does indeed mention eighteen sioła\textsuperscript{90} and eight pustoszy belonging to Meszczeryn; but there are no more incidences of the name in connection with individual holdings. It follows that Pan Siwicki had access to an older inventory than the one which he compiled with Meszczeryn. Moreover there was apparently another document, a register sent in the name of Meszczeryn, and that document attributed an even larger number of holdings to the captain. There were obviously considerable discrepancies between the two documents. However, the first fact to be noted here is that there was already a body of cadastral documentation concerning the Newel hinterland. The two documents (the pre-1619 inventory and the ‘register’) most probably related (\textit{inter alia?}) to the settlement of lands on Meszczeryn by Zygmunt III. We may wonder whether these documents in turn relate to earlier documents, Muscovite and Commonwealth.

For reasons mentioned above, the inventory of 1619 is one of the shortest and least comprehensive of the Newel inventories. Nevertheless we can get some idea of the Newel\' economy in the early seventeenth century. Apart from the fiscal matters already noted, we learn a certain amount on one section of the Nevel’sčina, namely the Mikolska włośc, which had belonged directly to the tsar\textsuperscript{91}. It was known in Russian as Nikol’skaja volost\textsuperscript{92} (Nikol’skaja volost’), and it brought in 90 roubles per annum. The auditors calculated that this sum was equal to \textsterling 300\textsuperscript{93}. The summer rental of the twenty-two lakes in the volost’ yielded 10 roubles or \textsterling 33-10 gr. In winter a tax in kind was levied on the same lakes:

\textsuperscript{90} As we established in Chapter One, early East Slav selo seems to be the original term for a village in the Nevel’ area.
\textsuperscript{91} 2612, 41. The compilers of the inventory draw a distinction between this włośc, which had belonged personally to the tsar, and all the others, which are termed (in prepositional-locative) ‘wboiarских włościach’. The włość is located immediately to east and west of Newel town, and includes the estate at Plissy (see previous chapter).
\textsuperscript{92} The inventorists themselves recovered the local version of the name: ‘Jeziorny nikolskiej Wlosći ZZ. [= 22]’ (p. 55).
\textsuperscript{93} The inventories show the złoty with a sign rather like an £ with a double cross. The result recalls both a pound sign and a euro sign. To avoid ambiguity I indicate the złoty with the sign \textsterling, i.e. a capital £ with a vertical bar. I indicate the Lithuanian kopa by \textsterling, i.e. a capital K with a vertical bar. The grosz is abbreviated to gr, with an indication as to whether or not this refers to the Lithuanian grosz, worth twice as much as the Polish.
'Ziezior Piata Ryba zimie'94, i.e. 'From the Lake [every] Fifth Fish in winter'95. Other taxes in kind included 200 quarters of rye and 300 of oats from the same volost'. Money and grain had been passed to the strel'cy directly. As we saw above, troubled times meant that little of this had been forthcoming recently.

Another source of income was a tax on town lands held by townspeople. This land, according to general practice in Belorussia, was granted to the townsfolk in perpetuity:

Gorodskoj obščine peredavalis' na «večnyje vremenj» zemljja, na kotoroj byl raspoložen gorod, paxotnyje zemli i gorodskije fol'varki za gorodom, zemljja pod ogorody, senokosy i vygony. Odnako zemljja, na kotoroj raspoložal'sja gorod, a takže drugije ego zemlj[...] prodolžali ostavat'sja sobstvennostju vladěl'cev goroda. Vladelec «žaloval» zemljju gorodskoj obščine vo vladenje s uslovijem vypolnjat' opredelennyje povinnosti.96

To the town community were transferred for 'all eternity' the land on which the town stood, the ploughlands and the town farms outside the town, land for vegetable gardens, hay meadows and summer grazing grounds. However, the land on which the town was placed, and also its other lands, remained the property of the the town's owners. The owner 'conceded' the land to the control of the town community on condition of the fulfilment of defined obligations.

There were apparently seven hundred quarters of such land taxed at three rates: on good land 2 Polish gr. were paid, and then 'spodlejszy popol'tora grosca polskich / Aspodlejszyg97 pogroszu', i.e. 'from worse land one and a half Polish groszy / And from the worst one grosz each'.98

94. 2614, 55.
95. That zimie is a locative is confirmed by lecie 'in summer' on the same page. This is late for the use of the locative without prepositional support. One may suspect a Lithuanianism.
96. Grickevič. Častnovladel'českije goroda Belorussi, 43.
97. The use of the same form as both comparative and superlative is a curiosity and seems un-Polish. It could be a Russianism.
98. 2612, 40-41. Should this charge be considered tax or a rent? Ultimately the difference is technical: the holder or owner can only use the land if he or she pays a charge. In later inventories, e.g., 2615/1 (1681), 34, we find mention that such land had 'long been occupied' by the townspeople ('Gumiennice Miejskie dawno / Pozajmowane po gc 2'). There is still a triple payment system based on land quality. The 'dawno / Pozajmowane' ('occupied long since'), coupled with the mention of three different rates, implies that this is
Thus the Commonwealth delegates found a system where the money income generated by Newel’ – by Nevelers – was not large. A considerable part of that income was used for defence of castle and town: food and money went to the strel’cy.

We should mention also the special role played by the church in agricultural development. The 1619 inventory\textsuperscript{99} tells us that ‘Wewłosći Nikolskiey Pustoszy Cerkiewne popowscy, Apoli sami ie pacHali\textsuperscript{100} (‘In the Nikolska wloge the church wastelands belong to the [Orthodox] priests, and the priests used to plough them themselves’). Lands and peasants belonging to the church are mentioned on pp. 18, 56 and 57. Church peasants had been obliged in Russian times to give ‘the monks and priests every fifth stook, as also every fifth fish’\textsuperscript{101}. Elsewhere there is mention of ‘church wastelands’\textsuperscript{102} and ‘church peasants’\textsuperscript{103}. Four wastelands are named ‘Popadzia’ or ‘Popadia’, i.e. ‘Orthodox Priest’s Wife’\textsuperscript{104}.

Let us now leave Siwicki and Meszczeryn to their discussions with Radilov and Domašniaj and see what changes in revenue generation came to Newel and its countryside during the seventeenth century.

In 1629 year Newel was once again assigned to the Commonwealth under the terms of the Truce of Stary Targ (Altmark)\textsuperscript{105}, which settled the war between Sweden and the Commonwealth. Once again a deputation was sent to Newel’ to compile an inventory of the town and the surrounding country areas. Much of the information to be found there is still the same system, in place since Russian times. We shall return to the matter in the next chapter.

99. 2612, 56.
100. ‘Ploughed’ is here used synecdochically to mean ‘farmed’.
101. ‘Apodani Manastyrscy Jpopowscy piaty snop dawali czerncom J popom, tak ze J rybe pianta [sic]’ (ibid., 58). The Polish terms are reserved for Orthodox monastics and clergy.
102. Ibid., p. 17.
103. Ibid., p. 18.
104. Ibid., 10, 53 (Popadzia), 17, 54 (Popadia). We know the name of one Newel priest’s wife in 1681: a house is registered to ‘Popadia Kryckia’, i.e. she was (or had been) married to a priest named Krycki. The same family provided priests well into the following century, according to the East Slav tradition that a son followed in his father’s professional footsteps. See 2615/1, 23.
105. Mariusz Markiewicz, Historia Polski 1492-1795, Kraków, 2002, 472, where, however, Newel is not mentioned. On the significance and fragility of the treaty, see Frost, The Northern Wars, 133.
internally contradictory or inconsistent; there is also damage to and ink spillage onto the pages. Nevertheless we can discover that there were 280 służby under cultivation in the Newel area, bringing in an income from czynsz that year of 818 58gr\textsuperscript{106} (i.e. £1637-56gr). The town has fifty-eight housing plots, of which one, the town clerk’s, is untaxed. The rest are rated at fifteen Lithuanian groszy and jointly create an income of 14 or £28.

We note what appears to be a very substantial decline in the town population since 1619. The evidence is not absolutely unequivocal, because the inventory is badly damaged. Probably the figure of 58 refers to houses within the pale of the (now rotten) stockade. In 1619 there were 510 dwellings, but it is uncertain whether the figures can be compared directly. The 510 dwellings of 1619 may have included those outside the stockade, which, it will be remembered, were empty.\textsuperscript{107}

From ‘Kapčyzny’\textsuperscript{108} came 22 or £44. Agricultural land, rated at 4 gr. and farmed by the townspeople, brought 18-38 gr.

The annual fee for the right to run the mill, now evidently restored, comes as a shock: it is now 45 or £90\textsuperscript{109}. The cost to the miller (probably not a jolly miller) has risen thirteen and a half times in ten years. This is a reversal of Russian policy, where local needs were taxed lightly, as one fries a small fish. The miller could not possibly absorb more than a fraction of this increase in his costs. As a monopoly service supplier, for at this stage we know of no other mill in the immediate area, he could pass on the imposition. This will have discouraged use of the service. To the extent that milling continued, the milling licence represented taxation of the basic foodstuff, rye bread.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{106} 2613, 38; the figure is repeated, with a discrepancy of half a Lithuanian grosz, on p. 43.
\textsuperscript{107} See below on population trends over the century.
\textsuperscript{108} A tax on the right to make alcohol; see the entry ‘KAPŠČYNA, kapščyna’ in the encyclopedic section of Statut Vjalkah knjastva Litojško 1588, ed. L.P. Šamjakin et al. Mi., 1989, 492. The standard Polish form is kapszczyna. The form in the inventory shows northwest Russian and dialectal Belorussian c (u) for ē (u) for šč (u).
\textsuperscript{109} By 1636 the mill licence cost 60 (£120); see 2614, p. 13 (numbered 7).
\textsuperscript{110} It is worthwhile to recollect that, unlike most modern English bread, rye bread contains the three basic essentials of nutrition (protein, carbohydrate and fat) in due proportions. In general the Newel diet was extraordinarily healthy, as we can see from the plantings and livestock, catalogued in later inventories, at the castle farm. Some account of this will be given in the Conclusion.
For the moment this is but a straw in the wind, but we may look for more such indications.

Exactions in kind are still being taken. We have details of grain exactions. To the north of Newel on Lake Niewan ‘Zniewodu Czwarta część’\textsuperscript{111}, the fourth part of the catch, must be handed over. Be it noted that the definition is very loose (sometimes the definition is by number: ‘pięta ryba’, i.e. one fish in five). On this occasion it seems that the Newel tax gatherer could ask for one fish in four or for a quarter of the catch by weight. He need hardly have worried about judicial review of his decision. People on Lake Niewan must also deliver four beams and two boards per \textit{sluzba} per annum. Had we all the details for the other \textit{włosci}, we would probably find similar exactions in their cases, too. It is certainly the case in some later inventories, and the requirements lasted into the eighteenth century. The town, too, had its obligations under the landholding arrangement detailed above.

The inventory contains details of tax liabilities for other parts of the Newelszczyzna; the details will be found in Table 5.1 below:

\textsuperscript{111} This and the other details in this paragraph will be found on p. 34 of 2613.
### TABLE 5.1: TAXATION IN THE NEWELSZCZYZNA, 1629

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Włosć</th>
<th>Stużba</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Lesowszczyzna</th>
<th>Lake Rate</th>
<th>Lake Yield</th>
<th>Pooods/Honey</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{113})</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>@ K 4</td>
<td>K 32(^{114})</td>
<td>K 4–31 gr</td>
<td>@15 gr</td>
<td>K 6–42–5</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>K 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{115})</td>
<td>27½</td>
<td>@ K 4</td>
<td>K 108,40 gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{116})</td>
<td>7½(^{117})</td>
<td>@ K 4</td>
<td>K 29,40</td>
<td>@10 gr = K 1–16 gr</td>
<td>@15 gr</td>
<td>K 1–45 gr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>K 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(^{118})</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>@ K 4</td>
<td>K 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(^{120})</td>
<td>22½</td>
<td>@ K 2</td>
<td>K 46–10</td>
<td>@8 gr = K 2–56 gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>K 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(^{121})</td>
<td>68½</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>K 168–45(^{122})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(^{123})</td>
<td>77½/4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>K 209–25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>K 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(^{124})</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>K 43–44–45</td>
<td>25% of catch(^{125})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>K 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(^{126})</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>K 78–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11½</td>
<td>K 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The key to the wlości will be found on the next page.*

---

112. The names of *wlości* (the term is spelt here as in the inventory) will be found on the next page. *Stużba* = area of land; rate = charge per *stużba*; *Lesowszczyzna* = charge for hunting (?); Lake rate = charge for fishing rights; Lake yield = revenue from fishing rights; Pooods/honey = amount of honey taxable; Yield @ K 2 = revenue from honey.
113. 2613, p. 75.
114. No other details are given for *Krata ska włość*, except that uniquely it is required to furnish 48 loads of hay @ 10 Lithuanian gr., yielding K 8.
115. 2613, p. 75.
116. 2613, p. 76.
117. Possibly "7½".
118. 2613, p. 76.
119. A separate figure is given for *slobodczyków* [genitive], people living in a liberty. No other details are given for *Dubien ska włość* or for the liberty. In the seventeenth century the castle had a farm (*folwark*) at Sukino, which was certainly a liberty before the end of the century (according to Gricevič, *Častovladelčeskije goroda*, 50) Sukino existed as early as the 1630s; he does not state his grounds. In AR XXV 2623/1 (1754) there is a mention of *Morgi Polne Folwarku Dubasowa* ("field morgi of Dubasowo farm"). I suggest that *włośc* Dubienska, Dubasovo, and the farm at Sukino were identical.
120. 2613, p. 76.
121. Ibid., pp. 76–77.
122. It may be that the rate is not shown because it was x1. The ‘1’ of ‘168’, which is not clearly written, should then be ignored. The number of *stużby* and the yield would then be (almost) identical. ‘68½’ would be half a kopa, 30 Lithuanian groszy, plus a sixth of a Lithuanian kopa, 10 Lithuanian groszy.
123. 2613, p. 76.
124. 2613, p. 77.
125. A note on p. 77 of 2613 says ‘Za Rybý’ zlezione plus minus Kop 40’. The note ‘Zniewodu Czwarta część’ is on p. 34 (see above). It is possible that the 25% figure is for winter fishing, the rent for summer fishing.
126. 2613, pp. 77–78.
KEY TO WŁOSCI, 1629

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kratayska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rabczynska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pupowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dubienska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manastyirska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mikolska – woytowstwo Zaworotynskie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mikolska – woytowstwo Zapliskie (6 &amp; 7 assessed jointly for honey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wlosc Zaniewanski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Toporowska</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition we are given details of liability for grain supplies for some at least of the wlosci. As with the honey, monetary equivalents of the grain are given, and they amount to well over ℛ 600 or ₣ 1200.

Since we have only the sketchiest details for fiscal policy in Nevel' under Muscovite rule, it would be unfair to dismiss the Commonwealth’s policy at this stage as merely exploitative.

A few other points emerge from the table. The developmental power of the Muscovite monarchy and of the Orthodox church is evidenced by the larger areas under cultivation in the two woytowstwa of the tsar’s personal fief of wlosc Mikolska and in the ‘Monastery’ area, which was, we are told in the 1619 inventory, ploughed by the clergy themselves. Of the former, woytowstwo Zaworotynskie is immediately to the east of Newel and woytowstwo Zapliskie immediately to the west. In the former the Radziwiłłs may even have played a part, since Plissy had been their ‘little estate’ back in the fifteenth century. The proximity of the area to Newel itself probably helped: for example, relatively heavy capital goods such as ploughs could be brought in by water (if they were not made locally). This flying start was probably enhanced by the increased capitalization possible on

---

127. By an oversight the noun is here treated as masculine.
128. 2612, 56.
royal land. The monks and priests who had their own peasants, and received income in kind from them, were also either more able or more willing to capitalize their farming adequately.

It is evident, then, that the new order in Newel has succeeded in finding sources of revenue not mentioned in the post-Russian inventory of 1619. Where we can compare like with like, we find a considerable increase in income. The yield from włośc Mikolska has risen hugely, even if we discount, as I think we should, £100 from the total from one of its two constituent wojtowstwa. That sum deducted, the total is £378–10, i.e. £756–20 in Polish złote. We recall that the equivalent sum for 1619 was £300. The revenue from this source has more than doubled.

The inspectors were not implacable. Because of continuing warfare (on this occasion the invader was Gustav Adolf) a number of landholders are exempted from czynsz until next year, 1630, or even longer – for example, the village of Klupowo is exempt until 1633\(^{129}\). But, since the inspectors were also clearly bent on raising revenue wherever and whenever possible, we can conclude that the exempted localities had been very severely affected by military activity.

Each part of the Newelszczyzna probably had a powinność or catalogue of duties (again, we know it was so later). At Topory, for example, this included twenty eggs for the castle, two beams per služba in winter, and two planed boards. But it was policy to try to increase the population of Topory. In this there was logic, since it was to the west of Plissy, which was already relatively developed. ‘[A]by tym więcej nac / siadanie teży włości [one word illegible] przybywało, pozwalamy onjm wolne / łowienie wpuszczy’\(^ {130}\) (‘that the more [people?] should come for the settlement of this włośc, we permit them free hunting in the virgin forest’). There was a condition: if they kill ‘Rysia wilka Lisa’ (Lynx\(^ {131}\) wolf\(^ {132}\)

\(^ {129}\) 2613, 9. It may have been a particularly poor place (‘Bedbug village’). In the interim (1632) the Russians captured Newel and held it for a year or so. The town was returned to the commonwealth by treaty in 1634 (see below).

\(^ {130}\) 2613, 37-38.

\(^ {131}\) The lynx is not otherwise attested in the literature, nor in the toponymy; nor has anyone mentioned the animal to me. It is nonetheless highly likely that at this time in a region where there was plenty of virgin forest and plentiful wild life the lynx would be ‘top predator’.

\(^ {132}\) The wolf is attested by toponymy, cf. VN Volčji Gory; and, personally to me, by a local sheep farmer, Stanisław Kuczyński.
Fox), they must pay a ‘czwiera mara’ (quarter measure) and the pelt should be presented to the king’s son (the future Władysław IV Waza). Failure to disclose the killing of such quarry would result (on discovery, although that is not stipulated) in a fine of £36, i.e. £72. We are not blind to the picture of wildlife and of social life presented here; nor should we fail to note the huge fine for poaching.

The 1636 inventory contains some details of a special case of revenue raising to which we shall return in the next section. No further records are extant until 1681\textsuperscript{133}. In the interim a great deal had changed in Newel and in the international situation. In 1649, the starostwo of Newel was awarded by the Polish-Lithuanian sejm to the hetman polny litewski, Janusz Radziwiłł\textsuperscript{134} – and the award was made in perpetuity\textsuperscript{135}.

When Janusz Radziwiłł thus gained Newel as part of his personal patrimony, the town ipso facto changed status: it was no longer a royal but a private town. Most of the extant Newel inventories were compiled under these arrangements, and these ‘Radziwiłł’ inventories are more detailed than the earlier. They catalogue the property from the town and countryside to the official tundish used for the pouring of beer from castle cask to castle jug.

As outlined in Chapter Three of the present thesis, there are grounds for believing that the Radziwiłłs held land in Nevel before the end of the fifteenth century, so that this award was a return to tradition. After Janusz threw in his lot briefly with Sweden, the future of his property was in doubt, and on his death King Jan Kazimierz threatened to hand over all he had owned to the loyal Lithuanian army. Under the Treaty of Oliwa, however,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{133} No doubt because of the disruption caused by the mid-century strife in the Commonwealth. The 1681 inventory is 2615/1.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Only five years later did Janusz Radziwiłł become wielki hetman litewski, on 17 June 1654 [NS]. In the same month Nevel was captured by the Russians. See the article on Janusz by Tadeusz Wasilewski in PSB, Volume XXX, 212; Poczet hetmanów Rzeczypospolitej. Hetmani litewscy. Ed. Miroslaw Nagiel als. W., 2006, 130. For the capture of Nevel, see below.
\item \textsuperscript{135} Perpetuity had a duration, on and off, of some six score years.
\end{itemize}
Janusz’s estates were returned to the family, the army being bought out for 100,000 złote. Janusz’s cousin Bogusław inherited all, including Newel, late in 1665.  

Newel became a private town exactly at the mid-point of the seventeenth century. This may be why the town is absent from the first of two catalogues given by A.P. Grickevič of Belorussian private towns. This catalogue covers the situation as it had developed ‘k seredine XVII v.’ (‘by the middle of the XVIIth century’), when of thirty-nine towns in Belorussia fourteen were private. Newel became a private town exactly at the mid-point of the century. This may be why the town is absent from the first list. The second list is of Belorussian towns over the period of the 1770s to the 1790s, and if once more Newel is absent from it, the reason is perhaps that de iure Newel had become part of the Russian empire in 1772.

In these years of constant warfare amid shifting alliances, Newel continued its role as an espionage centre; so at least it appears from a report by the vojevoda of Velikije Luki, addressed to Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič and dated 12 July 1648:

Da iulja, gosudar', vo 2 den' posylal ja, xolop tvoj, v litovskuju ž stornu na Nevl' [sic] lučanina Ivaška Aleksejeva, a velel emu protiv vtojego gosudareva ukazu pro vsjakija litovskija [sic] vesti rozvedat' podlinno tajnym delom.

And on the 2 day of July, sire, I, thy servant, sent again to the Lithuanian side, to Nevl’, a man of Luki, Ivaško Aleksejev, and commanded him according to thy royal command to spy out [rozvedat’] all sorts of Lithuanian news authentically in secret.

In 1654 Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič invaded Lithuania. ‘Načalo vojennej kampanii 1654 g. oznamenovalos’ krupnymi uspexami russkogo oružija. V ijune byl vzjat Nevel’ (‘The beginning of the military campaign of 1654 was marked by major successes of Russian

---

137. Grickevič, Častnovladelčeského goroda, 38-39. This is confirmed by Newel’s absence from the tipped-in map after p. 16. The catalogues are written in the form of continuous prose rather than as tables.
arms. In June in the north Nevel' was taken...'). For once we have specific news of the operation from an account that touches once more on Nevel' in the context of espionage, this time as object.

At this time the vojevoda of Opočka was Afanasij Lavrent'jevič Ordin-Naščokin, to give him his full name in standardized Russian. An extremely astute man, 'Ofon'ka' (as he styles himself in humble fashion; notice his hypercorrect okan'je) Naščokin, writes as follows to 'the lord tsar and gr[and] pr[ince]' Aleksey Mixajlovič:

V nynešnem [7]162 g. maija v 18 den' [...] Semjon Luk'janovič Strešnjov s tvoimi gosudarevymi ratnymi ljud'mi pošol izo Pskova na nevel'skoj rubež. I ja, xolop tvoj, posylal za litovskoj rubež k tem ljudjam, kotorye služat tebe, gosudarju, provedat' vsjakix vestej [...] i ko mne, xolopu tvojemu vedomo učinili iz-za litovskogo rubeža, čto polockije prigorody Sebež, Nevl', Krasnoy nyne služivymi ljud'mi bezljudny i bezzaposny, a v ujezdax, gosudar', u šljafty s potdannymi svoimi stavitca mežusobiye, grabiat i begut v dal'nije gorody [all sic]...140

In the present year 7162 [= 1654] of May on the 18[th] day [...] Semjon Luk'janovič Strešnjov with your highness's fighting men set off from Pskov to the Nevel' border. And I, your liegeman, have been sending141 over the Lithuanian border to those persons who serve you, sire, to find out all kinds of news [...] and I, your liegeman, have been made aware from beyond the Lithuanian border that the Polock outposts of Sebež, Nevl', [and] Krasnyj are now depopulated of their servitors and secure142, while in the countryside, sire, between the šljajta and their serfs intermecine strife is arising, people are plundering and fleeing to distant towns.

It appears that the burghers of Commonwealth Newel did not wait to meet Aleksey Romanov's fighting men; and in the countryside the landholders were unable to keep their peasants on the land. Yet according to a later despatch from Ivan Zolotarenko, the hetman of

140. Belorussija v epoxu feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 62.
141. The meaning may be pluperfect, but on balance I think not: had Naščokin had such useful information before the invasion began, he would no doubt have passed it on already.
142. 'Secure' would mean 'safe [for our troops]'. However, given that 'Ofon'ka' overcorrects his own akant'je, we may also take <bezzapasny> as bezzapasny 'without provisions'.
Nežin, on 14 July representatives of all classes in Nevel’ (‘šljaxta služilaja, i meščane, i ujezdnyje vsjakije ljudi’, i.e. ‘the servitor nobility, the burghers and all sorts of country folk’) bowed to the ground and swore fealty to the tsar. 143 This is confirmed in the nakaz or document of instruction given to Denis Petroviĉ Turgenev and Jakov Portomoin when they were sent that autumn to bring news to Bogdan Xmel’nickij 144 of towns that had sworn fealty to Muscovy again (i.e. as they did in the Time of Troubles). 145

Nevel’ opened the way to two important centres, viz. Polock and Vitebsk, and Newel was surrendered to Šeremetev by Borys von Dehren. 146 During the following year the Russians destroyed the town, 147 presumably because they were challenged for possession. In 1661 Newel was freed from taxes for four years by King Jan Kazimierz 148, which again implies possession. The paragraph in question refers primarily to the town of Disna (Dzisna); at the end there is the rider ‘Similar rights and exemption are afforded for four years to the towns of Siebież and Newel’. One of the primary aims of the present thesis is to reverse the perspective here implied, that Nevel’ is the least of the cities of Judah.

In the autumn of 1666 (as far away a London pieman cursed his luck) the Commonwealth and Muscovy were clearing up leftover business from the mid-century wars. 149 With the possibility of losing it forever, Newel became for Bogusław Radziwiłł dearer than everything in the world. He wrote to the Commonwealth’s negotiator, Jan Antoni Chrapowicki, requesting ‘żebyśmy przy traktatach nie oddawali Moskwie Newla i Siebieża’ (‘that in the negotiations we not surrender Newel and Siebież to Moscow’). The

143. Ibid., 67.
144. AOISR, Volume the Fourteenth. Ed. G.F., Karpov. SPb., 1889, 83; repeated on p. 100.
145. On the Thirteen Years’ War see Chapter Seven (‘The Thirteen Years War and the Second Northern War’) of Frost, The Northern Wars, 156-191; Chapter Nine (‘Od wielkości do upadku’) in Sahnowicz, Historia Biatorusi, 252-298.
148. Ibid. See also Belorussija v epocha feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 282, where we find a Russian translation of the Polish decision by the Warsaw Sejm.
149. On the treaty that resulted see Zbigniew Wójcik, Traktat Andruszowski 1667 roku i jego geneza. W., 1959.
treatment of the two as one flesh has a certain interest. Chrapowicki replied on 24 August (St Bartholomew’s Day, perhaps ill-starred for his correspondent, the Protestant prince):

...jako dawny i życzliwy domu Waszej Książącej Miłości Mejo Miłościwego Pana sługa, omnem adhibebo curam, żeby Newel i Siebież nie był alienowany a corpore W.Ks. Litewskiego.\textsuperscript{150}

...as an old and ardent servant of Your Princely Highness my Gracious Master’s house, I shall make every effort to prevent the alienation of Newel and Siebież from the body of the G[rand] Du[chy] of Lithuania.\textsuperscript{151}

He made every effort, but his and Prince Bogusław’s assiduity went unrewarded. The talks dragged on. On the last day of October Jan Antoni wrote once more to Bogusław:

Mamy w dobrej pamięci i Newel z Siebieżem Waszej Książącej Miłości i dołożyliśmy województwo połockie z ujazdami jako przed teraźniejszą były wojną.\textsuperscript{152}

We have not forgotten either about Your Princely Highness’s Newel and Siebież, and have added the palatinate of Połock and its outposts as they were before the present war.

The negotiations struggled on into the deep midwinter, as almost a century earlier Possevino and the two high contracting parties had talked amid snowdrifts. On 24 January 1667, Chrapowicki notes warily, the thirty-second session of the talks was held.


\textsuperscript{151} Italicized words Latin in the original.

Gdy przyszło o Newel, Siebież i Wielież – nie chcieli Moskale żadną miarą pozwolić, żeby to przy nas zostało, że z dawną przy Siewierszczyźnie tamte dwa były, a ostatni przy Toropcu.\textsuperscript{153}

When it came to Newel, Siebież and Wielież – the Muscovites were absolutely unwilling that it [sic] remain with us, [they claimed] that for ages the two former had been part of the Novgorod Seversk hinterland, while the last-named had belonged to Toropec.

If the Muscovites did indeed make such a claim,\textsuperscript{154} they had entered the realm of the fairytale. There is no historical connection at all between Newel and Novgorod Seversk. Let us recall, for example, that Nevel' had its own problems in 1185 when Prince Igor' was far away and you, land of the Rus', were already behind the hill. It is significant that two have become three, with the addition of Wielież.

The chief negotiator on the Muscovite side was not a tyro, but a man who enjoyed the implicit trust of Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič: Ordin-Naščokin, whom we last met as ‘Ofon'ka', spymaster of Opočka. By origin a minor landholder from the Pskovščina, he had already done the tsar great service. Now he was engaged in a great bluff. With one hand he holds up before the Polish delegates a model, so to speak, of the three towns; he speaks with fervour and insistence of Newel, even as he steals the left bank of the Dnepr, and, on a temporary basis, even great Kiev itself.\textsuperscript{155} Even now the story Chrapowicki gives us, of a Muscovite delegation with little freedom of manoeuvre because of pressure from the tsar himself, bears every sign of veracity; this is not diplomatic flannel. The tsar, in general a very different character from Ivan IV, writes to his representative about Poland: ‘Sobake nedostojno jest' i

\textsuperscript{153} Chrapowicki, \textit{Dziariusz II}, 188.

\textsuperscript{154} It is possible that Chrapowicki misunderstood the division made by the Muscovites. An association between Nevel' and Toropec might be deduced, rightly or wrongly, from some treaties between Muscovy and Lithuania. Ključevskij tells us that the Muscovite chief negotiator had learned Polish in the course of his diplomatic service (see V.O. Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija. Polnyj kurs lekcij v trex knigax}, Volume Two. M., 1993 [hereafter Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija}, Volume Two], 428), i.e. informally, and he may therefore have made his point unclearly.

\textsuperscript{155} When Aleksej later insisted on unilaterally extending Russian tenure of Kiev on both sides of the river, Ordin-Naščokin protested. This led to a cooling of relations between tsar and minister (Ordin-Naščokin was the head of the \textit{Posol'skij prikaz}), and the latter eventually, at the turn of the year in 1671-1672, received permission to enter a monastery. See V.O. Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija}. Volume Two, 440.
odnogo kuska xleba pravoslavnogo\textsuperscript{156} ("The dog is unworthy to eat even a single piece of Orthodox bread"), and more in the same vein.

Two days later the Muscovite negotiators mentioned the three towns again, but only to say ‘żeby o to i nie mówić, bo to rzecz niepodobna, żeby tego ustępić mieli’\textsuperscript{157} (‘that we were not even to mention it, for it was an improbable thing that they should cede it’). Once more, the towns are treated as triune, and not without reason. Again on 27 January the Muscovites rejected all discussion, for example of splitting the trinity: the Commonwealth would take one of the towns, Moscow two, in whichever combination the tsar might choose. But the Muscovites said that they might not depart from the tsar’s instructions, ‘choćby im zaraz zginać przyszło’\textsuperscript{158} (‘should they drop down dead this minute’). The Commonwealth delegates pointed out that in the treaty of King Stefan of blessed memory – the other snowbound treaty, the one facilitated by Possevino – Wieliź was declared part of the Witebsk hinterland. The Muscovite representatives replied that ‘choć on należał, choć nic należał – my go odstąpić nie możemy’\textsuperscript{159} (‘whether it did or it didn’t, we cannot concede it’). Chrapowicki, a keen phonologist, noted: ‘Jednak nie tak mroźno’ (‘Not quite so frosty’). The thaw, however, did not extend to the \textit{trójmiasto}, to coin a term. Under the treaty formalized at Andrusovo or Andruszowo, Newel and the other two border fortress-towns reverted to Moscow.

Eighteen months later the commission dealing with compensation for expropriated landowners considered the case of the unfortunate Prince Bogusław. ‘Przysądzono mu dymów 100. [...] Pogoda’ (‘He was assigned 100 households. [...] Weather fine.’).\textsuperscript{160}

Fine weather indeed; to him that hath shall it be given. The Belarusian historian A.Je. Taras believes that even the successful conclusion of the treaty was in part a matter of money – if you will, that Ordin-Naśčokin won his diplomatic war by the use, not of cavalry, artillery or infantry, but of bribery. ‘Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič prikazal ispol'zovat' samyj

\textsuperscript{156} Ključevskij, \textit{Russkaja istorija}, Volume Two, 433.
\textsuperscript{157} Chrapowicki, \textit{Diariusz} II, 274.
\textsuperscript{158} Chrapowicki, \textit{Diariusz} II, 275.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 420.
dejstvennyj argument – den’gi (‘Tsar Aleksej Mixajlović ordered the use of the most effective argument – money’). He goes on to cite in extenso the pre-revolutionary historian S.M. Solov’jov, who specifies some financial incentives offered and the Polish-Lithuanian preference for payment in červontsy, which were more easily concealed, ‘so that even the people in their homes would not find out’. The offers made are certainly very generous, but it is unclear whether this was a normal part of contemporary diplomacy.

The Treaty of Andrusovo or Andruszowo legitimized the return of Nevel’ to Russia. Nevel’ was apparently not clearly remembered by the scribe of the Russian version, for the list of towns captured by Muscovy and to remain under its control include ‘Dorogobuž, Belaja Nev’, Sebež, Krasnoje, takож i Veliž...’ Here the separate town of Belyj or Belaja has been taken as an epithet of Nevel’. This is surprising, after the histrionic negotiations, where both sides say, as it were, ‘Give me Nevel’ or give me death’. The oblivion is parallel with the ‘and Newel’ of the 1661 decrees on tax exemption quoted above. As for the Polish text, if correctly printed by Baranowski et al., Biały has simply been omitted. We may safely conclude that Bogusław, and indeed Chrapowicki, had reasons for wanting to retain Nevel other than salus rei publicae.

Only a year later Nevel’ ‘was returned to Lithuania’, and that in turn was given legal force by a treaty of 1678, under which Newel, Siebież and Veliž were conceded by the tsar to the king. That settlement was to last almost uninterrupted until the first partition of the Commonwealth in 1772-1773.

161. A.Jc. Taras, Vojny Moskovskoj Russ s Velikim kniažestvom Litovskim i Reč’ju Pospolitoj. Second edition. M., Mi., 2006, 770. Something of the better side of Soviet life sometimes survives: this work, of eight hundred pages exactly, with extensive quotations from Middle Russian primary sources, is referred to on p. 800 as ‘naučno-popularnoe izdanie’ (‘a popular scholarly publication’). It is true that there are some sensationalist elements in the book, such as constant reference to the behaviour of Soviet politicians.
162. Ibid. The incomplete citation is: Solov’jov S.M., Istorija Rossii s drevnejshix vremijon, Volume Six, p. 179.
163. The text can be found in Polish in Historia Polski 1648-1764. Wybór tekstów, ed. Baranowski et al., W., 1956, 91-92; and in Russian in Belorussija v epohe feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 171.
164. Kliúčevskij, Russkaja istorija, Volume Two, 494: see also Chrapowicki’s diary for 17.8.1678: [the Tsar] "ustępuje w stronę tego królewskiey mości y Rzeczy pospolitey Newla, Siebieża i Wieliza z uiazdami do nich przynależącemi...".
In 1681, a quarter of a century after the Deluge, the next inventory extant pictures Newel as giving more income than ever. There are now 314 households in the town, taxable at 15 gr per pręta. Newel has thus recovered rather well from Lithuania’s mid-century troubles, which had halved the population\textsuperscript{165}. There are extensive suburbs where people have houses or cultivate plots of land, growing vegetables, fruit and grain, all taxable at 3, 2 or 1 gr per pręta, according to the quality of the land. The fields beyond are rated at 18 gr per morg. The townsfolk pay a so-called ‘trade tax’, which brings in 7300\textsuperscript{166}. Moreover a publican or arendator is now exploiting some of the town’s revenue sources, for which privilege he pays 71000. Table 5.2 summarizes details given in the 1681 inventory\textsuperscript{167}.

\textsuperscript{165} Robert I. Frost cites a very precise figure, namely a drop in the population of 48 per cent after 1648. See his The Northern Wars. War, State and Society in Northeastern Europe, 1558-1721 (hereafter Frost, The Northern Wars), 324, citing information from J. Morzy’s Kryzyz Demograficzny na Litwie i Białorusi w drugiej połowie XVII wieku, Poznań, 1965.
\textsuperscript{166} The Lithuanian kopa has disappeared without trace.
\textsuperscript{167} 2615/1, 49.
**TABLE 5.2: INCOME FROM NEWEL TOWN, 1681**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>270½pr</td>
<td>15gr/pret</td>
<td>£ 135-01¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, residential or other, suburbs</td>
<td>357⅛/12pr</td>
<td>10gr/pret</td>
<td>£ 119-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen garden land</td>
<td>1260⅛/12pr</td>
<td>3gr/pret</td>
<td>£ 126-01¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior grain land</td>
<td>935⅝pr</td>
<td>2gr/pret</td>
<td>£ 62-11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior grain land</td>
<td>96pr</td>
<td>1gr/pret</td>
<td>£ 3-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open field land</td>
<td>678-05mrg</td>
<td>18gr/morg</td>
<td>£ 406-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town treasury</td>
<td>13wł</td>
<td>£ 10/włok</td>
<td>£ 130 (to town treasury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade tax on burghers jointly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenda from October 1681 for one year (Wasil Nikiforowicz(^\text{168}))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the ferry on the River Jemiona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 27-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayny (town)</td>
<td>per pret</td>
<td>3gr</td>
<td>£ 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayny (suburbs(^\text{169}))</td>
<td>per pret</td>
<td>2gr</td>
<td>£ 23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding town treasury)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 2231-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{168}\) The first arendator whose name we know. The absence of the mill from this account probably means that its licence was part of the arenda.

\(^{169}\) This item is calculated by doubling the number of pret (because the rate is 2 grosze per pret) and dividing the result by thirty (to give złote).
It is noteworthy that many of these ‘townspeople’, perhaps almost all, spent a considerable part of their time in rural occupations; we will see some details of this when we come to the eighteenth century, but for the moment the extent of the suburban land holdings gives a very broad hint. We shall also see signs hereafter of the urban activities usually associated with the term ‘burgher’: trade and artisan craft manufacture.

All this money came from the townspeople of Newel, and there is a note that suggests that they were less than entranced by this arrangement. Here is the note in full:

W tymże Miescie na przedmiejciu Jehorowskim / Puszkarowszczyzny Morgow 15 z Częścią ogrodów Pustych Miey: / skich ktoły byli Mieszczenie Vtaiłî, Obok Kozackich Ogro: / dow lezących, a z wygonem Popisowym y z gruntami Kozakow / Listowych, graniczących, oddano Aleksandrowi Ludryckiemu / Haydukowi Zamkowemu.

At the same place in the suburb of Jehorowo / 15 morgi of Cannoneers’ Ground and a Part of the Vacant Urb: / an gardens that the Townsfolk had tried to conceal, near the Cossacks’ Gardens lying, and bordering on the mustering ground and the list Cossacks’ lands, have been given over / to Aleksander Ludrycki, the Castle Hayduk.

This extract shows the informative power of the inventories. Here we find a parcel of land that had escaped the attention of inventorists and remained in the hands of local people more than six decades after the Rzeczpospolita took control of Newel. This secret garden is surrounded by land granted to the forces, military and civic, of the Commonwealth. Around this island of independence we find cannoneers, Cossacks and List Cossacks (hence the former group was composed of Register Cossacks). With rigid military logic the stolen land is given to the ‘Castle Hayduk’. Thus we learn not only of the ingenuity of Nevelers,

170. Who actually turned the sod, planted the turnips, pruned the apple trees? The burgher household will have been large and included house- and field-servants. All will have taken part in horticulture and agriculture, etc., according to their age, strength and skills.
171. ‘...byli Mieszczeanie Vtaiłî...’: the tense is pluperfect.
172. 2615/1, p. 48 (originally misnumbered ‘26’, i.e. on the basis of a count of double pages but with an error).
173. We shall say something of this and other specialized forces in the Newel garrison later in the present chapter.
attempting to retain something of their own, but also something of the military organization of the garrison. Artillerymen and Cossacks have access to land that they can cultivate as their other duties allow. When a little more land is discovered, another of the garrison’s elements is rewarded. We can also be assured that the light frontier defence force on Hungarian lines,\textsuperscript{174} of which we first hear in 1629, was extant at Newel in the eighth decade of the seventeenth century.

Meanwhile in the countryside things are no better. The rate per \textit{sluzba} has risen drastically everywhere; see Table 5.3.

\textsuperscript{174} The \textit{hajdák}, singular \textit{hajdú}, were a light mobile cavalry first encountered at the beginning of the sixteenth century in Hungary. The word is said (with some hesitation) to be a variant of \textit{hajió} ‘drover’. See: Zaicz Gábor, \textit{Etimológiai szótár. Magyar szavak és toldalékok eredete}, Budapest, 2006, 278, \textit{s.v.} \textit{hajdú}; \textit{Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen}, Gábor Liszka et al., eds. Band 1. Budapest, 1993, s. 511-512, \textit{s.v.} The word is found, undated, in the first decade of the sixteenth century; it is found dated in 1514.
### TABLE 5.3: LAND-TAX RATE INFLATION, 1629-1681

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WŁOSC</th>
<th>RATE 1629</th>
<th>RATE 1681</th>
<th>YIELD, 1681</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mikolszczyzna</td>
<td>£ 2</td>
<td>£ 30&lt;sup&gt;175&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£ 5461–22½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiewska</td>
<td>£ 3½ [?]</td>
<td>£ 26&lt;sup&gt;176&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£ 283–17½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kratayska</td>
<td>£ 8 [£ 4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupowicka</td>
<td>£ 8</td>
<td>£ 30&lt;sup&gt;177&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£ 530–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubienszczyzna</td>
<td>£ 8</td>
<td>£ 30&lt;sup&gt;178&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£ 82–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastyrska</td>
<td>£ 4</td>
<td>£ 31&lt;sup&gt;179&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£ 872–22½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toporowska</td>
<td>£ 5 [?]</td>
<td>£ 31&lt;sup&gt;180&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£ 972–10½?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not listed in 1629:*

| Woytowstwo Siruckie | £ 32<sup>181</sup> | £ 441–18 |
| Porzeckie          | £ 32<sup>182</sup> | £ 670–15 |
| Tarantowo          | £ 30<sup>183</sup> | £ 562–15 |
| Derewnie Anachowskie | £ 32<sup>184</sup> | £ 327–05 |

**TOTAL (all sources of income)**

£ 13,300–12½

---

175. 2615/1, p.83.
177. Ibid., p. 106.
178. Ibid., p. 107.
179. Ibid., p. 113.
180. Ibid., p. 120.
181. Ibid., p. 89.
182. Ibid., p. 97.
183. Ibid., p. 123.
184. Ibid., p. 127.
Increases in taxation so considerable meant that the annual income from Newel and the Newelszczyzna had risen hugely over the previous sixty years and had now reached Z13,300–12½\(^{185}\). Furthermore, considerable increases were expected for the following years: an extra Z1726–20 in 1682, Z151–05 in 1683 and Z15 in 1684, which would have meant an annual income of Z15193–07½.

So wide-ranging was the inventorist’s urge to count things that he counted chickens (‘398½’ [!] and eggs (3981/4\(^{186}\)), and looked forward to the advent of netted fish and elk pelts and the letting of the contract to run the iron-ore quarry or Rudnia\(^{187}\).

Such were the ambitious plans proposed by the governors (Œkonomy) of Newel to the Administrator of Newel, Andr[ze]y Kaminski, Cupbearer of Braslaw\(^{188}\). Yet such was the ingenuity and application of their agents that the income realized in 1684 was in fact Z32,881\(^{189}\). This extraordinary sum represents an increase of some two and a half times in a three-year period. It was achieved in part by massive increases in tax rates. Thus, for example, in wojtowstwo Siruckie the tax exacted per służba rose from Z32/służba to Z37. The same increase was imposed on wojtowstwo Porzeckie. Woytowstwo Pupowickie saw its rate lifted from Z30 to Z34. Woytowstwo Kratyskie or Psowskie bade farewell to a rate of Z26 and greeted, teeth gritted, the new rate of Z37. The Mikolszczyzna, once the tsar’s personal patrimony, suffered an increase of Z6 on the 1681 rate of Z30. Only the rate in wojtowstwo Tarantowskie lingered unchanged at Z30. The details will be found in Table 5.4, in which only areas appearing in both the 1681 and 1684 inventories are detailed.

\(^{185}\) Ibid., p. 136.
\(^{186}\) Ibid. The ratio between the two figures is 1:10, so that they may represent a notional figure of how many eggs might be expected per hen over some unspecified period. Ten a year seems rather poor productivity. The fractional hens and eggs are presumably some accounting device of the inventorist.
\(^{187}\) Ibid.
\(^{188}\) Ibid., 137.
\(^{189}\) 2615/2, 141-142.


**TABLE 5.4: NEWEL REVENUE INFLATION, 1681-1684**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>1681 Rate</th>
<th>1681 Yield / zł</th>
<th>1684 Rate</th>
<th>1684 Yield / zł</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newel Town</td>
<td>15 gr/pręt&lt;sup&gt;190&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5475–067&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;_&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt; &lt;sup&gt;191&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikolszczyzna:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapliskie</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5461–22½</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;sup&gt;193&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5537–26½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zawiercienskie</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4625–18¾&lt;sup&gt;194&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siruckie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;195&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>441–18</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;196&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1276–00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psowskie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;197&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;198&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1126–17½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[= Kratayskie]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porzechkie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;199&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>670–15</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;200&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2375–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiewianskie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;201&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>283–17½</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;202&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2045–12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupowickie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;203&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>530–15</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;204&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2067–18¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastyrskie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;205&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>872–22½</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;206&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1427–18¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarantowskie</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;207&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>833–18¾</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;208&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>833–18¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (All sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of income)</td>
<td>13,300–12½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,881–4½&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

190. AR XXV 2615/1, 49.
191. AR XXV 2615/2, 47.
192. AR XXV 2615/1, 83. If no separate reference is given, rate and yield appear on the same page.
193. AR XXV 2615/2, 66.
194. AR XXV 2615/2, 85.
195. AR XXV 2615/1, 89.
196. AR XXV 2615/2, 92.
197. AR XXV 2615/1, 101. In 1681 part of this territory was included with woytowstwo Zaiewianskie.
198. AR XXV 2615/2, 97.
199. AR XXV 2615/1, 97.
200. AR XXV 2615/2, 106.
201. AR XXV 2615/1, 101.
202. AR XXV 2615/2, 112.
203. AR XXV 2615/1, 106.
204. AR XXV 2615/2, 119.
205. AR XXV 2615/1, 113.
206. AR XXV 2615/2, 125.
207. AR XXV 2615/1, 123.
208. AR XXV 2615/2, 136.
This was too good to last, which may be another way of saying that the Newel peasantry could not cope with the demands of their masters and failed to fulfil the plan. By 1688 income had fallen sharply. There had been two major fires in the town, which involved major expenditure on restoration. ‘W Roku 1686 in Augusti [sic], Cerkwie zgorraly, / Ratowano Dzwo / ny, y Zegar w Manastyrze’209 (‘In the Year 1686 in Augusti [sic], the Churches burnt down, the Bells were saved, and the Clock in the Monastery’). The costs of rebuilding these will have devolved mainly on the church. More serious was a fire in the following year. ‘Z[a?] Moskiewsk[a?] było u Fortificowane, Lecz przez / Ogien w przeszlym Roku 1687, ku Jesieni w Nocy, Sztakiety, y / niektore Bakszty, zruinowane zostaly.’ (‘Under Muscovite [power?] it [= the town]’ was Fortified, But through Fire last Year 1687, towards Autumn in the Night, the Palisades, and / some Towers, were ruined’)210. But by 1688 all had been restored: ‘Teraz Nowo Stanety For / tificacie, y Bakszty, mało co nieskładzone211 inne zostaja, według dawnego / podzielonych Mieszczanom y Poddanyym Kwater’ (‘Now the Fortifications have Arisen Anew, and the Towers[; the others that are little damaged remain, according to the Quarters of old assigned to Burghers and Peasants212’).

The next table shows how sharp was the rise and fall in the Radziwiłłs’ income from Newel over the eighth decade of the seventeenth century:

---

209. 2616, 21
210. Ibid., p. 17.
211. The inventorist wrote <q> for /o/, an early proof of deenasalization of /o/ (the scribe, knowing that /o/ in his pronunciation sometimes reflected a ‘correct’ /ɔ/, wrote a hypercorrect version). Examples of deenasalization are not infrequent in the inventories even before this date.
212. The various quarters of the town were each obliged to maintain a section of the fortifications.
TABLE 5.5: INCOME FLUCTUATIONS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY, 1681-1688

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>1681</th>
<th>1684</th>
<th>1688</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newel town</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5475–6\textsuperscript{7}/12</td>
<td>3262–16\textsuperscript{1}/6\textsuperscript{213}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of town and country</td>
<td>13,300–12½</td>
<td>32,881–4\textsuperscript{3}/16</td>
<td>23,211–13\textsuperscript{13}/24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus although the income from the Newelszczyzna fell back very sharply between 1684 and 1688, it did not sink back to its \textit{point de départ} of 1681. Very broadly, between 1681 and 1684 income derived by the Radziwiłłs from Newel rose by a sliver less than £20,000. A terrible strain was placed on the golden Newel goose, but in 1688 the poor creature still managed some £10,000 more than in 1681.

By the end of the century the Newel economy had recovered to a point where the total income from town and country had passed the totals for the previous peak of 1684. When, however, we examine the details, we find that income from the town and from the rural \textit{woytowstwa}, so far from rising, had declined sharply. The details will be found in Table 5.6\textsuperscript{214}. Of the \textit{woytowstwa} that appear in both the 1684 and 1700, only \textit{one} has increased its yield, and only marginally at that, by £236–11½ in totals of over four and a half thousand. Seven other \textit{woytowstwa} had seen substantial contractions over those sixteen years. Newel town yields far less than it used to – its contribution to Radziwiłł wealth has dropped to hardly more than a third of its 1684 volume. How, then, has the whole Newelszczyzna managed to increase its flow of gold? Through the arendy (the second 1700 inventory\textsuperscript{215} mentions them in the plural). They contribute no less than £7970.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Place & 1681 & 1684 & 1688 \\
\hline
Newel town & ? & 5475–6\textsuperscript{7}/12 & 3262–16\textsuperscript{1}/6\textsuperscript{213} \\
Total of town and country & 13,300–12½ & 32,881–4\textsuperscript{3}/16 & 23,211–13\textsuperscript{13}/24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{213} 2616, 57.
\textsuperscript{214} For reasons to be outlined below, two inventories were made in 1700. The second is the more reliable, and has been used as the source for the information on volumes of income in that year.
\textsuperscript{215} 2618/2.
### TABLE 5.6: NEWEL INCOME, LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>1684</th>
<th>1688</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newel Town</td>
<td>5475–06(^{7/12})</td>
<td>3262–16(^{1/6})</td>
<td>1868(^{5/12})</td>
<td>(^{216}) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arendy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7970(^{217})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikolszczyzna:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapliskie</td>
<td>5537–26(^{3/4})</td>
<td></td>
<td>5149–15(^{218})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zawiercienskie</td>
<td>4625–18(^{3/4})</td>
<td></td>
<td>4862(^{219})</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siruckie</td>
<td>1276–00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1074(^{220})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psowskie</td>
<td>1126–17(^{1/2})</td>
<td></td>
<td>1092–5(^{221})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Kratayskie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porzeckie</td>
<td>2375–15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2257–10–7(^{5/2})(^{222})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiewanske</td>
<td>2045–12(^{1/2})</td>
<td></td>
<td>1608–3(^{1/4})(^{223})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupowickie</td>
<td>2067–18(^{3/4})</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastyrske</td>
<td>1427–18(^{3/4})</td>
<td></td>
<td>1213–4(^{1/4})(^{224})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarantowske</td>
<td>833–18(^{1/4})</td>
<td></td>
<td>721(^{225})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (All sources)</td>
<td>32,881–4(^{3/6})</td>
<td>23,211–13(^{13/24})</td>
<td>33,303–27(^{13/24})(^{226})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

216. AR XXV 2618/2, 49.
217. Ibid., 48.
218. Ibid., 67.
219. Ibid., 84.
220. Ibid., 89.
221. Ibid., 103.
222. Ibid., 111.
223. Ibid., 117.
224. Ibid., 129.
225. Ibid., 138.
226. Ibid., 142.
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In our day this would be termed a ‘V-shaped recession’ (following a Λ- or lambda-boom). Yet, if there has been only a weak recovery after the contraction in the streams of gold from the Newel countryside over the last decade and a half of the eighteenth century, we should recall where we started. In Russian times, back in 1619, Siwicki and Meszczeryn were told by Radilov and Domaśnij that the Mikolska włość brought in the equivalent of złoty 300. In 1700 that total had scaled a Himalayan peak: the two areas that made up the Mikolsczczyna contributed złoty 10011–15; that is, over thirty-three times more than eighty years before. Now in our own time, when our paper currency is in a sense worthless, we are used to massive inflation. When the coinage had, at least in theory, an intrinsic value (intrinsic, that is, as long as you place a high value on the fact that gold does not oxidize), prices were less subject to violent fluctuation. Debasement of the coinage was the only way to achieve quantitative easing.

We saw above that the income from the Newel town mills rose very sharply in the early years of (hotly contested) Commonwealth control, and wondered whether that might be the first sign of an upward trend in taxation. That question is now answered unequivocally.

In the autumn of 1632 a Russian army had invaded the territories acquired by Zygmunt III Waza; it laid siege to Smolensk. The new monarch, Władysław IV, who was sick at the time, sent contradictory orders to Krzysztof Radziwiłł, hetman polny litewski, who was the current landholder of Newel, and the enemy in the interim managed ‘zając poważny szmat terytoriów pogranicznych, co najmniej 30 000 km², w tym kilka ważnych miejscowości, jak Dorohobuz, Newel, Siebież, Biała, Rosław, Nowogród Siewierski’ (‘to occupy a serious piece of the borderland territories, at the least 30,000 km², including several important localities, as Dorohobuz, Newel, Siebież, Biała, Rosław, Nowogród Siewierski’). The Third Pskov Chronicle informs us: ‘Nojabra vzjaša toropčaně [sic] i lučani [sic] Nevle u Litvy gorod’ (‘In November [1632] the men of Toropec and Luki [Velikije] took Nevle

227. Władysław Czapliński, Władysław IV i jego czasy., W., 1972, 154. ‘This is the only occasion where I have found Nevel’ referred to in works primarily devoted to other subjects as ‘important’.
from Lithuania, a town'). The chronicler records also a Lithuanian flight from Sebež, giving the impression, justified or not, of a popular upheaval that terrified the Lithuanian authorities. It is noteworthy that the Pskovian writer has no truck with the long-altered political entity holding sway in Lithuania – rather as non-specialists in Britain stubbornly called the USSR ‘Russia’ throughout its existence.

However, the hetman and the monarch managed to reverse these early reverses. Under the ‘Eternal Peace’ that followed (June 1634), Newel reverted to the Commonwealth. The treaty envisaged the opening of the border to trade.\(^229\)

In 1636, after the town was recovered, Krzysztof Radziwiłł passed the income from Newel and Siebież to his son Janusz, and sent commissioners to inventorize it.\(^230\) In the aftermath a new inspection of Newel was ordered, and to that we now turn our attention. Are there already signs of new international trading activity with Russia?

Something was said above of the appearance of seventeenth-century Newel. Had we entered the town on a still day in 1636, our noses would have been busy with smells, pleasant and unpleasant, and from them we could learn a lot about Newel. In that year builders were hard at work in the town, and there was a forest smell of fresh timber in many places. The inventory tells us of a series of works undertaken by a reforming administrator, Pan Kunický;\(^231\) re-roofing the entrance gate to the castle and the corner tower, replacing a third of the stockade running between this tower and the next.\(^232\) From the northern corner tower Pan Kunický had also renewed the fence on the earthwork and added roofing boards, right to the entrance gate from the town. Attached to this gate is a prison, the one of which we know already through the streets named after it. The prison was surrounded by a high stockade, ‘oftrogiem Wysokim obwiedziono’. The adjective is used only here in the description of the castle. Evidently this was a notable feature. Moreover there was not only a stout door but

\(^{229}\) Władysław Czapliński, Władysław IV i jego czasy., W., 1972, 164.
\(^{230}\) Henryk Wisner, Janusz Radziwiłł 1612–1655, W., 2000, 51. In 1649 Janusz acquired Newel permanently, something that Krzysztof in his time (possibly at this time, when he had deserved the king’s favour) had sought in vain (ibid., 125).
\(^{231}\) Despite the many references to him in the 1636 inventory, no title other than Pan is ever given to Kunicky. At this stage Newel is a royal property whose starostwo has been awarded to Radziwill. Kunicky was evidently the chief official at the castle, the governor.
\(^{232}\) 2614, 1. I read ‘takii iztakiet’ as a haplology for ‘takiż iztakiet’, ‘a stockade of the same kind’. By the way, the 1636 tour des murailles is conducted clockwise, where the 1619 version ran widdershins.
also ‘Most Ze Zwodem’, a drawbridge, built ‘nowo zgruntu’, ‘anew from the ground’. These features had been added by *Pan* Kunický; thus for him it was equally important to stop prisoners escaping and to hold the fort. He had good reason to fear treachery; see below. All in all, *Pan* Kunický may justifiably be termed an active and reforming governor.²³³

The 1636 inventory was compiled by a certain *Pan* Kimbar.²³⁴ Given that his name means ‘cinnabar’, he may have been a hereditary scribe (cinnabar was the colouring matter used for the rubrics or ‘red letters’ in manuscripts). At all events, every Priam needs his Homer, and *Pan* Kimbar leaves us in no doubt about the constructive achievements of *Pan* Kunický. He dances from place to place, showing us here a stable and there a stockade put up by Kunický; even so Mr Collins praises the amenities of Lady Catherine de Burgh’s estate.²³⁵

Many of these new structures were painted to protect them from rain, snow and damp earth. Hence the air is permeated with the healthy smell of tar and pitch, local products, as we know. Newel buildings are frequently described as ‘czarny’ (‘black’), which means ‘painted with tar’.

Once out of range of those strong, healthy odours, we will catch the fainter fragrance of hay, stored in quantity for the horses that pull plough and harrow, cart and (very occasional) carriage. Hay, too, for the urban cows. Where there’s hay there’s dung, expiring a smell less pleasant, but a gage of fertility for field and kitchen garden. From the many farriers comes the smell of singed hoof as shoes are fitted. Newel has tanneries,²³⁶ and they have a strong, unpleasant odour. And as everywhere until well into modern times, in Newel

---

²³³. In all I have found sixteen references to *Pan* Kunický, all in connection with improvements in the castle or the folwark (official farm) at Sukino (2614, 1, 2, 3, 4). It is my informed belief that no individual is mentioned on more occasions in any Newel inventory. *Either Pan* Kunický arrived before the commissioners, Kimbar and Zabiela (on whom see below), and worked at the pace of a Peter the Great; or he had begun his work before Newel was lost to Moscow in the previous year and the brief Muscovite occupation had not undone his work.

²³⁴. It was signed in his absence by Mikolaj Zabiela; see 2614, 56 (the inventory is catalogued as having 52 pp., a number copied from p.1 of the inventory; but that number is an error).

²³⁵. In 1649 the *wojewoda* of Newel was one Andrej Jur’jevič Kimbar (as he appears in East Slav guise), who must surely have been a relative (if indeed the two are not identical). See Andrej Jur’jevič’s letters to the *wojewoda* of Velikije Luki, 9/19 March and 18/28 March 1649, in *R*-BS, Nos. 193, 195, pp. 212-3, 213-214. Both letters request passage and the right to trade for Commonwealth merchants bringing cloth and other goods, so that the benefits of the treaty were felt even in the spring of that difficult year.

²³⁶. See, for example, 2615/1, 27, where we meet the tanners Ostap and Zachar.
there lingered the smell of human excrement, threatening epidemics of contagious disease that might break out at any time.

Greed has no smell, but as we walk through the market yet another smell (fragrance or stench depends on taste) rushes into our nostrils. The name of the first street whose residents are listed has not been given, but it is probably ‘Pierwsza Rynkowa Pierzeia od Zamku’ (‘First Market Street from the Castle’), because the next streets bear that title with a change of ordinal. In these streets we find:

- Pawiełł Michałowský Kocíoł
- Daniel Szczepansk’ szynk gorzałczany y piwný
- Jan Łobkowicz.’ Ten ma szynk gorzałczaný y piwný

In the street known officially as ‘Druga Rynkowa Pierzeia od Zamku’ (‘Second Market Street from the Castle’):

- Jasko Biełowocký Zsýnem Marcinem. piwo y gorzałka

In the third street:

- Ostap Biernacký Kocíoł
- Stephan Bułýczow Kocíoł

And the fourth includes:

- Fiedor Hryniewicz Kociół szynk gorzałczaný ypiwný
- Jasko Kowal ? szynk gorzałczany ?238

The relevant names and institutions are:

237. 2614, 7.
238. It is hard to see how there can be doubt about whether someone is running a still or not. The queries, if such they are, may relate to Jasko’s surname, which was no doubt his original occupation (smith). It is not even certain that the mark is intended as a question mark.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pawieł Michałowski</td>
<td>Cauldron [i.e. still, distillery]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Daniel Szczepanski</td>
<td>Tavern for spirits and beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jan Łobkowicz,'</td>
<td>This one has a tavern for spirits and beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jasko Bielowocky With son Marcin</td>
<td>beer and spirits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ostap Biernacký</td>
<td>Cauldron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stephan Bułyczow</td>
<td>Cauldron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fiedor Hryniewicz</td>
<td>Cauldron [and] spirits and beer tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jasko Kowal</td>
<td>spirits tavern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus of the first eleven houses listed in the town, eight are being used either to manufacture or to market spirits (or to do both). In the neighbouring streets there are at least nine more distilleries or drinking houses. Notice that for the moment we have no note of premises used only for making beer, except the castle brewery. Barring major price differentials, hard liquor drives out soft. This is a corollary of Gresham’s Law. The use of alcohol as a palliative by people who do hard physical work is universal, but the intoxicant of choice is by custom a relatively weak drink such as beer. There may have been plenty in Newel whose work was not physically demanding but who nonetheless liked two or three measures of spirit of an evening. On the other hand the changing wind blows money to some. Consider Jasko Pustowlanin – ‘ten ma gorzaczalny [sic] szynk’ (‘this one has a liquor inn’) – whose origins were at the lonely margins of society on a pustosz, and who must have praised heaven for his prosperity.

As the seventeenth century progresses, so does the liquor trade. Our next inventory, that of 1681, notes: ‘Tamże [na Rzece Piesicy] Karczma nowo / zbudowano zprzyzadu od Newla, nad Mostem, moze przy Arenzie Rudnie byc / puszczeno’ 241: ‘In the same place [on the River Piesica] an Inn has been newly built where one arrives from Newel, above the Bridge[; it] may be launched at the Letting of the Quarry’. In 1694, we read

---

239. That facility was there in 1629, and probably in 1619; see 2613 (1629), 5.
240. 2614, 10.
241. 2615/1, 12.
Od Kotłow 40 namniey, ktoremi Gorzałki kurzą / Piwa robią Miody Syca y Vbożym / Mieszczanom mąąc wielkie pozytki płacice będą / po Z 15. [=] Ż. 600.242

From the Stills 40 at least, with which they smoke Spirits / make Beers[,] Saturate Honey243 also for the Poorer Townsfolk having great usage they will pay / at Z 15 [=] Ż. 600.

Moreover exports of spirits – and that means exports to Russia – are taxed at Z 1 per kufa. A kufa is a barrel equivalent to thirty tankards (krużki) or 9.75 gallons244. This brings in another Z 200. Note that this implies exports of 1950 gallons of strong drink.

The same inventory tells us that there were at this time (1681) twenty distilleries in woytowstwo Zapłiskie. Each pays much less than the town distilleries – a mere Z 5, earning Ż 100. We have a list of the distillers, and we can discover some facts from their names:

Fiedor Szwed              N° 1
Jakub Katolik            N° 1
Roman Ryksznyski         N° 1
Kuzma Jwanow             N° 1
Pawłuk Rudnik            N° 1
Jhnaec Szulzyn           N° 1
Piotr Onufreiow          N° 1
Jwan Pachomow z Łomow245  N° 1
Froszko Machinski        N° 1
Radziwon246 Siemionow    N° 1

242. 2617, 55.
243. I.e. make mead.
244. See the 'Weights and Measures' in Sergei M. Soloviev, History of Russia, Volume 10: The Reign of Ivan the Terrible, ed. and tr. Anthony L.H. Rhinelander, Gulf Breeze, Fl., 1995, xvii.
245. Lomy is a village some fifteen kilometres NW of Nevel, near Ust'-Dolyssy.
246. This is a local version of the Russian name Rodion, with Belorussian affrication of soft /d/ and with very strong labialization of the accented [o], giving rise to epenthetic /i/, realized as /w/. It follows that, could we see a seventeenth-century Neveler before us, we would notice the very active use of the lips on [o], and most probably on [u] as well. Typologically, we would expect the degree of lip-stretching on [i] and [i] to be equally noticeable. Thus the conversation of Nevelers will have been marked by noticeable facial mobility.
Andrey Szakowski N° 1
Hryszko Jhnaszow N° 1
Mikołay Kochanow N° 1
Hawryło [Jor[m]y N° 1
Koszcia [!] Szylow N° 1
Mikiew Wielebudzki N° 1
Kuzma Woronin N° 1
Miszko Woronin N° 1
Cimoch Lewonow – u tego od dwuch lat kotła niemasz
Ciszko Mikulicz

Surnames are usually given in order to individuate, so that in conversation two members of a community could identify an absent third. The first person on the list is identified by his nationality. Immediately one wonders whether this work was, or had been initially, a tabooed occupation. ‘Jakub Katolik’ prompts the same speculation, for Catholicism has been extremely slow to establish a toe-hold in the Newelszczyzna; he is an outsider and in all probability a genuine Pole. Mikołay Kochanow also sounds Polish; the manufacture of gorzalka (vodka) was pioneered in Poland. But others are definitely local. Roman Rykszynski gets his name from a dziesiątek (subdivision of a woytowstwo) that is part of the Woytowstwo Zapliskie. Pawluk [= Cyrillic Павлук (Pavljuk)] Rudnik is certainly the arendator of the quarry mentioned above (from rudnia).

247. The inventorist noted specifically the non-spirant pronunciation of the š, a sign, so to speak, of ‘non-Polonization’.
248. The reading of the surname is highly dubious; it may he a variant of Jeremiah.
249. ‘This one has not had a distillery for the last two years’. The construction is a compromise between Polish and Russian usage, and locates us in the borderland incertitudes.
250. 2617, 80.
252. For the moment the only Catholic place of worship is in the castle, which appears in the 1689 inventory: ‘w Zamku Koscioł Katholicocki...’ (‘in the Castle a Catholic Church’) (2616, 6). The penetration is even slower outside the town.
253. This is the usual term, with variants, in this and other inventories. Wódka is not found even once.
254. See, for example, 2615/1, 52.
To the east of Newel, in Woytowstwo Zawierecienskie, we find an unusual mixture of distillers’ names\textsuperscript{255}. The first is Parfien Woyt. His given name is Orthodox, not Catholic, from Greek παρθένος (parthénos) ‘virgin’\textsuperscript{256}; his surname, as late as 1694, is quite simply his rank, his place in society. He has seen a way to make more than he would from his land holding (\textit{woytowie} held their land free of czynsz – usually about half a \textit{slubia}). Others are definitely local and stood lower on the social cakestand: Rybak Pawłow was a fisherman until called to matters spiritual; Jwan Ouczynnik wears a sheepskin jacket flayed from a very local sheep (R. \textit{ovčinnik}, with \textlangle o\rangle; Belorussian \textit{aŭčynnik}, with the change /v/ > /ǔ/ and hardening of /ɛ/ > /ę/); Marcin Opuchlik comes from Opuxliki, a village of sulphurous springs on the isthmus between the two lakes known nowadays as Boľšoj and Malyj Ivan. Harasim (local equivalent of Russian \textit{Gerasim}) Kazakinski may have been a Cossack by origin. Łukasz Strelczonek, despite his Polish given name, seems to have been the descendant of a \textit{strelec}, a Muscovite soldier; this is argued by the fact that the inventorist heard no [ʃ] in the name (did not hear ‘\textit{strelec}’\textsuperscript{257}). Most curious are the names Klisz (an informal diminutive of \textit{Klim}) and, particularly, Alchim. It is just possible that this is a local form of \textit{Jefim}, with the East Slav change /oɛ/ > /oɛ/ and the /oɛ/ then affected by \textit{akan’je}, but it does seem more likely that someone, knowledgeable and a wit, saw him at the alembics of his trade and dubbed him ‘the Alchemist’\textsuperscript{258}.

In \textit{Woytowstwo Siruckie} at this time the contract for running the local mill and the inns was held by Wasily Nikiforowicz\textsuperscript{259} Bogucky; for the privilege he paid zł 160. Ten distillers brought the Radziwills another zł 50. So ran the system throughout the Newelszczynza. Each \textit{woytowstwo} now brought in a considerable sum through the licensing of distillers; see Table 5.7 below.

\textsuperscript{255} 2615/1, 81.
\textsuperscript{256} The Greek word is normally feminine (unusually for this declension) and is not attested in the masculine before the New Testament.
\textsuperscript{257} If we set this \textit{Strelczonek} with \textit{Katolik} and \textit{Andrey} above, we begin to get the impression that any polonization is proceeding very slowly indeed.
\textsuperscript{258} Against this is the fact that the Russian for ‘alchemist’ (\textit{ахимциk, alximik}) has hard [l']. On the other hand Polish \textit{alchemik} has a soft version of the lateral.
\textsuperscript{259} Note the historically correct N-, arguing again for strong cross-border influence from Russia.
### TABLE 5.7: INCOME FROM DISTILLING, 1694

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>TAX RATE</th>
<th>N° OF STILLS</th>
<th>TAX YIELD</th>
<th>EXPORT TAX TAX @ £1/KUFA</th>
<th>YIELD INNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neweltown</td>
<td>£1.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£300^261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Zapliskie</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Zawiercienkie</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Siruckie</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>£160^262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Zaiewanskie</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Pupowickie</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Monastyrskie</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Toporowskie^264</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£35^265</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Anackowskie^265</td>
<td>£.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**
- 128 stills
- £1140
- £200
- £460

**TOTAL YIELD FROM SPIRITS = £1800**

---

260. P. 55 (all references are to AR XXV 2617).
261. This is a composite arenda for the quarry, inn ‘and little mill’ (‘y Młynkiem’) on the River Piesica, accounted part of Newel town. This is not the double mill on the Jemienka, immediately below the castle walls.
262. The arendarz is Wasyli Nikiforowicz Bogucki ‘ze Młynu’ (‘from the Mill’). When spirit is distilled from grain the arrangement is convenient. Customers can also have a drink while awaiting their flour.
263. P. 168.
264. ‘Alias Łowieckie’ (p. 162).
265. ‘Alias Psowskie’ (p. 170).
The total income for 1694 cannot be exactly calculated, but it was approximately £20,750 — in other words, rather more than one-eleventh of the total was raised by the distilling industry and its associated activities, viz. milling, and quarrying for iron ore.\textsuperscript{266}

We mentioned the fact that in the year 1700 two inventories were compiled. The story of the first of these documents is unusual. It was compiled by Samuel Władysław Wiszniewski, who was responsible also for the inventory of 1688 [and that of 1694]. We find that, once again, the Newel revenue raisers had worked their magic charms. Over the six years since 1694 the income from distilling and its ancillary activities had increased threefold:

\textsuperscript{266} It is possible that the ‘little mill’ at Piesica operated a trip-hammer and was used to crush ore, which could have been smelted on the spot. In Newel there was no shortage of firewood. On the other hand it is a useful historical maxim that where labour is cheap technological progress is slow. Why pay for a trip-hammer when you can make a serf do the work?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>NO./STILLS</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>INCOME/ zł</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exports\textsuperscript{267}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Mill and Inn\textsuperscript{268}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piesicka [inn] and Quarry\textsuperscript{269}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapoliskie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{270}</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zawierecienskie</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{271}</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siruckie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{272}</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komzsa\textsuperscript{273}</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{274}</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psowskie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZWB\textsuperscript{275}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porzeckie</td>
<td>[5]\textsuperscript{276}</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{277}</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiewnskie [sic]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZWB 3/sł\textsuperscript{278}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100-7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupowickie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZWB 2/sł\textsuperscript{279}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastyrskie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{280}</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZWB @ 2/sł</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58-29½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łowieckie (Toporskie)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZWB @ 2 zł\textsuperscript{281}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarantowskie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{282}</td>
<td>72\textsuperscript{283}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5431-20gr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{267} All references are to AR XXV 2618/I, except as indicated. Exports of spirits are on p. 50.
\textsuperscript{268} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{269} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{270} 2618/2, 67 (actually unnumbered). A figure is given ‘Za wolne robienie [y] branie...’ of zł2 for 22 slugzy. This should give zł.44, but the figure entered is zł.242. I have omitted both versions, as unreliable.
\textsuperscript{271} Ibid. The inventorist or his clerk wrote ‘po [= @] gr[oszy]. 12’. Alas, this is clearly one-thirtieth of the real tax.
\textsuperscript{272} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{273} Komzsa is immediately beyond the eastern boundary of the modern Nevel district.
\textsuperscript{274} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{275} As was mentioned above, some overтовства have a figure ‘Za wolne branie i robienie napoiow’ (‘for the free taking and making of drinks’) and variants, at a rate of either zł.3 or zł.2 per slugza (in the present case neither rate nor number of slugzy is given).
\textsuperscript{276} The ms. reads ‘od Kotlow = N°[blank space] po zł.20 zł.100’. The inventorist has omitted the number of stills.
\textsuperscript{277} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{278} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{279} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{280} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{281} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{282} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{283} The inventorist or his clerk wrote ‘12’ in error.
This increase has been obtained primarily by hauling the level of taxation much higher. In most woytowstwa in the previous inventory distillers paid £.5 per annum for a licence. Six years later that level has risen by a factor of four. Income from the liquor export tax has risen tenfold. The basis for this is unclear; if the tax rate remained unchanged, then exports themselves had risen tenfold. At all events it is clear that some rise in exports has been achieved.

So sharp a rise in revenue raises the question: what was the attitude of the Newel authorities to the liquor export trade? They raised more than two-fifths of the estate’s distilling revenue from exports. Was the aim to limit the trade by increasing costs? That seems to fit ill with the rapid burgeoning of the distilling industry. More probably the authorities believed that gorzalka was too popular in Russia to be subject to the normal laws of supply and demand, and for the moment it seems that this was the case.

Yet there is among all the news of alcohol consumption the first small sign of a change of direction. The graph is levelling off. On p. 99 we read that in Woytowstwo Psowskie ‘Vbywa kotlow po przeszlym Inwentarzu / N° [?3]’\(^\text{284}\) (‘Stills are closing compared with the previous inventory N° [?3]’). The numeral is difficult to read because of a stain from spilt fluid, but is almost certainly ‘3’ (the second 1700 inventory tells us that four stills had closed and two survived; we shall return to the point).

We stated above that the first 1700 inventory was unusual. The aberration consists not in the scale of the increase in trade but in the curious execution of the work. Although the handwriting is better than in some inventories, there are some strange errors. One of the more striking instances will be found on p. 35, which presents part of the catalogue of burghers’ threshing barns. As often in the inventories, the names of land-holders are laid out in two columns. But the second of these has been brutally crossed out with more than twenty bold penstrokes: three or four more or less vertical, ten or so ‘right descending’, as teachers of Chinese have it, and a similar number ‘left descending’ (see first illustration at the beginning of the present chapter). There is a suspicious stain at bottom right. Various errors, spillages and violent deletions will be found, for example on pp. 38, 42, 51; pp. 46-60 are

\(^{284}\) 2618/1, 99.
very badly stained. At the top of p.101 some fifteen lines have been cancelled with lines in a
pattern recalling the Union Jack; this was done because these lines repeat information from
the top of the previous page (see second illustration at the beginning of this chapter; staining
can be seen on p. 101 at top, bottom and lower left).

The pièce de résistance, beyond a doubt, is p. 105, where the cataloguing of the
Woytowstwo Pupowickie begins. The official who inscribed the heading in block capitals,
rather neatly, on a sudden inspiration changed the initial in the toponymic adjective –
changed it from <P> to <D>, as if the adjective derived not from Polish pupa but from Polish
dupa. Researchers discovering such unpalatable facts must grit their teeth, ask pardon of
readers, and explain the vulgar significance of the emendation. It is as if a mapmaker from
the Ordnance Survey were to change the name of a verdant English vale from Longbottom to
Long Arse (see illustration at the end of this chapter). 285

We have rather lingered on the peculiarities of the inventory so that the evidence
would accumulate to the point where the reader will no longer be surprised or offended by
the thesis offered. I surmise that when the inventorists called on distillers and innkeepers in
the Newelszczyzna, they accepted the latters’ offers of hospitality. (Perhaps distillers
thought: ‘Take thy bill and write forty’). The strength of Newel gorzalka probably
fluctuated wildly. Impurities may not have been efficiently eliminated. The inventorists
may have made the fatal error of drinking vodka without eating. At all events, I suggest that
they were under the influence of strong drink, which they even spilt liberally over the
inventory, and on more than one occasion. Further, I suggest that when they discovered that
there were only two stills to visit in Woytowstwo Pupowickie, as noted on p. 112, they were
so incensed that one of them turned back to the beginning of the section and made an
adjustment in spelling to express their outrage at such puritanical abstentionism.

285. It is highly unlikely that this placename has a Polish etymology; it is in the far north of the
Newelszczyzna, where Polish influence was at its weakest. In Ivan IV’s time there is a reference to Popović na
Neve (Neve is a common error for Nevle) – see DDGVUK, p. 438. The reference is usually taken as being to
Nevel’, but I suggest that the end of the name was written in error for na Nevane, which is in the north of Nevel’
district, i.e. close to the seventeenth-century border with Russia. This gives a Russian etymology (‘Priest’s
son’) for the beginning of the toponym. This would be an unusual name for the East Slav lands. Moreover the
variation in vowels (o ~ u) needs explanation. I suggest that the etymon should be sought in Baltic or in Baltic
Finnish.
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There is a strange literary coda to the story of the Newel spirit manufactory. In 1844 a Polish-speaking szlachcic from Belorusia, Jan Barszczewski, published his *Szlachcic Zawalnia, czyli Białoruś w fantastycznych opowiadaniach*. Barszczewski was a man of the borderland, Polish by language, Belorussian by inclination, Russian by accident of history. He consulted Taras Ševčenko, who encouraged him to attempt the creation of a Belorussian literature. One of the results is *Wółkałak* (The Werewolf), the fourth story in the collection. It is set near Newel, and tells of a young peasant boy named Marko, who falls in love with a maiden who has caught the eye of a powerful man, one who has the favour of the Pan. At the wedding feast of his love and his enemy, the young man is given wódka to drink, and this wódka has been cursed. Marko finds himself transformed into a wolf, and lives as a beast for many years, until he finds himself able to bless a child unawares, instead of eating it, as his first instinct suggested. That moment marks the beginning of his return to his own body, to regain which he has first to bury himself in a grave.

This rather Coleridgian tale (for Marko is used as an object lesson by village worthies instructing children), unmarred by the least lightness of touch or any discrepant trace of humour, warns all readers to steer clear of the green dragon. Vodka, we are instructed, turns a likely lad into a ravening carnivore, and only love of children can bring the drunkard back to decent society. It is at least possible that Barszczewski set the story in the *Newelszczyzna* because of a persistent memory of the area’s rural distilleries.

---

286. The collection is *Szlachcic Zawalnia, czyli Białoruś w fantastycznych opowiadaniach przez Jana Barszczewskiego*. Introduction by Romuald Podworski. SPb., 1844. *Wółkałak* is on pp. 80-95. Some of Barszczewski’s other works are in Belorussian.

287. The story remained unknown to local people until the twenty-first century, when an abridged translation was published: Jan Barščevskij, *Oborotn* (v sokraščenii). Trans. Paul Marsh, in *Nevel’skij sbornik* 10, ed. Maksimovskaja. SPb., 2005. There is now a far superior, uncut, version: Jan Barščevskij, Šljažič Zaval’nia ili Belarus’ v fantastičeskix povestovanijax. Perevod s pol’skogo Dmitrija Vinoxodova. SPb., 2008. *Wółkałak* figures here as *Volkolak* on pp. 63-73. This private publication is beautifully bound and presented, with illustrations and two useful maps as endpapers. I thank the translator for presenting me with a copy.
The owner of Newel at this time was Her Highness Princess Elżbieta Augusta of the Rhein Palatinate, and the first 1700 inventory was not a dish dainty enough to set before her.\textsuperscript{288} The Newelszczyzna had been let to a tenant, who paid a lump sum in rent and then kept the income from town and countryside for himself. That tenant was Thomasz [sic] Wolan,\textsuperscript{289} Cupbearer of Troki. The new inventory was compiled by Jan Kazimierz Wiszniewski, who was surely a relative of Samuel Władysław Wiszniewski, culprit in the affair of the unfortunate emendation above. The second inventory was compiled in October; the first is dated October and November 1700, so that we may suspect a certain calendrical elasticity, making the second appear to have been completed before the first. The position in the archive gives the lie to this sleight of account-book.

From the new, clear-headed inventory we learn that \textit{Woytostwo Zapliskie} has sixteen stills at the cheaper rate of $\ell$ 12 (= $\ell$ 192) and \textit{Zawiercieleńskie} nineteen at the same rate (= $\ell$ 228). In this \textit{woytowstwo} we find confirmation of a decline in distilling: ‘Vbyło Kotłów po przeszłym Inwentarzu in N\textsuperscript{o} 10\textsuperscript{290}\textsuperscript{291} (‘Still have lessened compared with the previous inventory in the number of ten’). \textit{Woytostwo Struckie} has three stills, delivering $\ell$ 60 at $\ell$ 20 per still, but ‘Vbyłe Kotłów po przeszłym inwentarzu N\textsuperscript{o} 4’ (‘Still compared with the previous inventory to the number of four have ceased’). That means more than half. The tide of strong liquor has reached the full and begun to fall. In Komsza eleven stills at $\ell$ 20 bring $\ell$ 220. In \textit{Woytowstwo Psouskie} [sic; note the localism] two stills at $\ell$ 20 bring $\ell$ 40, but ‘because of various burdens’ (‘dla roznych ciężarow’) four more have closed down. We saw above that the first 1700 inventory agrees on the number of stills operational, but gives the number of those that had closed down as, in all probability, three. The discrepancy, I suggest, is the result of the same phenomenon as that which explains the other errors in that inventory, namely, the fact that the compilers were tipsy.

\textsuperscript{288} In all probability the Radziwiłłs seldom if ever saw inventories. Elżbieta Augusta’s mother, Ludwika Karolina, was a Radziwiłł who married the elector of Rhein-Pfalz. Newel remained in her personal possession and passed eventually to her Radziwiłł heirs, after a long, three-cornered dispute with her German relatives and the Sapiehas, who also had a claim.

\textsuperscript{289} 2818/2, 2 (title page).

\textsuperscript{290} The phrase ‘in N\textsuperscript{o} 10’ (‘in the number of ten’) is an example of ‘modern Latin’.

\textsuperscript{291} 2618/2, 84.
In *Woytowstwo Porzeckie* [sic] 2 złoty come from five stills. *Woytowstwo Zaiewanskie* contributes 3 złoty, from ten stills, at 2 złoty.

When we come to *Woytowstwo Pupowieckie*, we find that the P is written with particular clarity. There are still only two stills, rated at 20 złoty each and therefore giving 40 złoty. Again, there is a note telling us that five stills have closed down ‘dla roznnych ciężarow’. *Woytowstwo Monastyrskie* has four stills and a yield of 80 złoty; *Łowieckie* (or *Toporowskie*) and *Tarantowskie* each have six at a mere 12 złoty, so that each brings in 72 złoty.

To some extent the decline in the number of stills was made good by the increasing income from a relatively new category: in most of the woytowstwa there is an entry ‘Za wolne robienie y branie napoiow’ (‘For the free making and taking of drinks’) or similar. This category first appears in 1684. For example, in that year the *Woytowstwo Sierufickie* paid 72 złoty ‘Za Robienie Napoiow, ybranie Wolne onych’ (‘For the Making of Drinks, and the Free taking thereof’) at a rate of 3 złoty per *służba* on a tax base of 24 *służby*. This relatively new form of tax is now more frequently encountered; see Table 5.9.

---

292. This makes it evident that Jan Kazimierz Wiszniewski knew of his relative’s *faux pas*.
**TABLE 5.9: ALCOHOL: HOME-MANUFACTURE-AND-CONSUMPTION TAX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOYTOWSTWO</th>
<th>YIELD/ zł</th>
<th>STILLS LOST</th>
<th>REVENUE LOST/ zł</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zapliskie</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komszanske</td>
<td>94(\frac{7}{8})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psouskie</td>
<td>73–15</td>
<td>4 @ 2 zł</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porżeczkie</td>
<td>151–17½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaiiewanskie</td>
<td>100–7½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pypowickie</td>
<td>91-15</td>
<td>5 @ 20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastyrskie</td>
<td>58–27½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łowieckie (Toporskie)</td>
<td>86–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zawierecienksie</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 @ 12</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siruckie</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 @ 20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

899,4163

380

It is not certain that all the figures are recorded, so that the total may not be definitive. It seems most probable that the new imposition was meant to compensate the beneficiaries of Newel taxation for the revenue loss resulting from closure of stills. But the phrase ‘wolne robienie napoiow’, rather than ‘...gorzalki’, implies that other alcoholic beverages, such as beer and mead, were also being made at home – as they always had been. But home brewers had, it appears, so encroached on the activities of professional distillers as to threaten their monopoly. Instead of intervening to guarantee the quality of spirits (insofar as that could be achieved in early modern times), the Newel authorities intervened to protect the Radziwill income. ‘Wolne robienie’ would then mean ‘unsupervised home brewing and distilling’. There remains the question of ‘branie’, the taxable ‘taking’ of alcohol. Given that the tax seems to have been imposed on the basis of the *sluzba*, it seems that the community was obliged to pay a tax on the basis of notional consumption of alcohol. In other words, it was assumed that in a *sluzba* a quantity of alcohol would be made and consumed. This policy did

293. Seven-eighths of a zloty, which is normally divided into thirty groszy, and indeed seven-eighths of anything, is 0.875.
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nothing at all to limit the consumption of alcohol, including spirits. It is strange to talk of a tax promoting consumption; but if one had to pay the tax come what might, then one might as well drink the liquor on which one was being taxed (be poor and drunk instead of just poor).

*Gorzalka* quickly became very popular; as early as 1636 there are a dozen and a half liquor businesses in the town. Further, there are no signs before that time of any spirits in the town at all. Nevelers thus found themselves in a position where they were offered a colourless, tasteless drink that induces (transitory) euphoria.²⁹⁴ Lives hard, climate cold – many will have found it a tempting anesthetic.

Such also is the story of many drugs, including opium. The use of force excepted, there is much in common between the export of *gorzalka* to Russia from the Rzeczpospolita and that of opium to China by the Honourable East India Company under the auspices of the British Empire. Did those responsible for the supervision, that is, the taxation, of the trade understand what the effects of vodka imports would be in Russia? Probably not, at least initially. But as they saw the effects at home (and they must have had opportunities in plenty), they may well have thought that undermining the efficiency of Russia’s fighting forces was a worthwhile by-product of the invention of distilling. More, they may well have thought that such an operation was necessary: the rapid spread of very strong alcohol in the borderlands would have affected the forces defending Newel just as much as those attacking it. We shall see in the next section that Newel’s defenders were not of the most reliable. In *gorzalka*, however, it was as if the Rzeczpospolita had devised a weapon devastating but incapable of being aimed.

²⁹⁴. So I am told.
Few enjoy paying taxes. In modern west European states the arrangement is supposed to be that in exchange for the financial sacrifice citizens receive services provided more aptly by joint than by individual action. Protests about high rates of tax will be met with the proverb (or cliché) ‘You can’t make an omelette without breaking eggs’.

The people of seventeenth-century Newel would have been justified in answering with the enquiry (or cliché) ‘Where’s the omelette?’ They received precious little in exchange for a very significant tax burden. The main service to which an inventorist might have pointed, had he had the least inclination to justify his activities, was the defence of Newel, castle, town and countryside. And the defence of Newel was not handled successfully.

At first blush all seems well. There are *hayduks* to patrol rapidly on horseback, scouting for incursions from beyond the border. They can bring back word to the town, where the Cossacks can be quickly mobilized to meet the threat. Should Russians manage to reach the castle, its artillery will be able to hold them off.

Unfortunately this strategy depends on the forces being available to do their military duty, and there are signs in plenty that they were otherwise engaged. The *hayduks*, for example, have a village named after them; probably they are farming the land there (and they have also inherited the secret garden discovered amid the town lands). Hajdukowo is across the lake to the southwest. The ferry will be required to deliver the men to the castle; their horses have forgotten them. The Register Cossacks are allowed to farm six *włoki* for each horse they supply\(^{295}\); most have one horse, a few two or more. Unhappily these lands are widespread through the district. At least the artillery should be on hand. The artillery is stored in the *Cekawz*. By 1629 there were ‘Dział Spisanych mniejszych y większych całych Siedm wszy= / tkie na końch y łożach [= łożach] Starych’\(^{296}\) (‘Of pieces inventorized lesser and greater, whole [i.e. undamaged] Seven all on wheels and carriages Old’). There are also two broken cannon, and ‘Dzialła trzy mienili byc P. Meszczenyrowe’ (‘Guns three

\(^{295}\) [N]a Kon wloš, szesc[.].’ 2613, 42.
\(^{296}\) 2613, 4.
they named as being Mr Meszczeryn's'). What about the bold gunners? Can they save Newel from the Russians? Their commanders have houses in the castle. In the 1629 inventory we find:

Dom Leszczego Puszkarza pusty
Dom Hansa Puszkarza [...]  
Dom Z[i...jia Puszkarza][297] [...]  
Dom Siemiona Puszkarza[298]

The importance of artillery defence is underlined by the fact that four of the twenty houses in good order (for two were in ruins at this time) were assigned to cannoneers (of whom one was absent; he may have had a more comfortable house in the town, something occasionally found in the inventories). However, an unpleasant surprise awaits us when we look into the next inventory, that of 1636. Only one gunner is mentioned among the tenants of the castle houses:

Dom Puszkarzsky. Pusty. Hanusa Zdrayćcy[299]

That is, 'Artilleryman's house. Empty. Hanus the traitor's'. This is surely the 'Hans' of 1629. Once more we see a straw pushed along on the wind. Here we have a foreign specialist in the employ of the Commonwealth – and he has defected across the border. Nor is he the only traitor: in the same list we find also 'Dom Dmitra Häyduka Zdrayćcy Mieszka Zygmunt Häyduk' [300] ('House of Dmitr the Hayduk the Traitor Zygmunt Hayduk Resides'; Zygmunt had probably been promoted to replace his treacherous chief). Gunners, hayduks – is no one trustworthy? Not the Cossacks, evidently. Out in the country we find 'Kozatczyzna Iwana Borody Zdrayćcy Wł 6 ZaJezioarem Niewa / nem...' [301] ('Cossack landholding of Iwan the Beard the Traitor Włoki 6 Beyond Lake Niewan'). This is in the north of the Newelszczyzna, handy for defection across the border. Elsewhere we find

[297. 2613, 5.  
298. Ibid., 6.  
299. 2614, 4.  
300. Ibid.  
301. Ibid., 56]
‘Kozatczyzna = Donca Biruka Zdraycy Pustosz Kupcowo’\textsuperscript{302} (‘Cossack land-holding of Biruk the Don [Cossack] the Traitor Wasteland of Kupcowo’\textsuperscript{303}. Historiographically speaking, the *trahison des cosaques* of 1648 is well-known, and there is no reason to believe that Newel was exempt from the infection; but the treachery before 1636 is here specifically catalogued.

The 1636 inventory lists the Cossacks who replaced the traitors, as also those who did not desert their posts (or their lands):

*Daniny Kozackie*

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
Dla StraZý ţ obroný Zamkoweý / naPięcdZiesiąt Koný Posześciu / & Koni 2 \\
Wiólk naKon, od Kio S. Pamięci Pod Przysądem Zamkowým / & Koni 2 \\
PrzyWileiem Vtwierdzone, Ale teraz Ci týlko Sá Mianowicie / P. Grzybowski Rotmistrz & Koni 2 \\
P. Gzimont [?] & Koni 2 \\
Nowý P. Poliudowsky & Koni 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

*Cossack Land-grants*

For guarding and defence of the Castle / for Fifty Horses At six / Włoki per Horse, from the King of B[lessed] Memory Under a Grant of the Castle / Confirmed by a Charter, But now These only Remain Namely

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
P[an] Grzybowski Captain & Horses 2 \\
P[an] Gzimont [?] & Horses 2 \\
New P[an] Poliudowsky & Horses 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

From this we learn that the senior Cossack officer in Newel was a rotmistrz like Meszczeryn,\textsuperscript{304} assisted, as it appears, by two chorzęi (ensigns, or as we would say cornets).

\textsuperscript{302} Ibid., p. 26 [2-5 – crossed out].
\textsuperscript{303} ‘Biruk’ is the Russian *birjuk*, a dialect word for a wolf, with Belorussian depalatalization of *ļ*/. Evidently a wolf in wolf’s clothing. His land was in the area held by the Meszczeryn family.
\textsuperscript{304} In another inventory, that of 1689 (2615/1), we read that a house in Newel was occupied by His Grace *Pan Obserszteleunant* [Lieutenant-Colonel] Holszt. He was living in a house in the centre of Newel ‘do woli J P
In this context the granting of the *starostwo* of Newel to Captain Mesczczeryn looks less surprising. If we yoke the two facts together, it seems to show a certain misprision of Newel, a lack of resolve to hold the town at all costs (something that may well have been tactically justifiable). Nor does the list of names which follows those of the officers inject much confidence into a reader. There are twenty-seven names, either of Cossacks or of land holdings. Of these, nine are qualified in advance by the adjective *nowy* (‘new’). Some individuals or holdings are qualified by the preposition *po* ‘after’, meaning that the previous Cossack land holder had defected (or died?). On ten occasions we find *Kozatczyna* and the adjective *pusta* (‘Cossack holding... empty’). Four of the traitors are qualified as ‘dunca’ or ‘donca’ (both in the genitive case), i.e. they were Don Cossacks who had settled far from home; one of their replacements is apparently a Wallachian.

Apart from their interests as agriculturalists, one at least of the Cossacks seems to have considerable interests in the town. This is the Cossack Białowocki, whom we met in the previous section. Dym No. 4 is also registered as ‘Jaska Bielowockie’\(^{305}\), ‘Jasko Bielowocki’s’. Białowocki the bold Cossack is at the least a relative of Bielowocki the prosperous distiller.

So the forces whose duty it is to defend Newel have other fish to fry, fields to plough. They are like the man in the parable who, when summoned to a wedding feast, protested that he had ‘bought two brace of oxen and must needs go and try them’. When the Russians came visiting, those of the garrison who did not prove treacherous were probably too far away to help.

Thus for the Newel military’s *human resources*. Nor is the castle properly maintained. In 1629 we read that ‘Brama wjazdna o Trzech Piętrach Zgniła’\(^{306}\) (‘The entrance Gate with Three Storeys has Rotted’). This is the main entrance from the town. There is no stockade any more: ‘Ostrog ktory był koło miastawzytek zgnił y nimaszgonic’\(^{307}\) (‘The Stockade that was round the town has all rotted and you have

Xziży Paniley milosciwewy’ (‘at the pleasure of Her Highness the gracious Princess’). This officer was certainly a foreign specialist.

305. 2614, 4.
306. 2613, 1.
nothing left of it'). In 1681 ‘Na przeciwo tey Bra:my Brama druga od Jeziora Newla nazywająca Wodna, Wierzch tey Bra:my iuż Się obalił’308 (‘Opposite this Gate [= the gate from the town – see above] the Gate from Lake Newel called the Water [Gate], the Top of this Gate has already Collapsed’).

If we look at the defence of Newel from Wilno or Warsaw, this policy seems tactically justified. This was an era when wars were wars of manœuvre. The two sides sought to attack and to defend by moving their forces rapidly and unexpectedly. In such circumstances the defence to the end of minor fortresses turns those forces into objects of prestige. When such a fort falls, the prestige of the defending side collapses with it. Time after time Newel was abandoned: before 1619, before 1629, in 1632, during the Deluge in 1654, in or shortly before 1665, and under the Treaty of Andruszowo in 1667. The populace could not but gain the impression that the Commonwealth set little store by the town. If there existed the smallest spark of nostalgia for Muscovite rule, national policy might have been designed to provide tinder and a draught to enflame that spark. With 3981¼ eggs one can make quite an omelette; but it was eaten elsewhere.

Had Commonwealth (or Radziwill) rule been successful (that is, successful from the point of view of their subjects (*poddanni*)), one might expect to find the proof of that omelette in the number of households in the town over the course of the century. We should say in advance that there can be no guarantee that we are always comparing like with like.

Firstly, the figure for 1619 is the largest for the century. This may reflect reality, but it is likely that a proportion of the houses was empty, and it may have been a large proportion. Thus the estimates for 1619 most probably reflect the reality at the last moment before that date when Nevel' was held by Moscow. Further, since later inventories do not list the relatively large number of houses in the castle (thirty-six in 1619, twenty-two in 1629), they have been left out of all calculations. The inventory of 1636 has a huge reduction in the

308. 2615/1, 2 (actually unnumbered).
number of households. This may be an accurate reflection of the position, but it may also show only the households within the line of the old town stockade. Towards the end of the century, when our records resume after the Deluge, there has been a considerable increase in the number of households (1681)\textsuperscript{309}. Growth is extremely rapid over the next three years, households rising from 314 to 384, implying a large net influx of people into the town. Over the next four years there is a considerable, though smaller, decline from 384 to 362. \textit{Par contre}, the number of households grows rapidly over the last six years of the century, from 362 to 399.

This information is laid out in Table 5.10, to which is added a series of figures for the possible overall population of Newel, calculated on the basis of an average number of household members per \textit{Dym} of five and of seven individuals.\textsuperscript{310}

\textsuperscript{309} Beyond a doubt there was a fall before this increase. To take one example among many, in Polock a census taken at the height of the troubles (1654) showed that there were more empty houses than occupied. See \textit{Polock. Istoričeskij očerk.} Ed. P.T. Petrikov \textit{et al}, Mi., 1987, 59.

\textsuperscript{310} Estimating population on the basis of numbers of households is, obviously enough, an inexact activity and not a precise science. Readers are welcome to restrict their own analysis to the number of households.
### TABLE 5.10:

**NEWEL HOUSEHOLDS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DYM Y</th>
<th>@5</th>
<th>@7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>AR XXV 2612</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>39-40.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>AR XXV 2614</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>AR XXV 2615/1</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>2198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 ('17')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>AR XXV 2615/2</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>AR XXV 2616</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>AR XXV 2617</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>AR XXV 2618/2</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seventeenth century, like Saturn, tended to devour its offspring. Famine or epidemic might be the cause of death, or the century's endless wars. Particularly noticeable is the sharp decline in population between 1619 and 1636, a period of constant strife; yet 1636 is also the year when the inventory notes the achievements of Pan Kunicki in rebuilding the town. Thus one may suspect that the town was in the course of reconstruction after partial destruction, or that the inventory itself is incomplete. As we saw above, the mid-century position was probably very grave, but we have no data for that period. The figures for the rest of the century show a certain consistency, varying only between a minimum of 314 in 1681 and 399 in 1700. The sharp rise between 1681 and 1684 is suspicious. Either there was a sudden influx of population or once more there is an inconsistency in the inventories.
As for the number of members per Dym, I believe that it tended to be large rather than small. The reason is that there is no other housing stock, and yet the Newel burghers are farming extensive lands close to the town. These lands fan out like the tail of a turkey to northeast, east and southeast (to the west lies Lake Plissy and to the south Lake Newel). The necessary labour must have been provided either by the patriarch’s family or by labourers and maids who lived under their master’s roof.

Yet there was more to life in Newel at this time than war, death, and the constant scrabble for money to pass on in tax. In the closing paragraphs of this chapter we will show something of other aspects of Newel life in the seventeenth century.

The built environment was quite varied. The largest structure in the town was, of course, the castle, but there were churches in numbers. Apart from the castle churches (by the end of the century only one survived, and that had turned Catholic), there was in 1636 the Church of the Annunciation in the market, next to the partially rotten town hall. There were two abandoned churches in the posad in that year, one ‘Swąte’ [sic] Mikoly’ and the other ‘Swiate’ SPasa’ (i.e. ‘St Nicholas’ and ‘St Saviour’s’).

Later, in 1681, we find that a church ‘of the Most Holy Mother of God’ (‘Preswiaiode Boharodycz’ – probably the Annunciation church) has been turned into a monastery church at the cost of the governors, on condition that ‘neither the monks, nor the present Father Hegumenos [Abbot], nor his successor are to annex [przyimowac] even the smallest part of the Streets’.

We are told also that the monks had quarters across the street, and that this fact ‘is clearly specified amid the Town Plans’ (‘wpo: szrodku Planow Mieyskich wyraznie iest Opisane’).

---

311. On patriarchs see below, and particularly the next chapter.
312. 2614, 8.
313. Ibid., p. 11.
314. 2615/1, 16. One should remember here a maxim from the history of manners: if books forbid spitting, it means that people spat. If abbots are enjoined not to enclose bits of street, it means they had that custom.
By this date, and indeed earlier, there should have been no Orthodox churches within the town walls. In 1645 the first Bishop of Smolensk, Piotr Parczewski, wrote a Relatio or report to Rome:

Syntagae publicae neque ecclesiæ schismaticorum, iuxta edictum regis Sigismundi III, presertim Smolensci, intra moenia nulla ratione permittendæ, neque in domibus privatis occulta haereticis aut schismaticis prædicationi, sub pena excommunicationis...

Public synagogues and churches of the schismatics, according to the edict of King Sigismund III, and especially at Smolensk, are not to be permitted within the walls for any reason, nor secret preaching in houses to heretics or schismatics, under pain of excommunication.

We must take it that the operative words here are ‘especially at Smolensk’, and that in Newel the deviation was winked at.

Indeed, another church had been brought within the walls for safety: ‘Cerkiewka zaraz przy Kramach założenie S° Mikolaia w Woynych a w te: / dy przeniesiona była ktora iz zadney w Miescie Parafiey niema’ (‘The little Church right by the Shops, St Nicholas’, during the war it was then brought in which has no Parish in the Town’)319. This was the

315. Smolensk had been taken from Lithuania in 1514, but reverted to the successor Commonwealth in 1611 after a protracted siege. For confessional-political reasons the see of Smolensk was not created officially until May 1625, and the first bishop was consecrated only on 28 April 1634. The three obstacles had been the opposition of the Bishop of Wilno, the delicate position of the newly-Uniate former Orthodox bishopric of Smolensk (to give its East Slav name), and the danger of war; see Relationes Status Dioecesis in Magno Ducatu Lithuaniae, Volumen II, Editit Paulus Rabikauskas SJ. Rome: Academia Lituana Catholica Scientiarum, Rome, 1978 (Fontes Historicæ Lithuaniae, Volumen II) (hereafter Relationes, ed. Rabikauskas), 289-290. In 1654 Smolensk passed into Muscovite hands again.

316. Relationes, ed. Rabikauskas, 316. The quotation is from Appendix III, Statuta synodalia (Synodal Statutes).

317. There is a clever exemption here for Jews. They may not have a public synagogue (Newell’s first synagogue was in the liberty of Sukino), but they may have any number of minyanim or prayer-rooms, for which a quorum of ten is necessary. This does not fall under the ban on preaching within the home (see below), since Jews are neither schismatic nor heretical. It would take a person of less sceptical mind than the present author not to see here an economic motive on the part of the authorities.

318. Catholic practice since the days of Luther had been to keep their faith alive in Protestant lands by secret preaching within the houses of the faithful; here church and state combine to prevent others from doing likewise.

319. 2615/1, 16.
church from Plissy, and was used by the people of Plissy, although it was inconveniently far. Yet another church commemorated the Assumption; the street it stood in was then known as Assumption Street.

Beyond the Brama Jehorowska (George Gate, based on Russian Jegor, here with spirant [γ], whence Polish <h>) is a St George’s Church. ‘The townsfolk call it “God’s Houses”, because everyone is buried there, because it is impossible to dig In the Town [for resasons of public health].’ Beyond the Brama Spasska (Saviour Gate) there had been a church of the Transfiguration (Przemienienia Pańskiego), but now ‘Ociec Makary Mikulicz Czerniec pobudó = wał założenia S° Heliasza’ (‘Father Makary Mikulicz the Monk has built a church of St Elijah’). Beyond the Brama Łucka [the gate on the road to Velikije Luki] there was a new church, yet another St Nicholas’.

The same inventory presents another example of the removal of a church to a safer site within the boundaries of the town. The Church of the Trinity had been founded by ‘P[an] Pawłowski, Muscovite Captain’ two versts outside the town. The governors of Newel had the church brought inside the pale; the land was distributed among the townsfolk; ‘Budynki zaś przy tey Cerkwi będące Czerncy na Swoią zniesli potrzebę.’ (‘The buildings attached to this church, on the other hand, have been dismantled by the monks for their own need’).

Lastly we may mention that in the 1681 inventory we are told of three churches in the countryside: to the north of Newel ‘Cerkiew w Pupowiczach S° Jerzego nad Rzéką Vdraią...’; towards the western edge: ‘Cerkiew w Monastyrszczyznie, Naswietszy / Panny Maryey Matki...’; and lastly, due north of Newel: ‘Cerkiew S° Troyce wokopie nowo wybudowana / w Woytowstwie Porzeckim’ (‘[Orthodox] Church of the h[oly] Trinity in the moat newly built in Woytowstwo Porzeckie’).

320. The walk takes a fit person about twenty minutes. Forty minutes’ walking and two hours’ standing in church make an unrestful day or rest.
321. 2615/1, 17. The ban was relaxed in the eighteenth century.
322. Ibid.
323. 2615/1, 17.
324. Ibid., p. 18 (“10”).
Between 1681 and 1684 (perhaps as Jan III Sobieski saved the rotten wooden walls of Vienna) Newel’s two central churches were destroyed by fire:

‘Cerkwie dwie były jedna Założenia Błahowieszczenia dawna druga Piatnica / Ktora Moskwa na Ratuszowym wybudowała Mieyscu, / obiedwie zgorzały. Teraz dawna Błahowiez[zczenia] / wolno budowac, a drugiey Piatnicy niePozwolaq325 a to dla Mieysca na Rynek według / zwyczaiu w Miescie...”326

‘There used to be two Churches one of the Annunciation[,] of old the other Friday327 Which Moscow had built on the Town Hall Place328, both have burnt down. Now the former Annunciation may be rebuilt329, and the other Friday they are not permitting and that for the space for the Market according to custom in the Town...’

But the Church of the Assumption of Our Lady Marya was in good order. The church of St George beyond the George Gate was still there, and monks were now living there. There is also mention of a Trinity Church and the Church of St Nicholas on Plisa330.

The Orthodox church provided some services for Nevelers. These included a ‘hospital’, concerning which we find a laconic note: ‘Szpital za Moskwy zbudowany’, ‘Hospital built under Moscow’.331 It is outside the town, in a sidestreet off the road leading from the George Gate; the site will have been chosen to limit infection. The church also tended the graveyard. The ‘white’ and ‘black’ (secular and monastic) clergy took care of the constant offering of mass, of others forms of service, and of prayers for the living and the dead. It is worth remembering also the foundation myth of Russian Orthodox Christianity, namely that the religion was chosen because of the inspiring nature of the service in the St

325. The <q> is written quite clearly, but represents <a>.
326. 2615/2, 14.
327. I.e. Good Friday, i.e. St Saviour (?)).
328. I suggest that ‘Mieyscu’ is here used in the sense of ‘piazza, open space in the centre of a town’.
329. It was; and burnt down again in 1720, when it was replaced with a masonry church, of which the Catholic church was jealous. See next chapter.
330. The church that had been brought within the stockade.
331. 2615/1, 22. When was it built “Za Moskwy”? Given that Muscovy had no long periods of tenure in the seventeenth century, I believe that a sixteenth-century date is very probable. It may even have been associated with the visit in 1566 by an Orthodox priest or several, as mentioned in the previous chapter.
Sophia cathedral in Constantinople. The failure of the Catholic church to make converts may have resulted in part from the changes made to Catholic ritual at the Council of Trent, half a century before Newel came under Commonwealth control. Those changes had a moderating effect on the spectacle of Catholic ritual. Nevelers could see before them the concrete benefits of Orthodoxy. These included the fact that the liturgy was couched in a language much more familiar to Nevelers than Latin was.

What of Catholicism, the dominant religion of the Rzeczpospolita? In the sixteenth century the Catholic hierarchy had been well informed on the subject of Newel. The latest developments were reported by the astute Antonio Possevino, SJ, to the Secretary of State, Cardinal di Como, and to Pope Gregory XIII himself. In the seventeenth century the position was quite different. The indifference of the Catholic hierarchy is epitomized in an extract from an appendix entitled ‘Visitatio generalis ecclesiarum’ (‘General Visitation of Churches’) to a relatio (official report to ecclesiastical authority in Rome) of 1645, composed by Piotr Parczewski, the first Bishop of Smoleńsk. Parczewski went to Rome himself at the end of 1645 and presented the report in person.

As the Bishop noted, there were eight parishes in the diocese of Smoleńsk. Parczewski’s report notes:

 Sexta et septima [ecclesiae] in oppido Nevelecebef [sic], in quibus nondum sunt ecclesiastici, quia bona ab haereticis possidentur, sed saltem capellae exigue, et ita sacerdotes tenui victu sustentantur.

The sixth and seventh [churches] are in the town of Nevelecebef [sic], and they have as yet no incumbents, for their property is in the possession of the heretics [i.e. of

---

332. The story is told in the Russian Primary Chronicle. See: PVL, X, 2, 106.15 ff. (pp. 817 ff.).
333. Although not utterly familiar, as we saw above; see the article by William R. Veder cited above in Subchapter 3.
334. This objection could not, of course, be raised against the Uniate liturgy.
335. The document is undated; the clear arguments for the dating will be found in Relationes, ed. Rabikauskas, 298-299.
336. Ibid., 299, in footnote 36.
337. Starodub, Počep (noted in Latin in the phrase in oppido Pozepuo, apparently showing cokan’je), Roslavl’, Dorogobuž, Belyj, Krasnyj, Nevel’, and Sebež. Bishop Parczewski recorded the names in Latin; they are given here in their modern Russian versions. See Relationes, ed. Rabikauskas, 304.
Orthodox Christians]. At all events these are but paltry chapels, and thus the priests are maintained in a frugal living.

Here we need to distinguish between the meaning and the implications of the text. We read a denunciation of wretched premises and indigent clergy. But Parczewski’s zeal would ring the truer if he had been able to distinguish correctly between Newel and Siebież. The distance between the two is considerable, some fifty-five miles. The hybrid ‘Nevelecebef’ is evidently based on an original version Nevel et Sebef. The conflation of -t S- > c- is difficult to explain as a written variant, but it makes perfect sense if the phrase was dictated, e.g. by Parczewski himself, to a secretary. This would explain the fulsome description of the church at Starodub, for he himself had founded it as parish priest: he was appointed to that parish in 1627.³³⁹ Or he may have delegated at least part of the visitation to a deputy, who then dictated the appendix to a secretary. The -f at the end of -cebef may also be the result of a mishearing, since all spirants are easily confused in mouth-to-ear communication. It is true that there is also a possible palaeographic interpretation, viz. that <f> has been written as a misunderstanding of <ʃ>; but long <ʃ> is less usual at the end of a word, being replaced by <s>.

In either case, the error reveals an instrumental attitude to Newel. This two-headed, and as such non-existent, town is good enough to be an argument for better funding and for an attack on heresy, but not good enough to be resolved into its constituent, mutually remote parts.

There is one other reference to Newel in the 1645 relation:³⁴⁰ it is in the body of the text, as opposed to Appendix I. On this occasion Newel is spelt correctly and is mentioned separately from ‘Seebef’ [Siebież]. The difference argues that the appendix was compiled by a different author.³⁴¹

In this entry Newel’s church is said to be ‘ipsa simplex parochialis’ (‘itself a simple parish [church]’) (similar descriptions are applied to several other churches in the diocese).

³³⁹ Relationes, ed. Rabkauskas, 298-299.
³⁴⁰ Relationes, ed. Rabkauskas, 304.
³⁴¹ The ⟨⟩ given by Rabkauskas may possibly have been ⟨⟩: some contemporary Newel inventorists, or their scribes, write a dotless ⟨⟩, which resembles a ⟨⟩.
The church in question was the castle chapel.\textsuperscript{342} The poor state of the Roman rite is ascribed to infringements of ecclesiastical liberty and immunity,\textsuperscript{343} which evidently means ecclesiastical property rights. This will still be a sore point a century later.

The civil power (as opposed to both the military and the ecclesiastical) was represented in the town hall. If the first such building we know of was rotten,\textsuperscript{344} we can surmise that it was replaced from the fact that there was an allowance of land to provide for the three burgomasters\textsuperscript{345} and the town clerk, and they must have had a place in which to foregather. As we have seen, there was a traditional degree of independence of the town authorities that antedated the granting of Newel's Magdeburg charter. We noted in the Introduction that Newel's armorial bearings evoked the notion of the brave little town standing against the mighty enemy, charged as they were with David and Goliath.

What did a Magdeburg charter offer Newel? Kopysskij writes that in the charters of Belorussian towns at this period there are invariably present trading privileges, the right to the use of plots of land, usually in exchange for fixed charges,\textsuperscript{346} regulation of state charges for burgurers, exemption from grand ducal jurisdiction and private administration, and the extension to the town of the right to its own judicial and administrative powers.\textsuperscript{347} We know that Newel had a town hall, three burgomasters; a town clerk will also be found. The right to its own judicial system was far older than 1623, when Zygmunt III Waza granted charter, seal and armorial bearings to Newel.\textsuperscript{348} In all probability, as we saw above, that privilege dated from the 1430s.

\footnotesize
342. 2615/2, 5. I suspect that 'simple' means 'having a single altar'.
343. Relations, ed. Rabikauskas, 305.
344. 2614, 8.
345. It is relevant to compare this figure with that for Polock from the mid-seventeenth century, viz. four burgomasters; see Polock. Istoričeskij očerk. Ed. P.T. Petrikov et al., Mi., 1987, 54. Newel took itself seriously, calling its citizens nevel'čane, a term directly parallel with polotčane and vil'ńčane.
346. Both land and charges are present in Newel (details below).
The town hall stood at one side of the market place, most probably opposite the entrance to the castle. Between these two powers there usually stood at least two churches, representing a higher power. There were shops (probably very simple) along four sides of the market place, and probably mobile stalls in the space between. Shops and stalls constituted the market. Markets are often considered a species of natural phenomenon, and the market at Newel is probably very old.

At the same time Newel market was given an urgent fillip by the need to pay taxes. Townspeople paid some taxes unknown in the countryside – podymny, for example, exacted from the household, in addition to the czynsz, which varied with the size of the plot. A.M. Karpačjov believes that taxation had an inhibiting effect on the growth of the town economy in Polock. Clearly, income required to pay tax might have been used for capital development. On the other hand, where such income is additional, it increases turnover. Had taxation not been there as a stimulus, that income might never have been generated. The crucial thing is to prevent taxpayers from fleeing the jurisdiction; and that may have been the motive for defections to Muscovy.

Some country-dwellers, on the other hand, probably participated in the money economy exclusively to pay tax. Some of them will have sold to middlemen, others will have had their own market pitch or have come in to hawk a little produce from time to time, especially before Michaelmas (harvest home – pay up).

Thus the country is intimately bound together with the town. Grain grown in the woytowstwa is milled at the Newel mill. The townsfolk have their land on the outskirts of the town. Country honey is turned into town mead; the bees give the wax for the candles in church (while the beekeeper uses a rushlight).

349. For the network of streets around the market place and in Newel in general see the previous chapter.
351. Some were of individuals or small groups. See the case of the servantman Ivaško Ivanov, who defected through “Nevl”, bringing his wife, son, and sister, and information about Lithuania (K-B5, No. 85, p. 108); and that of Ondruška Ivanov, who, after two years in Newel, defected at a frontier post between Siebiež and Opočka (K-B5, No. 88, p. 111-112). We know also of mass defections, for example of three hundred peasants to Brjansk in 1649, apparently because of failure of the grain harvest (see Belorussija v epoxu feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 45-46).
352. There had been another mill, in the countryside; and there were others later.
Other important economic activities include fishing and hunting, of which some mention has already been made. We note in passing that ‘Jezioro Vio (= Ujo) złote dno nazywają’353 (‘Lake Vio is known as golden bottom’). There is a curious arrangement at Lake Jazno (‘Jazno barzo [sic] Głębokie y wielkie’354 (‘Jazno is very Deep and large’)), in the far west of the Newelszczyzna:

Jezioro Jazno, kiedy łowią Monastyrcy Podani, maį miec brzegu / z Moskiewskiey Strony, dwanascie Sązni [sic] a nie więcej, dla wyciągania / tylko sieci, według dawnego postanowienia z Moskwą, a od kazdego Niewodu / powinni, po dwa Tysiaca Sielaw dawac do Zamku Newelskiego.355

Lake Jazno, when the Monastery’s serfs are fishing, they are supposed to have of the shore twelve Fathoms from the Moscow Side and no more, only for the landing of the nets, according to a long-standing arrangement with Moscow, and from every Net they must give two Thousand Sielawy to Newel Castle.

Taxation on that scale (more than £22 per net) will certainly have discouraged the custom.

As for hunting, there was a Newel Chase master of the hunt (Lesniczy Puszczy Newelskiego), in 1636 one Stanisław Serafimowicz, the structure of whose name reveals a Polonized local East Slav (Stanisław is a Polish name; the patronymic-surname is of the type common in Lithuanian Belorussia in post-Lublin times).356 Another specialist office-holder was the Bobrownik, the beaver officer, whose name was Sierhiecj Dmitrowicz Kołotowka. Here there is a personal note in the inventory, added in darker ink and a different hand: ‘NB Zel£za Bobrove dwoie. Jedno ý to moicé’, i.e. ‘NB Beaver Irons two. One and the other mine’.357 The work became more important with time: in 1700 there were ‘Zelaz

353. 2615/1, 8.
354. 2615/1, 5.
355. Ibid., p. 8 ("5").
356. 2614. The page bears a deleted number ‘24’ and the correction ‘25’. The page is actually 53.
357. The handwriting is not that of the main body of the text. Darker ink is generally a sign that the writer is of higher social status, perhaps because he uses undiluted ink. Sierhiecj Dmitrowicz Kołotowka has a local East Slav name: Sierhiecj is an Orthodox name, here pronounced with Belorussian (and general early Russian) spirant [y]; his patronymic has Belorussian depalatalization of soft [r]; his surname shows East Slav poloniasie, without akan’e. I suggest that he was a skilled local huntsman, aware of the damage caused by beavers and of the value of their carcases for meat and pelt, but without the capital to buy a modern metal trap. Someone with access to the inventory did have that capital and lent the beaverman two traps. Perhaps it was the ubiquitous
Bobrowych No. 4[.] Osobiwie jedne zlamane’ (‘Beaver Irons No. 4[.] Separately one[,] broken’).\textsuperscript{358}

In a countryman’s eyes beaver are perfect prey. On the one hand the dams do great damage. I once saw the destruction brought about by a colony at Kuhmoinen, not far from Jämsä in Hame. The dam had created an oval lake perhaps a hundred metres by fifty. Dozens of spruce and pine stood forlorn in water two or three metres deep. They were quite dead, their trunks stripped of bark, their needles all fallen. On the other hand beaver-dams are a resting place for migratory fish such as salmon and have other beneficial effects. Moreover the beaver’s fur, adapted for aquatic life in a cold continental climate, is very valuable, at least where there is a market for fur (certainly the case in the Rzeczpospolita). Their meat is also highly prized.\textsuperscript{359}

Such, then, were the activities of Newelers in town and country. As early as the 1629 inventory we can identify individual Newelers, finding names that will recur in some or all of the later inventories until the last. They include the following:\textsuperscript{360} Niewzor, Rubis, Otroszczonek, Podosinowik, Smolak, Piskulka, and Zdanko. This last is a name that survived in Nevel’ until the mid-twentieth century. Some of the remainder are occupational surnames that tell stories of Nevel’ history and prehistory. Piotr Smolak must have been descended from tar-boilers. ‘Podosinowik’ means ‘beneath the aspen’, and may simply refer to the location of a forebear’s izba. We should, however, remember the possibility that the aspen was particularly valued because of the economically important portageable boats made from it.\textsuperscript{361} These boats probably used the Nevel’ waterway or neva described in Chapter Two above. Microtoponomy may reflect this: there were in Commonwealth times pustoszy

\textit{Pan} Kunický.
\textsuperscript{358} 2618/2, 12.
\textsuperscript{359} I once took advantage of a rather grudging offer to try beaver meat. Beaver are occasionally culled in Finland, and an acquaintance of mine belonged to a syndicate licensed to shoot four animals. I happened to visit when the syndicate’s members were eating the products of their enterprise, and out of curiosity begged a one-centimetre cube of the meat. Beaver proved dense and flavoursome, a little like beef. This was not far from Savonlinna, on a sulit summer day.
\textsuperscript{360} Practically all the names (Christian names, patronymics, nicknames, surnames) are subject to considerable variations in spelling.
\textsuperscript{361} Cf. Olavi Korhonen, \textit{Language contact as reflected in the migration of the Finns, the Saamis and the Vikings} in ed. P. Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, \textit{Scandinavian Language Contacts} (hereafter Olavi Korhonen, \textit{Language contact}), Cambridge, 1984, 67-96.
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called Asinowicza, Osinnik and Osinowka, the names being older than the inventories. Aspen is valued in northern Europe also for another reason: it makes the best boards for sitting on in the bathhouse. This is because its close texture makes it planeable to a very smooth finish, splinters being undesirable in this context both a priori and a posteriori. Aspen also yields very little resin; anyone who has leant against resin where it bubbles out of spruce or pine in the banja will testify that it is a most uncomfortable sensation.

A third name that may refer to occupation is Piskulka, ‘Squeaker’, form East Slav pisk ‘squeak’. The word may refer to a portable long-barrelled gun (onomatopoeic, cf. Russian piščat’ ‘to squeak’, piščal’); we will find later some names that relate to other arms of military service. But Piskulka may simply be a nickname (again, ironic or not) because of an unusual voice. Likewise Niewzor ‘unsightly’ is probably a nickname; at all events, it stuck, and we find it in the inventories down to 1761, when Bazyli Niewzór held Dym No. 163 and Spiryd Niewzor Dym No. 186 in the Nevel’ suburbs. Rubis is an unusual surname and has a Baltic air; again, it is found passim in later inventories. Otroszczonek ‘scion, shoot’ is yet another name that is found in generation after generation. As the registers become less damaged and less badly written, we can (and shall) trace their holdings throughout the town and its immediate surroundings.

We should mention also the phenomenon of matriarchs who (because of war, or the drink?) outlive their husbands and are then registered as landholders, for example:

**TABLE 5.11: WIDOWS HOLDING LAND IN 1629**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prokopowa Otroszczenkowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimofiowia Nikiforowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waskowa Chro[li]owa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Marzycha?] Rokiwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

362. 2612 (of 1619), 11.
363. 2623/1 (of 1754), 50.
364. 2623/2 (of 1754), 68.
365. Other softwoods may be used for the rest of the structure.
It is noteworthy that even the given names of these women have been lost.\textsuperscript{367} The reader will notice the local (sometimes contradictory) features in these names: preservation of $<$N$>$ in Nikiforowa (with correct $<$f$>$ from Greek $<$Φ$>$); avoidance of $$/l/$$ in Chro[l]owa; the presence of the Otroszczonek family name seen above; and a surname derived from a generic name for the willow. The registration of widows as house- or landholders continues through the century.

That doughty matriarch the Crone of Pohja, antiheroine of Elias Lönnroth’s \textit{Kalevala}, went to extraordinary lengths to procure the manufacture of a \textit{sumpo}. As a reward she offered allcomers the hand of her only daughter in marriage. The smith and cultural hero Seppo Ilmarinen, a man whose long search for a helpmeet had proved bootless, responded positively to the Crone’s request. Seppo put the required ingredients (a single grain of barley, a swan’s feather, the milk of a barren heifer, the wool of a summer sheep) into his forge. He and his men stoked the fire for a week to reach the extreme heat required to generate a \textit{sumpo}. Thrice he looked into the the forge and saw there first a golden crossbow, then a golden warship, then a heifer with a golden horn and a star from the Great Bear on her forehead; but none of these was a \textit{sumpo}. Ilmarinen ignored these precious objects, beautiful but dangerous, and had his men ply the bellows still harder. At last, at the fourth attempt, he opened the door and found the new-forged \textit{sumpo} within.

Now rejoiced the Crone of Pohja;
And conveyed the bulky sampo
To the rocky heights of Pohja...\textsuperscript{368}

\textsuperscript{367} In 1629 a piece of land on the outskirts of Newel was held by ‘Marzycha Rokicka Onisko Rokicki’ (2613, 41), evidently a wife and husband. Marzycha, if I have read her name correctly, is probably the first Newel woman whose full name we know.

\textsuperscript{368} Niin illastui Pohjan akka;
saatoi sitten Sammon suuren
Pohjolan kivimäkehen...

A *sampo* is triangular in plan. On each of the three faces there is a spout. At the turning of a handle the three spouts begin to pour forth the wealth of the north in the Iron Age: from one spout comes grain, from the second salt, from the third gold. 369

Janusz Radziwiłł and his heirs (his cousin Bogusław, the latter’s daughter Ludwika Karolina, her daughter Elżbieta Augusta, and eventually Prince Hieronim Florian Radziwiłł and his successor, Karoł Radziwiłł, known as ‘Panie Kochanku’) found in Newel a *sampo*. As long as their agents did the relatively easy work of twisting the handle, Newel poured forth grain and gold. True, no salt came from the third mouth. Instead a transparent liquid that looked like water, burned like fire, came pouring forth in a torrent.

Seppo Ilmarinen and his friends from Kalevala discovered to their cost that they had made a mistake in passing on their technological expertise to their enemy in the north. So prosperous did the Crone become that the terms of trade turned radically in her favour. The southerners needs must raid Polja to steal back the *sampo*. Initial success was compromised when the Crone came flying after Seppo and the others, with a hundred heroes beneath her wings, to recapture the *sampo*. In the fight that followed the magic machine was destroyed.

Likewise the Russians came calling throughout the seventeenth century to win back Newel, the *sampo* that had once been theirs. Time after time the castle changed hands or was burned, churches were destroyed or had to be moved at great cost in labour, the town suffered, the countryside too, to the point where even taxes were forgiven for a couple of years or so (a sign of the extreme seriousness of the situation). Perhaps Newel’s apparently magical survival was the result of its repeated immersion in fire.

The Commonwealth, by accident or design, found that the third spout had an important political use. The export of spirits to Russia linked the two states in trade and at

---

110-134; there is a useful essay on the typology of the ‘magical device’, 525-528.
369. English readers may see a parallel in ‘Hamlet’s mill’ (*Amböda mòlu*), the great world mill that at first ground gold and peace, but later, when the quern-maids rebelled, war and misery. See Sir Israel Gollancz, *The Sources of Hamlet*, Oxford and London, 1926, 1-8, 313-314. The oldest reference to the mill is found in a stanza by Snæbjörn of Vatnsfjord, preserved in Snorri Sturlason’s *Prose Edda*; the references will be found in Gollancz, *op. cit.*
the same time undermined Russian fighting efficiency. Unfortunately it did not help the Commonwealth greatly either. Enjoining the consumption of spirits in the countryside as well as the town, of which we see the first signs towards the end of the century, was not the best way of promoting efficiency among land-workers, or indeed among auditors.

If we lift the brightly coloured cover of Newel — all those colours that are mentioned in village names, green, white, russet, blue — we find that the device does not consist of carefully ground cogs, shafts and paws; it is not an Antikythera Mechanism. Inside there are humans, and when we see them we remember that the commonest colour among the village names was black, the colour of mourning and, in Russian, of backbreaking toil (čornaja rabota) and the common people (čern'). Year after year, the first claim on the efforts of Nevelers, on their labour and their thought, is the payment of taxes in cash and in kind to those who turn the handle and to those whose buckets stand beneath the triple spouts.

They mainly eat who only sit and wait.
Województwo Krakowskie

Derewnia Kruliany

Jura Zuzi
Wacław Krupczak
Ospanie Chmury
Derewnia Misiłanów

Piotr Danilow
Zachar Danilow
Derewnia Stępieżanów alias Pieprimitive

Michał
Lawron Pawłowici Syn Pawlit
Tomek Pieprzycone
Derewnia Dreliwiczyno

Kazimierz Wolićow Syn Maciej Lubracyj Ospanie
Kazimierz Wolićow Syn Józef
Iwan Kosićow Syn Toma

Anachin Fela Krupczak Fara Synan, syn Ospania, syn Tomi

Przygoda, Tomi
CHAPTER SIX: THE RETURN OF THE SARABANDE

Here I see the azure plains of two lakes, where a fisherman’s white sail appears at times; behind them a row of hills, and fields in strips, and hutments scattered afar, and herds wandering on the damp shores, smoke from the threshing-houses, winged windmills; everywhere the traces of contentment and of toil...

A.S. Pushkin, The Village¹

---

¹. Здесь вижу двух озер лазурные равнины,  
Где парус рыбара белест иногда,  
За ними ряд холмов и нивы полосаты,  
Вдали рассыпанные хаты,  
На влажных берегах бродящие стада,  
Овнины дымные и мельницы крилаты;  
Везде следы довольства и труда...

А.С. Пушкин, Деревня [1818]
Not a dog barked. In 1772 three significant areas of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations were transformed into sovereign territory of three neighbouring states. ‘Stanisław August’s protesting missives to European courts elicited no more than sympathetic evasions. The British government tut-tutted at “this curious transaction”, but saw no reason to get involved. To Edmund Burke’s question, “Poland was but a breakfast... Where will they dine?” the answer seemed to be that no one, among the major powers, was much bothered.’ From the the Porte to Petersburg, from Vienna to Berlin, the great empires of central and eastern Europe and of western Asia were scared. They looked into the mirror of their neighbours’ ambitions and saw their own likeness. Emperors and their ministers had conceived the idea that the threat to imperial power was the Commonwealth, a state with an ineffective army, where the nobility had long since agreed that no change was necessary in their perfect monarchical republic, and where any member of the Diet could on a whim veto any legislation. A spectre was haunting Europe, the spectre of the Rzeczpospolita. It took two more meals to clean Europe’s plate of Poland-Lithuania. For Newel, however, the first cut was deep enough.

Breakfast had been preceded by des amuse-gueule, for example, the Szpis (Zips, Spiš, etc.), occupied by Austria in 1768-1769. Polock, too, felt Russia’s breath hot and hungry on its border. In 1767, the year of the last Newel inventory extant, ‘For a period of some six weeks, detailed and extensive surveys were conducted by Russian officers and their cossack escorts of the Polish lands north of the [Western] Dvina’. Commonwealth sensibilities were to be soothed by the fact that the officers ‘were conducting standard military procedures associated with army supply’, a reassurance some might find unsettling enough. However,

5. 2631/1. In the AGAD catalogue this inventory is misdated 1761, but on the title page it is dated 12 February 1767, unequivocally and in a clear hand.
7. Ibid.
the instructions to the surveyors went far beyond this. They were to draw up accurate summaries of landownership, property relations, agricultural and forestry resources, revenues, population and topography. Where local landowners would not cooperate, they were threatened with military reprisals. The Russian officers turned to Jews, peasants and the Orthodox clergy for information. The nobility of the patalinate of Polock sent panic-stricken pleas for reassurance to the King and the Confederacy of Radom.8

These instructions have a great interest of their own. Jerzy Lukowski had quoted them in extenso in an article9 published in 1983. They were obtained by the Grand Hetman of Lithuania, Michael (as Jerzy Lukowski anglicizes the name) Massalski.10 The document in question is written in Latin characters that seek to convey a Russian original. The interest of this text to Nevel' historiography lies, for one thing, in the signatory, who was one 'Ober Kwatyrmeyster, Illa Niefiediew'. *Illa* is a Belorussianized version of Russian *II'ja*, with consonant doubling before original soft *jer* (Cyrillic <я>) ; cf. the Newel surname *Illin*.11 His surname is reflected in the Newel inventories, too. For example, the next entry in the 1619 inventory after the 'Iwan Illin' just noted is 'Niefiedz marcinow'.12 'Niefiedz' is a hypercorrect form: it reflects OCS *Mefedodii* (*Mеfодий*), but the initial /m/ has been wrongly emended to /n/. This, then, is another from the complex of names affected by the popularity of the archangel Michael. On this occasion people have thought 'I know that I should say *Nikolaj*, not *Mikolaj*. Therefore I should say *Nefedz*, not *Mefedz*"13. None of this necessarily implies that 'Illa Niefiediew' was in reality a west Russian or even a Belorussian. For that we would expect, at the least, -dz- in the surname. But, given the

---

8. Ibid.
10. The very attentive reader may remember this family from the beginning of Nevel' history, when in March 1488 Timosiej Mosalskoj presented Ivan III with a *démarche* on the subject of his nomination of governors to the town of Velikiye Luki. Note the Belorussification of the surname (with akan'je).
11. 2612 (of 1619), 5, 'Iwan Illin'.
12. Ibid.
13. Once again we are dealing with a Belorussian form, showing affrication of *d* > to *dz*. The purely Russian version is *Nefiod* (*Heфедор*); see ESRJa, comp. Max Vasmer, III, 70 (s.v. *Heфедор*), II, 612 (s.v. *Mефодий*). The depalatalization of /CH/ to /Ch/, where C = any consonant, is a phenomenon found in colloquial Russian versions of Greek names; cf. in Chapter One, Table 1.3, the names *Arjom* from Greek *Artёмios* and *Jefim* from *Efēmios*, pronounced [ɛfimios] in Medieval Greek. We would expect *Artemij*, *Jefimij*. 
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vagaries of the document as described by Jerzy Lukowski, the possibility is not excluded; the forename argues for it. Of course, 'Illa' may be the result of the scribe's local origin. If, however, 'Niefiediew' really was a person of relatively local extraction, then he may have been sent in part for his local knowledge, as was Rotmistr Meszczeryn in 1619.

Secondly, the instructions themselves are cast in terms very similar to the Newel inventories, and to Belorussian Radziwiłł inventories in general. For example, point 1 concerns bodies of water: 'What all more notable, as well as lesser, lakes, rivers and streams are located in all the above-named lands...'.\(^\text{14}\) Point 2 requires information on the exact number of inhabitants, names of townships, etc.; point 3 concerns enterprises of all sorts, point 4 agriculture: '...how many pastures are there, meadows, hayfields, clearings, forestry and other resources...'.\(^\text{15}\) All these points are covered in the more detailed of the Newel inventories, often in the same order.

In sum, then, this document shows that the Russian authorities (although not Repnin, one of Catherine II's ambassadors to Warsaw\(^\text{16}\)) had a clear knowledge of how landed property was inventorized in Commonwealth Belorussia. They were demanding the exact reproduction of that information, and it would be helpful to scholarship if one day the resultant Russian documents were to turn up. As for Niefiediew's instructions, this text would be even more informative if the original could be published for scholars in an unnormalized version; it should be apparent from the previous chapter, and will be apparent again from the present chapter, that much useful information can be extracted from a document by a careful examination of the orthography of a document and its implications as to the origins and attitudes of scribes and of informants.

Above we wrote a phrase that tolls the knell for Commonwealth Newel: 'lands north of the Dvina'. Its significance is obvious if we turn to a map in a book by Bogusław Dybaś. It shows the distribution of fortresses in the Commonwealth by the end of the seventeenth century\(^\text{17}\). 'Fortress' in this context refers to a large fortified building of the type developed

---

15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. The map in question is tipped in before the back endpaper of Bogusław Dybaś, Fortece Rzeczypospolitej.
in Renaissance Italy. A series of powerful bastions with acute-angled terminations radiate from a proportionally low central tower. Large cannon are housed in casemates to rake besiegers with fire as the latter are forced by the protruding bastions to divide their onslaught.\textsuperscript{18}

Such fortresses were built all over the Commonwealth, with a small preponderance in favour of the Crown. If we look at the Grand Duchy, however, we see that a line of fortresses was built from the seacoast of Livonia at Riga, through Dyneburg (Dvinsk, Daugavpils), Półock and Witebsk to Smoleńsk. To the northeast of that line lie the traditional frontier castles, examples of an altogether older tradition of military architecture: Siebież, Newel, Uświat and Wielż. To what extent, we may wonder, were those outposts defensible in the eighteenth century? How far was our own castle at Newel maintained in a state of defensive capability?

We would err, however, if we thought that in 1700 the Commonwealth’s fate was already sealed, or that Nevelers spent the first seven decades of the eighteenth century looking over their shoulders and muttering ‘The Russians are coming’. The inventories, far from offering such a picture, portray a town and a countryside much more diversified in its activities, much less preoccupied with warfare, than those from the previous century. Much of our attention in this last chapter will be concentrated on urban Newel and its immediate surroundings. We start, however, with a rural eclogue in the spirit of Theophrastus.

\textsuperscript{18} On the importance of such fortresses see Robert I. Frost, \textit{The Northern Wars: War, State and Society in Northeastern Europe, 1558-1721}, Harlow, 2000, 23-25. The general principle (split ‘em and hit ‘em) applies to Château Gaillard and Krak des Chevaliers, and indeed Babylon.
In the margin of a Newel inventory for the year 1754\textsuperscript{19} there is a note of which only three characters can now be read: ‘ma8’. Elsewhere on the same page we find another marginal note on two lines: ‘Wo / m’. We now despatch these six characters in search of historical meaning.

The ‘ma8’ in the former case is not quite unambiguous: the hand of this inventory uses ‘8’ now as the digit, now as the letter <s>. Luckily for the historical imagination, the main text is clear. At Dym No. 9 in the village of Piesciuchino in the Pustynskie woytowstwo live ‘Ausiey Fiedorow Syny Pauluk Jwan y Apin’. It is unusual to find the names of sons in the inventories; the naming of three of them is perhaps unique. But Ausiey Fiedorow’s family was larger than that: from the columns to the right of his name we discover that he has ‘Syny 8 Konie 4 Pszczoly 3’ (‘Sons 8 Horses 4 Be[hives] 3’). So the note ‘ma8’ can be read as ‘ma 8 Synow’ or ‘ma Synow 8’. In either case, Ausiey’s family was large.

We turn to the second marginale. I suggest that this is to be read as ‘Wo[yt] / m[a]’. If we read this jointly with the main text, we find that the Woyt,\textsuperscript{20} as usual, had ‘¼ sł wolny’ (a quarter of a służba free of czynsz). The marginal note repeats that concession. The Woyt’s name was Kondrat Maximow. He had no sons and no beehives, but he had a responsible position and six horses. In terms of agriculture on the Commonwealth border, Kondrat had the eighteenth-century equivalent of a farmyard full of tractors, crop-sprayers and combine harvesters.

Somehow the Woyt was able to make use of his full stable, and this fact argues that his household was larger than the record shows. No doubt he shared the heavy work with landless male peasants, but it is probable that he had children, that is, daughters. In that case

\textsuperscript{19} 2623/3, 96.
\textsuperscript{20} The inventories never show <s>, but it is noteworthy in any case that neither Russian nor Belorussian have ‘vujt’. Since Russian uses the combination [vuj] daily (in zdravstvujte, for example), it follows that the word entered western East Slav before Polish had made the change from long [o:], a consequence of the loss of the jers, to [u].
his neighbour Ausiey will have seemed a very interesting figure. We can see Kondrat on a long Newel evening in summer saddling up to ride over to Piesciuchino, to visit the Fiedorows in their bee-loud glade. Ausiey was perhaps glad to entertain the suggestion, may have said with Pushkin’s matchmaker ‘We’ve the buyer, you’ve the goods’.

Because the inventories show only sons, and literally never daughters, this cinematic sequence is merely speculative, though not improbable. We can, however, sketch in a little more information about Ausiey and his family. The master of the house is from the local Orthodox Christian tradition. His Christian name, as we may well term it, is from the Greek Ἐὐσέβιος ‘pious’. The classical pronunciation was [eus’ebeios], but the medieval version was [e’sevios], which gives a formal Russian version Jevsevij (Esvéaut), abbreviated colloquially to Eseu (Jevsej). According to the usual East Slav rule, /#e/ > /#o/; the /o/ has then been subject to Belorussian and Russian akan’e. On the other hand the change /νC/ > /uC/, i.e. the transformation of /vl/ before a consonant into a semivowel, is very Belorussian; it can be seen also in the name <Pauluk>, i.e. Павлуко, a diminutive of Pavel. <Iwan>, i.e. Russian Ivan (Ivan), is typically Russian. As for the third son, Apin, his name derives from Greek ἀπόμα (ápoma), pronounced in medieval Greek ['apina] ‘compensation, redemption’. Again, this is purely Orthodox.

The family’s surname Fiedorow, too, is north-eastern Belorussian or Russian. There is in the eighteenth-century inventories strong evidence that medieval Greek /fl/ (<q>) is frequently replaced in Newel by <chw> or <p>, and so we must see the surname as rather Russian. This is a swallow; if more such appear, they may confirm a summer of Russian influence.

22. I. e. initial /e/ changes to initial /o/.
23. The term ‘Ruthenian’ will not do here, since the Ruthenian of the Ukraine was not subject to akan’e, which unites the other two East Slavonic languages.
24. Further details may be found in Ganzha, Slovar’ familij, 12, article І. Auséiev, etc.
25. Examples can be found passim, e.g. Chima Wdowa (from Greek Euphènía (Eúphènia), Medieval (e’Timia)) (2620, 10, of 1731, where on the same page we find Fëdor Smolak with ‘Russian’ <D>; Jeuchim, from Russian Jevfim (Evfím) (2623/3, 87, of 1754); Fliph [for Filip] Klëya (2632, 19 (on the dating of this inventory (to 1761) see below); Trachim (for Trofim) Biebus, ibid.
What can we say for certain about these two families living in the Newel countryside in the mid-eighteenth century? Firstly, however we may deplore the fiscal system imposed on Newel by the Radziwills, it is clear that both families must be termed prosperous. Ausicy Fiedorow is not improvident; he has not begotten eight sons without the means to support them. He has four horses; few Newel farmers have so many (then or now). The more horses, the more land can be ploughed, ploughland harrowed, hay and grain brought to loft and barn, timber hauled. The Maximows’ stable is even better stocked; and if they lack honey, no doubt neighbours such as the Fiedorows will give them a taste, a magaryč to sweeten a bargain. We shall see that in the eighteenth century there are signs of a certain prosperity in Newel town as well.

Secondly, if the only eighteenth-century Newel families we knew were the Fiedorows and the Maximows, we would think that after well over a century of (almost continuous) Polish-Lithuanian government there was remarkably little impact of so Catholic a state. 26 Such a view would prove rather less than adequate; yet it is noteworthy that, whatever the advantages of belonging to the same confession as one’s overlords, Catholicism is very far from being the dominant faith of Newel town; still less in the country. Of the three named Fiedorow sons, none has a remotely ‘Catholic’ name. 27 To judge by these two families, one would imagine late-Commonwealth Newel as only Orthodox; but in the historical record we find also Latin-rite and Uniate Catholicism and Judaism. Religion is no bar to prosperity, and some of those who profit from Newel’s wealth are religious figures. We shall also see that there is an interesting alliance between economic activist incomers and a group of wealthy Newel townsfolk.

Thirdly, on the basis of these two families we would be able only to make conjectures about the lives of Newel women. We saw in the previous chapter that a few women were mentioned in the seventeenth-century inventories, and in point of fact we can say much more

26. There is a clear outline of how the Commonwealth became predominantly Catholic in: Richard Butterwick, ‘Deconfessionalization? The Policy of the Polish Revolution towards Ruthenia, 1788-1792’ Central Europe, 6.2 (2010), 91-121. See also his ‘How Catholic was the Grand Duchy of Lithuania?’ in Central Europe, 8.2, (2010), 123-145.
27. There is an argument to the same effect from the different qualities of ‘Polish’ Greek and ‘Slavonic’ Greek found in the Newel area. When ‘Greek’ of Polish-Lithuanian origin is found in Newel, it is classical Greek: for example, in the title of the governor, e.g. OEkonomos (genitive singular) in 2619/2, 56. This is very different from the abraded medieval Greek seen in many Newel Orthodox names, such as Apin and Asey.
about women in the eighteenth century. All the women of whom we can speak are, relatively or absolutely, prosperous, not to say rich. On the whole they operate within large extended families, but we may infer that they were not silent by-sitters. If we remember the ballad *The Waggoner’s Lad* –

Oh, hard is the fortune of all womankind!  
She’s always controlled, she’s always confined:  
Controlled by her parents until she’s a wife,  
A slave to her husband the rest of her life.²⁸

– then we will be surprised by the numbers of Newel women who control considerable means of production. We should not, however, forget the many unseen women, such as Kondrat Maximow’s putative daughters, whose fates are unknowable.

Fourthly, Maximow’s position as Woyt reminds us that the governance of Newel was fairly complex. In each Wojtowstwo below the Woyt there were several Dziesiątniki; the Woyt answered to ‘the Castle’, as did the liberty of Sukino,²⁹ but the town had its own autonomous structures.

It will emerge in the course of the present chapter that the eighteenth-century inventories offer better historical information than their predecessors. All the reasons for this are technical. One is that handwriting is clearer, partly because it is more familiar to a modern researcher, partly because the inspectors seem to have taken greater care. Another is that the organization of the inventories, although very variable, is in general clearer and, so to speak, calmer than it was in the seventeenth century. For example, one inventory gives considerable information on the occupations of townsfolk. Another makes it relatively easy to track the landholdings of individual burghers. At all events, the improvement in the

²⁸ A version of this ballad was collected by Cecil Sharp, though without this stanza, which however is easily recoverable.
²⁹ According to A.P. Grickevič (in Častnovladel’českije goroda Belorusssii, 50), Sukino existed as early as the 1630s. The inventories, however, do not note the liberty’s existence at so early a date. The place is noted from the 1619 inventory onward, and was already the terminus of a ferry service (2612, 4). On the Newel side the terminus was close to the castle, which had legal jurisdiction over the liberty.
legibility and range of the material in the eighteenth-century inventories is useful primarily because it helps us to give clearer answers to the question ‘What was life like for Nevelers?’.

We may hope that our six characters have fulfilled their function and provided a point de départ for the historical investigation of Newel in the last seven decades before the First Partition of the Commonwealth: partly through what is typical in them, partly through the atypical.

During the early eighteenth century power in Russia was exercised by a giant of a man, a strategic thinker with great practical gifts, an energetic and capable administrator possessed of a constantly igniting imagination. Less introspective than Ivan IV, nonetheless he emulated the latter in son-killing.

Peter I of Russia took an interest in Nevel' from the early days of his geopolitical career. In 1680 Peter wrote jointly with his brother Ioann to Nikita Ivanovič Stupišin, granting him lands for his work in negotiating the fifteen-year peace treaty with Poland-Lithuania (1678). In the letter the brothers regret the cession under the earlier treaty of Andrušovo (1667) of ‘Polock, Vitepsk, Dinoborok, Litip, Rezica, Mariauz, with all southern Livonia, Veliž, Nevļ, Sēbež with all their outlands and territories’.30 Since Peter was born in May/June 1672, and the letter was written in January 1680, we may suspect that he played no part at all in its composition. Rather the text bears witness to Russia’s permanent interest in Nevel.

That interest was redeemed by Peter in 1705, when, in the course of operations during the Great Northern War, his forces occupied Nevel’.31 The Russians held the town for two years, and towards the end of that time the tsar himself visited the town.32

---

32. During the Russian occupation Field-marshall Šeremet'jev gave his unpleasant opinion of the Uniate
The immediate danger to Commonwealth power had passed. There is one piece of evidence that Newel’s military vulnerability was better understood in the eighteenth century than in the previous. In 1731 the town defences have been improved:


The Position of this Town [is] above Lake Newel and the River Jemiona. Fortified about with a Stake-Wall / alias a Palisade anew34 Some years ago. Gateways four decent with Bolts. There are Towers above the town built anew two, and old Towers two[.]

This same inventory makes it clear that there is a block of premises in the town used by farriers: not simply civilian blacksmiths shoeing horses for Fiedorow, Maximow, and their town relatives; a note explains that these plots are ‘Kowalow zamkowych alias Puszkazow pod Kuzniami’35 (‘under the Smithies of the castle Farriers alias Cannoneers’). Two pages later there is mention of ‘Andrzej Safronowicz, Kowal Zamkowy’.

Yet one wonders what Andrzej and the other canneneer-metal workers did all day. The castle artillery is still inadequate. There are only two large iron pieces and four smaller. For the large guns we find thirty-eight iron ball, and this is a suspicious circumstance. When the Commonwealth took over Newel in 1619 there were forty.36 Surely this cannot be the same ammunition, minus two cannonballs?

---

33. 2620, p. 5.
34. ‘Ogrodzone [...] Palisadą nowo’ may be understood as ‘Ogrodzone [...] Palisadą nową’, since in the inventories we often encounter denasalization of [s] (<s>) to [z] (<z>), i.e. ‘Fortified [...] with a new Palisade’. However, nowo is used as an adverb immediately below, and that seems the likelier reading in the first case, too.
35. Ibid., 19.
36. 2612, p. 55.
At first the store of infantry firearms look more modern. There are in all forty-eight flintlocks. There are also fourteen iron arquebuses, of which one has burst; for the thirteen survivors 1000 bullets are available. At this point we smell not gunpowder but a rat. In 1619 in the Newel keep there were twenty-four arquebuses and fourteen thousand bullets as ammunition for them. These details look suspiciously similar, and we must conclude that the auditors are recataloguing armament more than a century old. When we look at the inventory for 1749, we find ‘Hakowniec [sic] osadzony[ch] po Staroswieciku wiek / szych y mnieyszych [...] calych 12’, ‘of arquebuses mounted in the archaic manner larger and smaller [...] whole 12’, i.e. twelve had not burst; three more are listed as not usable. In all probability when Catherine II’s representatives took over the town at the First Partition, they found these same weapons and their bullets lying in the armoury: *inutile ferrum*, in Vergil’s phrase: scrap iron.

Reverting to the 1731 inventory, we find between the castle and the town a tactically unhelpful state of affairs: the moat has not only dried out but is being used for horticulture. ‘[W] Samym rowie rzuni zasiewaia y plete zakladaia’ (‘[I]n the moat Itself various men sow and pay jointly’). The owner of Newel benefits from the fact that the moat is now an ineffective defence.

This pattern of renewal beside neglect runs through the last decades of Commonwealth rule. In 1764 we are told that the approaches to the castle are very good in places. Thus the bridge on the lake, i.e. at the south-east corner of the castle, is good and the gatehouse there new: ‘Most na Jejzerze / dobry Brama ta Nowa bez Wrot’ – but there’s the rub: it is without gates. Farther on, from the moat as far as the Luck Gatehouse, there is no fence above the moat. The Saviour Gateway ‘is Old from hewn wood’ (‘Brama y Spayska Stara zdrzewa ociosanego’). The bridge from the Saviour [Jspayska] Gatehouse across the moat is ‘powerfully holey[;]’ Fence there is None immediately, but having walked away a

---

37. The *OED* suggests the spelling *harquebus*, but *me puero* this kind of gun was an *arquebus*, and I shall stick to that version.
38. Ibid., 55.
39. 2622, p. 6. The anomaly of the apparent masculine nominative singular agreement (‘Hakowniec osadzony’)) is apparently a mere oversight.
40. 2620, p. 6. The sentence begins with a lower-case <w>, which I have modernized.
41. 2626/1, p. 6.
little it Begins and it finishes right at the Jehor gate’ (‘Most od Bramy Jspaskiey przez foj se mocno dzirawuy Parkanu od bra / my zaray Niema ale trocha odszeszy Zaczynasię y konczy sí az przy bramie Jehorowskiey).

This description is fraught with tactical dangers; the gatehouse without gates, for instance. Much of what is said here is found already in the inventory of 1761.\(^2\) The picture is no better in the last inventory of all, 2631/1 (of 1767). Here the description of the gatehouses, bridges and palisades is repeated more or less verbatim.\(^3\)

Was no one responsible for maintenance? Certainly. There was a castle cannoneer, as we have seen, with a staff of smiths to assist him: they should have maintained artillery and smallarms. We may suspect that there was more money to be made from making iron rims for cartwheels, horseshoes for civilian horses.

As for the palisade defences, they had long ago been parcelled out among Nevelers in a ‘Dystrybuta Grodzy Palisadowe Koło Zamku Newel / skiego y Miasta Newla’ (‘Distribution of the Palisade Fortification About Newel Castle and Town’).\(^4\) From the castle’s main entrance to the Byczek (Bullock) [Tower], a distance of 337½ \(loki\), the responsibility belongs to the Woyt of Zaworocienskie woytowstwo (‘Woyt Zaworocienski grodzi’, ‘the Zaworocienski Woyt fortifies [it]’). From the Byczek Tower to the Łuck Gatehouse, 225 \(loki\), Newel town and the suburbs were responsible; the same areas took care also of the palisade thence to the Saviour Gate (‘do Bramy Ispaskiey’, 150 \(loki\).) The long stretch of 502 \(loki\) from the Saviour Gatehouse to the George Gatehouse was the joint task of the Zapliskie, Zajewanskie, Pupowskie and Monastyrskie woytowstwa (areas to the west, northeast, and north of the town).

The next stretch measured 247½ \(loki\) and ran from the George Gatehouse to ‘the Cages’, i.e. the town prison, which we saw in Chapter Four as the centre of a small nexus of six streets; this too was under the care of the town and suburbs. The defences diverged at the

---

\(^2\) 2624, p. 7.
\(^3\) 2631/1, p. 8.
\(^4\) This rubric and the details are taken from 2623/1, 40, but they are similar in earlier versions.
town prison. For the defences from the ‘Cages’ to the Water Gatehouse above the lake, 285 loki, the whole of Newel wlosc (as the inventories spell the term) was responsible. The second line, of 300 loki, went thence to the prison at the main entrance to the castle, and this line was looked after by the Komszanskie, Psowskie⁴⁵ and Sieruckie woytowstwa.

Throughout this account we have talked of the responsibilities of the town and the woytowstwa, but it is clear that these were more honoured in the breach (literally) than in the observance. On balance, then, whether we look at gateways without gates, rundown palisades, armament, or the indolent discharge of military obligations and civil defence duties, Newel was patently failing to defend itself. Even broken windows are left without attention: another 1761 inventory, which gives detailed descriptions of the castle buildings, notes⁴⁶ that even in the gubernatorial residence one of the main rooms has four windows of small panes, of which ‘niemalo szybek pobitych’. A neighbouring building has three windows in which half the panes are broken⁴⁷ in yet another there are eight broken panes in three windows.⁴⁸ There are many other signs of neglect. The fact that even the most important building is neglected argues that the governor did not often reside in the castle.

That was, in turn, part of a pattern typical of the last decades of the Commonwealth. The point here is to see the precise forms, specified above, that military negligence took. They had their origins back in the previous century, during which, as we saw in the previous chapter, the specialists in the Newel garrison fried other fish.

---

⁴⁵. The text is unclear at this point, but one line ends (apparently) ‘Pso’, while the next begins ‘uskie’, where <u> ≠ /u/, Belorussian <ъ>.
⁴⁶. 2632, p. 4. This inventory is undated, but it can be shown easily that it dates to the same year as 2624, namely 1761. The latter lists the total income from Woytowstwo Zapliske in 1761 as £18545—1½. AR XXV 2632 gives precisely the same sum (p. 85). Such a phenomenon is otherwise attested only for inventories compiled in one and the same year.
⁴⁷. Ibid.
⁴⁸. The panes may have broken because of rotten frames. In winter, moisture in the timber would have frozen and expanded, cracking the glass.
In Nevel' the summer dawn breaks very early; the town is not far from the southern edge of the 'white nights' zone. Apart from the birdsong that we mentioned in the previous chapter, what would we have heard if in the eighteenth century we had stood on the outskirts of Newel at dawn in summer?

Nothing at first, but as the sun sends early shafts through the forests to the northeast there is a low rumbling and a faint tattoo, presage of a cart. Nothing surprising: an early carter on his way to deliver or collect. But when he passes the drubbing does not. A second carter? Surely not, but a second cart, yes, and then a third. On the other roads out of Newel, too, carts are leaving. Their drivers are wiry or burly. A number of them are driven by women. Still they come, more and more of them, overtaking lads, each carrying a sickle, a scythe, or some other agricultural implement; sometimes a friend or an employer stops to give one of them a lift. This exodus goes on for some time. It is the eighteenth-century Newel rush hour. If we return at twilight we will find the same people and horses straggling back towards the town, some of them on the way to an inn for a drink, others home to eat and sleep and wake again tomorrow morning for another day in the fields: the growing season is short.

We know that there must have been a Newel rush hour because all round the town there was horticultural and agricultural land held by townspeople. The inventories list all these lands and those who held them. All the landholders are Newel townspeople. The organization of the listing of lands is variable; there are literally hundreds of pieces of land.
The second inventory of 1700, 2618/2, begins its catalogue of town lands with vegetable gardens immediately outside the town stockade. The payment for these is five groszy per pret (square rod); there are 1034¾ pret.

Next come Gumiennice Mieskie, ‘town threshing floors’. A gumiennica is a special building for drying grain before threshing or the threshing floor itself. The charge on these is four groszy per pret. The Gumiennice are organized in areas of variable size called Rez, ‘section’, cf. modern Belorussian rêz ‘(proxod piloju) rez; razrez’ (‘stroke with a saw’ cut; section’). It is quite clear that this is a local word; related Polish words begin with <rz>, e.g. rzezać ‘to cut’. The Polish-speaking inspector did not associate the Newel noun with the Polish verb. Eight of these sections are mentioned, covering in all 1032 pret.

We can add that in the next inventory the correlation between vegetable gardens and threshing floors has changed in the latter’s favour: the gardens total 892½ pret, a decline of over a hundred. The threshing floors cover a slightly larger area, viz. 1038½ pret. The rates are as previously, and, because of the 20 per cent difference between the two rates, the threshing floors bring in some 4.10 less than the gardens (4.138–13 compared with 4.148–43).

It seems likely that Newel’s threshing floors were as much places of storage as processing facilities: in effect they were barns. The barns held rye, the staple dietary grain (containing as it does some quantity of the three major dietary requirements), but also oats.

---

49. 2618/2, p. 32. The catalogue of lands and landholders extends to p. 47.
50. I.e. the monies payable to the Radziwill owner of the town. It is still unclear whether the landholders were, de iure, landowners paying a tax on their land or tenants paying a rent for it. A note in 2632 (1761; on the dating of this inventory see above), 48, says of a certain piece of land that it is ‘Morg Ponikiperowej Pusty’ (‘a Morg After Nikiperowa Vacant’). On p. 50 we find that a general’s son-in-law holds the general’s piece of land ‘after’ the general (‘Mor: Grunt z Zabudowaniem Wolny / ny po Generale, teraz Mie[.]ka / Tomasz Papkowskiego [sic] zyc byw = / [zeg]o Generala’ (‘Mor: [= morg; the colon marks the abbreviation] Ground, with Buildings, Free after the General, now Tomasz Papowski the son-in-law of the General lives [there]’)). These notes may indicate that the land passed on to a member of the same family, but that does not prove ownership.
51. One square pret = 18.66 m².
53. The annual income summary (Prouent Roczny) at the end of the inventory’s section on income from the town gives the amount as 1032¼, probably because of confusion with the income from kitchen gardens, viz. 1034¼. The area given there for the gardens is also wrong, viz. ‘34½’ instead of ‘1034½’.
54. 2620, 28.
55. I think that the total should be 4.138.43. The figure was probably copied up wrongly from notes.
(important for people and horses) and barley. The last is vital for one of the most important products of eighteenth-century Newel: beer. In 1761 there were twenty-seven breweries in Newel town, and they devoured barley in great quantities.\footnote{56}

We come now to the category of land called Morgi polne, ‘field morgi’.\footnote{57} The fee per morg is twenty groszy; there are 854 morgi, bringing in the annual sum of £569–10\footnote{58} (i.e. 854 x 20 ÷ 30).\footnote{59}

The total income accruing annually from town horticultural and agricultural lands in 1700 was £878–24½. It should be noted that this income is directly comparable with the revenue from one of the smaller woytowstwa, such as Siruckie (elsewhere often Sieruckie), which in the same inventory brings in £872–22½. In part this reflects the fact that money is made more easily in a town than in the countryside, even if the town cannot eat without the land. Unlike cities, however, Newel was largely able to feed itself because of the fantail of gardens, orchards and fields that spread about the town. In part the relatively low income from the Newel countryside reminds us that much of the hinterland was still forested. Forests were important sources of hunting (hence of dietary protein) and of the most important building material, timber. Much of the land was of poor quality, undercapitalized, or worked by too small a labour force. Newel, on the other hand, was close to its food-producing land. The workforce was a cart-ride away. Such lands were referred to in seventeenth-century inventories as ‘dawno Pozaymowane’\footnote{60} or similar, so that there had been time to deal with basic obstacles such as the removal of loose rocks, tree stumps and the like. Both within the town and on the land there were byres; hence manure was available. Within the town, we may add, there were also buyers: Newel had an economy with some degree of specialization, as we shall see later in this chapter; not everyone tilled the soil in person, and surplus produce was certainly sold in the market.

\footnote{56} 2624, pp. 23, 36, 38.
\footnote{57} A morg (to cite the modern form) is approximately equal to 5600 m².
\footnote{58} Ibid., p. 47.
\footnote{59} 2618/2, p. 38-41.
\footnote{60} E.g. 2613 (1629), p. 41; 2615/1 (1681), p. 34; and 2616 (1688), p. 41.
By careful examination of these suburban landholdings, and of other premises on the edge of the town such as breweries and smithies, we can extract useful historical information, concerning individuals, their families and their occupations. The families include familiar names: Zdanko, Atroszczonok, Bychowiec, Rubis. These last, for example, had lived in Newel town at least since 1629. We can trace many individuals from it. In 1713, Newel’s first identifiably Jewish resident, named as Leyba Zyd, lived as a tenant of Łowin Rubis at Dym No. 230, and that fact, as we shall see, is significant.

In the next inventory (1731) we find that a Jan Rubis has bought a block of smithies; he has another piece of land on the same page. Moreover another landholder on that page is ‘Jwan Rubis, Kowal’. Jan holds many more pieces of land, e.g. on p. 8 (three pieces); on pp. 15 and 22, the holder of pieces of land is given as ‘Jan Rubis kowal’. Elsewhere he holds land with his brother. Much later, on p. 160, we read that the contract for running the inn at Wieremiejowo has been assigned to Jan Rubis at a cost to him of B44. Again, on p. 176 we discover that the three-year contract for the fishery in the lakes of the Manasterskie woytowstwo, annual cost B18, is held jointly by Jan Rubis with Michaylo the Woyt (‘Zakantraktem trzyletnym, na rok po B18 z Michaylem Woytem dwuma Ratami maią płacie’).

It is possible that there is more than one Jan Rubis, but we can also imagine him as a single entrepreneur: Jan Rubis the farrier, agriculturalist, contractor. We can imagine him rising at dawn, instructing his journeymen and apprentices on the day’s work in the smithies and then riding out on a well-shod horse to supervise the men and boys who work on his parcels of land. Travelling to his fishery, which spread as far as Jazno at the edge of the

61. This is how the forename appears to my modern eye. At this period there is often confusion of shape between <ω> and <ε>. Lewin is scarcely conceivable. The name Lewon is found frequently, and I suggest that it was intended.
62. 2619/2, p. 34.
63. 2620, p. 11.
64. The custom of valuing contracts in talers survived the Saxon dynasty.
65. The 1731 inventory mentions three other members of the extended Rubis family: Nikifor (pp. 18, 22), Bazyli (p. 19) and Sioma (evidently East Slav Sjoma from Semjon) (p. 22). More hereafter on the contrast between East Slav ‘Jwan’, ‘Nikifor’ and ‘Sioma’ and unequivocally Polish ‘Jan’ and ‘Bazyli’.
66. This is the lake where the fishing rights had once belonged to Orthodox monks.
Newelsczynia, would most conveniently have entailed an overnight stay (there was a hostel on Lake Jazno). No doubt his brother shared the supervisory work and was left in charge in his absence.

The 1749 inventory<sup>67</sup> sees the advent of a new generation: not only Jan Rubis Kowal<sup>68</sup> and Jwan Rubis<sup>69</sup> again (p. 27), but also ‘Jwan Rubis młody’, i.e. ‘the young’, on p. 20. There is also a ‘Jan Rubis młody’ (‘the young’), attested three times on p. 26<sup>70</sup> and once on p. 29. One of the references<sup>71</sup> reads: ‘Jan Rubis młody po D[...] Browarami, i[...]luditir / plac y Pochwie / doru Zdanku’, to be read as ‘Jan Rubis młody po[d] D[woma] Browarami, i[nc]luditir plac y po Chwiederu Zdanku’, i.e. ‘Jan Rubis the young [has premises] under Two Breweries, site after<sup>72</sup> Chwieder Zdanko also included’. We should note the partnership with the Zdanko family. There are other Rubis, too: ‘Nikifora Rubisa Burmistra’ (‘[land] of Nikifor Rubis the Burgomaster’). Thus the Rubis family is broadly represented in three occupations: agriculture, metalworking, and brewing, and it exercises considerable power in the town hall.

In 1754 Jan Rubis held <i>Dymy</i> Nos. 4, 179 and 260.<sup>73</sup> The third of these is registered under the names of ‘Jan Rubis, syny Jan y Nikifor’. Thus it seems that these are respectively the Jan Rubis of 1731; his son (otherwise known as ‘Jan Rubis młody’); and Nikifor, the <i>Burmistrz</i>. Thirteen parcels of land are ascribed to ‘Nikifor Rubis’.<sup>74</sup> Other Rubis landholders include Bazyli (eleven pieces<sup>75</sup>), Michał (<i>Dym</i> No. 223 and seven pieces<sup>76</sup>), Zachar (<i>Dym</i> no. 338 and one piece<sup>77</sup>) Tymofiy (one piece<sup>78</sup>).

---

<sup>67</sup> 2622.
<sup>68</sup> 2622, pp. 27, 28.
<sup>69</sup> 2622, p. 27. Most of the references to individuals in this inventory are in the genitive case. Unusually, no ambiguities arise, and no further reference to this practice will be made.
<sup>70</sup> Once in the contorted order ‘Rubisa młodego Jana’, which suggests that the inventorists themselves had trouble with cataloguing extended families.
<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 26.
<sup>72</sup> ‘Po’ (‘after’) followed by a name is used regularly in the inventories to refer to the previous holder of land or premises.
<sup>73</sup> 2623/3, 14, 20 and 25 respectively.
<sup>74</sup> 2623/3, 22, 26, 28 (three pieces), 29 (two pieces), 30, 32 (three pieces), 36, 42, 43.
<sup>75</sup> 2623/3, 28, 29, 32, 38, 40 (three pieces), 41, 43 (two pieces).
<sup>76</sup> 2623/3, 23 (<i>Dym</i>), 33 (three pieces), 38, 40, 42 (two pieces).
<sup>77</sup> 2623/3, 36 (<i>Dym</i>), 27.
<sup>78</sup> 2623/3, 33.
The 1761 inventory mentions Jan Rubis Kowal and Jan Rubis starszy (who may be the same person) at Dym No. 160, living not alone, but with (at least) 'z Bratt Arciom', 'with his brother Arciom'. This is presumably the brother mentioned but not named in the 1731 inventory (see above). The thirty-year timespan shows the persistence of good relations within the dynasty. The same Jan Rubis, now termed 'Starßzy' ('the Elder'), also holds Dym 186. 'Jan Rubis Starszy Browar' has more premises noted on p. 36. A new member of the family, apparently, is 'Jan Rubis Spaski' or 'Jan Rubis Ispaski', who holds Dym No. 314.

Two entries in this inventory mention Nikipor Rubis. He has Dym No. 269, next to Jan Rubis Kowal at No. 270. The other entry reads 'Nikipor Rubis Kowal', 'Nikipor Rubis the farrier'. Whether this is the Nikipor who was previously burgomaster is unclear; this inventory identifies two burgomasters, viz. Szymon Bychowiec and Pan Teodor Minkiewicz. Other family members mentioned are 'Michal Rubis Kowal' and 'Abramowa Rubisowa', who is evidently the widow of an unattested Abram Rubis.

The undated inventory 2632, as we saw above, is also from 1761. It follows that we can use information from this inventory to confirm our picture of the Rubis in 1761. This inventory lists at least seven places where Jan Rubis Starszy is master. Jan Rubis Kowal is found in four places, Jwan Rubis Kowal in two, and Jwan Rubis without other qualification in one.
This supplementary inventory also brings out the connection between the Rubis and the town government. Nikipor has Dym No. 269,93 which is also the residence of ‘Symon Bychowiec Burmistrz’,94 one of the burgomasters. Jan Rubis the farrier has the place next door, No. 270,95 and that is also the residence of Pan Michał Dubrowa, the Pisarz (town clerk).96 Jan Rubis the farrier has another Dym at No. 272.97 In the last of all the inventories, 2631/1 of 12 February 1767, the Rubis are still found in many places.98 We can thus trace this family from 1629 until the end of Commonwealth rule in Newel. We see them expand their economic activity into different areas, literally (as at Jazno, on the western edge of the Newelszczyzna) and metaphorically (from agriculture into metalwork, fishing, running pubs, etc.). Their economic importance brings political rewards.

It is possible to form a clear view of the gamut of activities in Newel in the second half of the eighteenth-century, their diversification and specialization, thanks to the fact that the inventory of 1761 specifies the occupations of many of the town’s (and of the suburbs’) residents, including members of notable families: the Otroszezonek, Podosinowik, Komkowicz, Piskuška and Kłypa.

Shops are grouped by the castle bridge.99 An area outside the Łuck gatehouse specializes in brewing and in livestock. There are ten breweries, or, more probably, some form of joint enterprise, since ten names are given.100 Many of those involved are from old Newel families: Szymon Kłypa, Pilipowa Czaynukowa,101 Jan Rubis Spaski and

93. Ibid. (i.e. 2624), p. 25.
94. 2632, 32 (Symon’s namesake-father had also been burgomaster). The third burgomaster at this time was Piotr Zdanko; see 2624, 17.
95. 2624, 24.
96. 2632, 32.
97. Ibid.
98. E.g. pp. 16 (five entries), 20.
99. 2624, 22. This is the bridge at the main entrance to the castle, about halfway along the southern palisade. It had been a drawbridge, but one suspects that it could no longer be raised.
100. 2624, 23.
101. This family is elsewhere always Chaynuk. Either the îz is an error or I have misread an îh (in the handwriting of these inventories there is some confusion of the two shapes).
Mikołajowa Komkowiczowa. Zacharyasz Lewoszkiewicz is a newcomer, of whom more hereafter. Teodor Minkiewicz the burgomaster is also here, as is Teodozy Pochazewicz.\textsuperscript{102} Both these are clearly natives of the borderland; cf. the -lewicz ending; but they are highly polonized; cf. their Polish given names. It is very difficult to imagine ten separate brewing businesses on neighbouring premises. Secrets of brewing might be shared unwittingly, or a rival might slip vile potions into one’s brew. We must surely conclude that the enterprise shared costs, economies of scale, and profits. There is another group of breweries, sited outside the town, in the Jehorowskie przedsienie, as well as a third, much smaller.

Next to the breweries are swironki, byres.\textsuperscript{103} There are seven of these, and once again old and new Newelers are involved. Old: Jakim and Michał Zdanko, Szymon Bychowiec, and ‘Podosinowikowa wdowa’ (‘Podosinowik’s widow’). New: Teodozy Pochazewicz, Jan Harmanowicz (once again note the polonizing given names). There are some more signs of a degree of localized specialization (that is, members of the same trade operate in the same part of the town) among, for example, butchers, tailors and shoemakers.

Twenty-four occupations are noted in this inventory, apart from clergymen and public office-holders such as the burgomasters. The inventory also treats being a Jew as if it were an occupation. Six occupations have a sole representative; the rest have from two representatives to more than two dozen. Table 6.1 lists them.

\textsuperscript{102} Perhaps to be read as Pchoiiewicz, where <ch> represents [ɣ]; the name is met elsewhere with <gi>, according to early East Slav and WRCL (<r>), 103. 2624, p. 23. All the swironki share a single Dym number, viz. 157 (the main brewery complex has two numbers, 155 and 156). The translation ‘byres’ needs justification, because in the inventories swironki may also mean ‘shops’: cf. 2615/1, of 1681, p. 19: ‘Tamże Świronków, alias Kramek N° <,>, i.e. ‘In the same place [the marketplace] of Świronki alias Shops N° [the number is absent, perhaps hidden by the binding]’. As far as I know, the sense ‘shop’ is not attested in dictionaries. It is difficult, however, to believe in an eighteenth-century complex of shops in the Newel suburbs – an ‘out-of-town shopping centre’. Rather we may imagine this as a place where milch-kine were kept, so that the three Dymy 155-157 between them slaked the town’s thirst for beer and milk.
Table 6.1: Nevelers’ Occupations in 1761

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Occupation Polish</th>
<th>Occupation English</th>
<th>Number of Practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Krawiec</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>34^{104}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Garbarz</td>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Browar</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Szwiec</td>
<td>Shoemaker^{105}</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kowal</td>
<td>Farrier</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Swire,</td>
<td>Byre or</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Swironiec</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gancarz</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kramarz</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kupieć</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rzeczni</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ciesla</td>
<td>Housecarpenter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tkacz</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lawnik</td>
<td>Stallholder</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Winnik</td>
<td>Distiller</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kotlarz</td>
<td>Cauldron-maker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mularz</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pachołek</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stelmach</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kucharz</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rymarz</td>
<td>Leather-worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Slosarz</td>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Staynia</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Stolarz</td>
<td>Furniture-maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Złotnik</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of enterprises: 177

Where in this table several occupations have the same number of practitioners, they are listed in alphabetical order.

---

104. There may have been a thirty-fifth tailor. A man named Jwan Krawiec (‘John Tailor’, without even a difference in spelling) lived at Dym No. 421, close to other tailors at Nos. 420, 430 and 431. No other trade is indicated, so this may have been his work as well as his name.
105. These craftsmen (none is a woman) will have made all kinds of footwear.
These occupations and their interrelations enable us to create a sophisticated picture, almost a cinematic account, of life in Newel in 1761. To some extent we can reconstruct supply lines and processes of adding value. Thus five weavers suffice to supply thirty-four tailors, although some cloth may have been bought in from elsewhere, perhaps from Mohilew. Some of the cloth woven in Newel must have been woollen, although the Newelszczyzna is far from being obvious sheep country. The rest was linen; Newel has good conditions for the cultivation of flax. The weavers may have sold cloth wholesale to the Newel shops, but a great deal of their produce must have gone to the town's numerous tailors. Each weaving enterprise supplies seven tailoring businesses. The tailors' main market must have been the male population, for heavy winter coats, for breeches, for the formal cloak-coat with slashed sleeves (kontusz) that was a sign of nobility and of aspiration. Much of women's attire must have been made at home, from cloth purchased in the market or bought directly from the weavers. So numerous were the tailors that Newel may well have been an exporter of garments beyond its immediate hinterland.

Another chain of supply starts with the byres, in which Newel's urban kine were kept (as well as pigs, perhaps). When the cattle from (most of) fourteen byres were too old to produce milk, they were slaughtered by one of the town's six butchers. No doubt the butchers had also some country suppliers who drove in an animal or two from time to time, though countrymen will have done most of their own slaughtering. The butchers probably dealt also with pigs, and perhaps with goats, since there is better evidence for the economic importance of goats than for that of sheep. The meat was sold in the market. Two butchers, Karp Naumienok and Arciom Łopyr, have premises right at the heart of the town, and it seems likely that they retailed meat directly, perhaps slaughtering in a backyard and selling it at the front of their houses. The existence of six butcheries argues that livestock-raising throve and that there was strong demand for meat. That in turn argues that a considerable number of Newelers did not themselves have the time or inclination to raise animals for meat, but did have the money to buy it.

Nothing from the carcasses will have been wasted, brains, tripes or lights. Hoofs, horns and bones, are useful, too. There is no mention of glue-making, but that smelly occupation may have been part of Newel butchers' work. It is certain, however, that tanning
is the second commonest trade in the town, there being twenty-nine practitioners. This is a very large number, and we must wonder whether six butchers could keep them supplied with skins. If not, then they will have found suppliers of skins for tanning in the country. We may also wonder whether there was enough oak bark in the Newel area to supply tanners with the astringent necessary for their work. Most probably some other bark replaced oak, alder for example. 

Where did all this leather go? We need to remember also that daily exploitation of the Newel area’s equine population (numbering more than 3000) required leather in quantity. Ploughing, harrowing, haymaking and harvesting all required the cooperation of the horse, as did the delivery of produce to market and the movement of goods such as alcohol around the area. All this was done by the use of carts and horse-drawn sleighs. At least some of these were built by the town’s two cartwrights. Horses, too, haul Newel’s few carriages. Riding, in peace and war, was also important. Hence the need for bridles, headstalls, reins, saddles, traces, and horsecollars. Leather had numerous other uses in early modern societies, some of which persist into our time: for bags, cases and small boxes, leathern hinges, etc. All in all leather must have been greatly in demand. Yet at this time there is no professional leather-worker in Newel. There had been one: in 1754 there is a site noted as ‘plac Krzysztowa rymarza’ (‘premises of Krzyszto the leather-worker’). It appears that his business did not prosper: his house appears shortly afterwards with a new occupant: ‘po Rymarzu Symon Poddzinowik [a garbled version of the Newel surname Podosinowik]’ (‘after the leather-worker Symon Poddzinowik’).

However, a large part of the tanneries’ output, possibly the greater, was taken by Newel’s twenty-three bootmakers. Once again, reflection will tell us that Nevelers needed good footwear. Twice a year, at the spring thaw and in the later autumn, the area was subject to flooding (boots). For summer ordinary shoes would be more convenient, though poorer Nevelers probably made do with the same boots, or shoes of bast. Best for winter are felt boots, but, as we saw above, there is no evidence for large-scale sheep-farming around

---

106. The liquid in which skins have been steeped, known as ‘tanner’s ooz’ has useful preservative properties, e.g. for weatherproofing cloth.
107. 2620, 6.
108. 2622, 23.
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Nevel. It is therefore probable that boots were worn in winter as well. Lighter, more
delicate shoes for women were probably also made.109

After the tailor’s and the tanner’s, the next most popular trade in Newel in 1761 was
the brewer’s. At this time the town Arendarz had the right to extract from townsfolk one
Tyňf for every Cwiertka of beer they brewed, but the townsfolk had the right to make beer:
‘Ktore piwo na Swoy profit obrocic y Szynekowecz Szynkowacz Sprawedliwy ma kazdy / ma
Kazdy Mieszczanin’, i.e. ‘Which beer Every Townsperson has [the right] to make for
Their own profit and Retail by Just measure’. Some word such as ‘prawo’ is evidently
missing; otherwise we have the absurdity that ‘Every Townsperson has to make’ beer.113
Evidently there was sufficient demand for beer to keep twenty-three enterprises of the kind
now called ‘microbreweries’ working all year round. There is one small shred of evidence
that hops were grown, namely the village name Chmielowka (= East Slav Xmilejovka), in the
north of the Newelszczyzna. This derives from Chmiel/Xmel’, ‘hops’, though it may refer
also to wild bryony. Otherwise alehoof, heather or honey may have been used to add
flavour.

Fifth in our list of occupations is that of farrier: there are seventeen smithies in the
town, each no doubt headed by a master craftsman, with at least one journeyman and a boy
to work the bellows. We have already mentioned reasons for the high demand for their
work: horses must be shod, wheels (perhaps) tyred with iron and agricultural implements
made of it. The forges should also be at the disposal of the castle as necessary. Finer
metalwork will be done by Jan Kazioł the locksmith; the finest of all by the town’s
goldsmith, Alexander Zdanko. It is significant that at this time it was the town’s richest
family114 that had capitalized this expensive business. Alexander was not Newel’s first
exponent of the craft, indeed there had been a dynasty (see Subchapter 11 of the present
chapter). All the raw materials for this work must have been brought in from far away, with

109. For other possible uses of leather see Grickevič, Častnovladel’českije goroda Belorussii, 82 (section
headed ‘Koževnnoje i mękovoje производство’).
110. Repetition in original.
111. 2631/4, 49.
112. Several brewers, e.g. Pilipowa Czynukowa, Miłołaiowa Komkowiczowa, are women.
113. The word prawo did not spring readily to an inspector’s pen.
114. The evidence for this is unequivocal and will be adduced below.
the *myto* and several middlemen raising the goldsmith’s costs. This story is also part of the rather brief narrative ‘Newel and High Culture’, which we shall tell hereafter.

There are seven potters in Newel. Most of them have premises in the suburb beyond the gatehouse on the road to Velikije Luki.\(^{115}\) Kilns were fired with firewood from the forests that we know to have grown on this side of town, and with sand from Newel’s soil.\(^{116}\) The main necessities for ceramics were to hand, though we may wonder whether they had flux, and therefore what the quality of the finished ware was.

Newel had six shopkeepers in 1761, of whom five had their premises to the left of the entrance to the castle. Teodozy Pochażewicz, whom we have already met in variant spellings, had one shop, as had Szymon Komkowicz and Alexander Harmanowicz. Szymon Kłypa had two shops,\(^{117}\) and ‘Podosinowikowa wdowa’ (‘Widow Podosinowik’) no fewer than three. In the Jehorowo suburb one Jwan Okieny has a shop, which may have been convenient for those living in the suburb or for country people living nearby. Hence there were in all nine shops in Newel. Unfortunately there is little compelling evidence as to the stock-in-trade of the shops. There was some differentiation, certainly – why else should the widow have three shops or Szymon Kłypa two? Since many things could be home-grown by Newelers or bartered with neighbours, we may think that some goods were brought from afar, from Lithuania, Polock or even from Poland proper. Szymon Kłypa is registered as one of the six Newel merchants, so that he was able to handle the buying in of goods for retail in his two shops. The other merchants are Nikipor Otroszczonek, Anton Otroszczonek and Piotr Skurka, all from old Newel families, and Wasil Michayłow and Tryton Jakutow, who both appear to be *novi homines*.

To the shopkeepers we may add two stallholders, for that, I suggest, is how we should understand the term *lawnik*. This term may mean ‘przysięgły zasiadający w ławie

---

\(^{115}\) There is a note on p. 32 of 2632 (1761) concerning a site between *Dym* nos. 253 and 254: ‘Apanas Ukleja tam glinę biorą’ (‘Apanas Ukleja there people extract clay’). At *Dym* no. 278 lives ‘Sciepan Ukleja Mularz’ (‘Sciepan Ukleja Mason’); his neighbour Alexander Kisiel is another. It is therefore possible that the Luck clay deposits were also used for brick-making.

\(^{116}\) Several sandy areas are mentioned on p. 54 of 2632. One plot of more than one *morg* is characterized as ‘Piasek y Jamy Wielkie’ (‘Sand and Large Pits’), evidently a sign of extraction. Cf. also the VN Pesok.

\(^{117}\) 2624, p. 22.
sadowej"¹¹⁸ (‘juror sitting in the jury box’), but both the men in question, Tymofiy or Tymofii Podosinowik and Szymon Komkowicz, are from families involved in retailing and brewing. Perhaps they retailed beer for the refreshment of customers in the shops and in the market that operated in the open space by the castle bridge.

Of occupations not yet considered, the need for house-carpentry is obvious in a town that was primarily wooden. The two mularzy show that there was some work for masons. Yet the trade was little known in Newel: the correct term is murarz, and the dissimilation /r/ > /l/ is a clear sign of unfamiliarity. There was a single furniture-maker for the whole town.

The three distillers were probably employed directly by the arendarz to provide spirits for the Newel austerya, as it is wryly called¹¹⁹ (the etymon is mediæval French hostellerie). The kotlarzy (cauldron- or kettle-makers) may have supplied the kotły or vats for distilling, but in the main they probably supplied burghers and country people with pots and pans for domestic, commercial and agricultural use. The town’s sole cook, too, probably bought from them. What kind of people were his clientele? It seems unlikely that he was employed by a single master. Rather he may have had a cookshop, with a small range of dishes available daily for busy people. And by now it must be clear that Nevelers were busy from dawn till dusk and often later, because they worked in several trades as well as looking after their plots of land.

This section has provided clear evidence that the Newel economy had become quite diversified, although many of the diverse jobs were done by the same individuals, their employees or their peasants. At the same time we may compare that economy with towns situated farther from the frontier. Even in 1575 Kleck had a range of twenty-six trades; in 1645 there were two hundred and sixty artisans working in forty-one trades.¹²⁰ Grickevič

---

¹¹⁸ Wiesław Boryś, Etymological Dictionary, 297, s.v. ława.
¹¹⁹ The word austeria, to give the modern spelling, is not unique to Newel; in recent times there was even a film called ‘Austria’; the action took place in an inn. The confusion of the word for an inn with Latin austerus ‘austere’, Greek austēros (aborzygos), is indicative of ambiguous attitudes to religion and the consumption of alcohol. Even more revelatory is the Newel inspector’s corruption of the toponym Oreškovo ‘Hazelnut village’ to Arestowo ‘place of arrest’.
¹²⁰ Grickevič, Častnovladelčeskie goroda Belorussii, 61-62.
estimates that the relative importance of the various trades did not change greatly over the period 1661-1802\textsuperscript{121}. Newel's position on the borderline seems to have had an inhibiting effect on the range and number of enterprises. Similarly, the number of shops in Newel was remarkably small compared, say, with Szklow. True, even there the number of shops tended to decline, from '250½' \citep{121} in 1643 to one hundred and twenty in 1772, but the difference in absolute numbers is remarkable.\textsuperscript{122}
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A helpful adjunct to this information about occupations is found in an inventory of 1764,\textsuperscript{123} which lists all the town householders, as is normal in the inventories, but after the first mention of each of them adds all the other land held by that individual. Only this inventory is so arranged.

We are thus enabled to compare and contrast the holdings of individuals and of extended families. Here, firstly, is a table giving all the names of landholders who had more than one piece of land. At the end of the table two landholders figure both of whom have a single piece of land ('Jan Atroszczonek drugi' and 'Apanas Otroszczonek'). This has been done to clarify a later table, which gives cumulative totals for the landholdings of extended families.

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 73-74, and Table 5 (across top of 72-74).
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 141, Table 10; cf. also 135.
\textsuperscript{123} 2626/1, 23-71.
### TABLE 6.2
**MULTIPLE HOUSEHOLDERS AND LANDHOLDERS**

\[ W = \text{Women landholders' names} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF HOLDINGS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jan Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Filip Klipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Antoni Maczkiewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michałowa Zdankowa ( W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theodozy Pohojewicz [or Pohożewicz ( et ) ( var. )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jakim Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Symon Bychowiec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hrehory Karaś ( browar )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Piotr Krycki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tymofiy Podosinowik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jan Rubis starszy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chama Dubrowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stefan Kurakowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mikołaj Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mikołaiowa Komkowiczowa ( W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gabryel Koszko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hrehory i Fiodor Zielenkowicz\textsuperscript{124}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Symon Komkowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nikiperowa Rubisowa ( W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Piotr Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jan Atroszczonek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michał Dubrowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Antoni Atroszczonek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teodor Minkiewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nikiper Rubis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jan Zaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Michał Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Piotr Borysowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Karp Michieykо</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jan Rubis młodszy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kaźimierz Szyszmymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Piotr Zielenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Karwacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Rylski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Theodor Piskulka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{124}. These are the sons of their neighbour Piotr Zielenko (9 locations)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDINAL POSITION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF HOLDINGS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bazyli Komkowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leonowa Atroszczenkowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chwiedor Hwozd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexiey Sapun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prokop Szubowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paweł Atroszczenek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Komkowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirid Niewzor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nikiper Atroszczenek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piotr Atroszczenek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilipowa Chaynukowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wasko Hużno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amiellan Łakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symon Mikulicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michał Rubis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Osip Czorny Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Harmanowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zacharyaszowa Leoszkiewiczowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jozef Nowicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dziemid Chaładziła</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trachim Chałtana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jwan Kabun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrey Karpowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jhnat Atroszczenek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan Atroszczenek drugi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apanas Otroszczenek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6.2 (Continued)  
MULTIPLE HOUSEHOLDERS AND LANDHOLDERS
Where in this table several landholders have the same number of pieces of land, their names are given in alphabetical order. There are fifty-nine multiple landholders. The aggregate number of their holdings is 588 pieces. The average number of pieces held is very slightly less than ten, viz. 9.96. Thus twenty-seven people hold more pieces than that average and thirty-two hold fewer pieces than that average. We do not know, of course, how productive any given holding was. Some of the holdings were non-agricultural, and might generate wealth disproportionately to their size. Nor do we have any way of judging variations in the soil quality of agricultural land. We may suspect, however, that those who held most land also held the most productive land, whether agricultural, commercial, or artisanal. The number of individuals holding one piece of land and not belonging to a larger burgher family is well over three hundred. It follows that we can make clear distinctions between more and less prosperous burghers. Such distinctions got a bad name in the Soviet era, but that does not invalidate their significance. We shall say more of these two groups in a moment.

The number of holdings includes the dym where the landholder resided and on which he or she paid czynsz. Occasionally, as in the case of Jan Rubis, a landholder had more than one dym. Given that some individuals held a large number of pieces, and that they were involved in many ventures, it is not surprising that some families needed two residences, nor that they had the wealth to run them.

Indeed, we need to ask where the labour force came from to work these parcels of land. Most Nevelers had another occupation. Occasionally we have direct evidence that fathers and sons held land: ‘Jan Rubis starszy’ and ‘Jan Rubis młodszy’; ‘Jan Atroszczonek’ and ‘Jan Atroszczonek drugi’; ‘Piotr Zielenko’ and ‘Hrebory i Fiedor Zielenkowicz’. We can be sure that this pattern was repeated within nuclear (as opposed to extended) families. Where a nuclear family held one or two pieces of land, the members of the household probably sufficed to till the soil.

In particular we need to discard any idea that only men can work on the land; women formed part of the workforce. There are many examples of women landholders (marked in

---

125. The two holders of single pieces of land are excluded from these totals.
Table 6.4 with W at right). Are we to believe that these women directed the work of their sons and labourers without ever visiting the fields? Or that they visited, said ‘The barley will be ready to harvest tomorrow if the weather holds’, and went home to put their feet up? No, we can be sure that women landholders took an active part in the physical work of what we call farming. They doubtless acquired every skill necessary for agriculture, from discouraging pests to swinging a scythe. There is evidence that some of these women had other occupations, and therefore other skills, as well.

The next table names the six Newel women who held more than one piece of land:

**TABLE 6.3**

**FEMALE HOUSEHOLDERS AND LANDHOLDERS IN 1764**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF HOLDINGS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michałowa Zdańkowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mikołajowa Komkowicza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nikiperowa Rubisowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leonowa Atroszczonkowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pilipowa Chaynikowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zacharyaszowa Leoszkiewiczowa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows us that three of these six women held a dozen or more parcels of land. In all they hold sixty-two parcels, and the average number held by each woman is 10.3; note that this is larger than the average for all landholders. The average for all landholders is 9.96; the average for male landholders is 9.92, so that women, few in number, held more parcels on average. This is not without interest. One possible reason is that some of the women were widows, and perhaps benefited by inheriting from husbands after the latter had acquired more holdings over a lifetime. Michałowa Zdańkowa\(^{126}\) is the second landholder of Newel, equally with two men. She holds (approximately) one piece for every twenty-five

\(^{126}\) <d> <n>.
pieces held by multiple landholders. This we may compare with her relative Jan Zdanko, who holds 32 pieces, i.e. approximately one piece for every eighteen pieces thus held.

This picture of female economic power is rather spoiled by the fact that none of the six is allowed her own name. Each appears under a feminized version of her husband's forename and surname. Three of the six women are apparently widows, as will appear from the next table. The table's main purpose is to distinguish between family enterprises and individual enterprises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jan Zdanko</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michałowa Zdańkowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jakim Zdanko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mikołaj Zdanko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Piotr Zdanko</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Michał Zdanko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jan Rubis starszy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nikiperowa Rubisowa</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nikiper Rubis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jan Rubis młodszy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Michał Rubis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jan Atlroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Antoni Atlroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leonowa Atlroszczonekowa</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paweł Atlroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nikiper Atlroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Piotr Atlroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jhnat Atlroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan Atlroszczonek drugi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apanas Otroszczonek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mikołaiowa Komkowiczowa</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Symon Komkowicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bazyli Komkowicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jan Komkowicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chama Dubrowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michał Dubrowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Filip Klica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Antoni Maczkiewicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hrehory i Fiedor Zielenkowicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Piotr Zielenko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Woman; B = burmistrz
TABLE 6.4 (Continued)
LANDHOLDINGS: GROUPED VERSUS SINGULAR HOLDERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF HOLDINGS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theodozy Pohoiewicz [or Pohożewicz et var.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Symon Bychowiec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hrehory Karaś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Piotr Krycki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tymofiy Podosinowik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stefan Kurakowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gabryel Koszko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teodor Minkiewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jan Zaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Piotr Borysowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Karp Michieyko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Każimierz Szyszwymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Karwacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Rylski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Theodor Piskulka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chwiedor Hwozd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alexiey Sapun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prokop Szlubowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spirid Niewzor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Płipowa Chaynukowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wasko Hużno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Amiellan Łakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Symon Mikulicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zacharyaszowa Leoszkiewiczowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jozef Nowicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dziemid Chaładziła</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trachim Chałtana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jwan Kabun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andrey Karpowicz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus three of the women from Table 6.3 hold their land apparently in their own right; at any rate there is no sign that they are widows. Thus Michalowa Zdankowa holds land separately from Michal Zdanko, who was in all probability her husband, although we cannot exclude the possibility of some other relationship. The same argument applies to Nikiperowa Rubisowa, whose probable husband Nikiper has his own lands. Unexpected but significant is the fact that these two women both hold more than twice as many parcels of land as their life-partners. On the other hand there is no Leon Atroszczonek among the other Atroszczonek husbandmen, so that Leonowa Atroszczonekowa is clearly a widow. Similarly with Mikolaowa Komkowiczowa: there is no living Mikolay Komkowicz in this inventory, so that she too must be a widow.

The same applies to Zacharyaszowa Leoszkiewiczowa. We know exactly whose widow she was: in the inventory of 1761 her late husband is registered as holding three houses and a share in a brewery. His occupation was malarz, ‘painter’ in the sense of ‘house-painter’, so that this family is unusual in that none of its income came from agricultural or horticultural activity.

The main purpose of Table 6.4, however, is to show the apparent agglomeration of landholdings in extended families – ‘apparent’, because we cannot be sure that all the landholders sharing the name of Zdanko or Rubis got on so well that they were able to cooperate in the joint exploitation of Newel’s sour earth. One’s interpretation of the facts, which are indubitable, will depend on one’s view of families in history: do they bubble and fester with resentments because of what some patriarch said to a daughter-in-law at a wedding a generation ago? Or are families so intent on promoting their joint interests that they will suppress all resentments? On balance my view is that in early modern societies individual interests are likely to have been subordinated to those of the extended family.

Let us now examine, on the basis of the data in Table 6.4, the nature of these agglomerations. First, foremost, being part of an actively entrepreneurial extended family represents a very considerable advantage. As individual landowners, Filip Klipta and

---

127. His surname takes the form Lewoszkiewicz, which is more probable that the other version.
128. Filip belonged to an old Newel family whose surname elsewhere takes the form ‘Klypa’. It probably
Antoni Maczkiewicz are jointly the second most important, with Michałowa Zdańskowa. But if we take into account the existence of family landholding, Klipa and Maczkiewicz are much less significant. The agglomerated lands of the families Zdanko, Rubis, Atroszczonek, Komkowicz and Dubrowa129 are all more extensive than those of any individual, with the exceptions that one Zdanko holding, Jan’s, is the largest single holding, while that of Michałowa Zdańsko is as large as Klipa’s and Maczkiewicz’s.

Secondly, it is remarkable that of the landholding extended families all save Zielenko and his two sons Hrehory and Fiedor number a woman in their ranks. Remarkable, thirdly, is the fact that no such family numbers two women among its leaders. It seems that there was room for only one matriarch in each Newel ‘clan’. We may tentatively conclude that these were powerful matriarchs accepted as such by their male relatives and exercising their economic power on a par with their male relatives, yet brooking no competition from female rivals.

Fourthly, the fact that a family has only one landholding member does not mean that the family was unimportant. On the contrary, the families Bychowiec, Podosinowik, Minkiewicz and Piskulka, for example, were already well-known in seventeenth-century Newel. Of the three burgomasters of 1764, one is Piotr Zdanko, member of a wealthy Newel extended family, but the other two, Symon Bychowiec and the nobleman P[an] Teodor Minkiewicz,130 while prosperous enough, were not part of a powerful extended family. More will be said on this intricate problem later in the present chapter.

Fifthly, we may note a certain polonization of the leading extended families, but a polonization that is superficial, undermined by a deeper loyalty to their Newel-borderland origins. The wealthiest member of the Zdanko family has the Polish given name Jan, as have the head of the Rubis family and Jan Komkowicz. Polish, too, is Bazyli (Bazyli Komkowicz): had it been Russian, the initial /b/ would have turned up as /v/; nor would

---

129. The name derives from the common Slav term for an oakwood and is epicene. The forename Chama is a Belorussian version of Θολά (F tholá).
130. 2624, p. 35.
there have been the change [s] > [z] (a Latinism quite unknown in Greek). Other Polish names among multiple landholders are: Theodozy, Stefan, Gabryel, Teodor or Theodor, Kaźimierz and Zacharyasz[owa] (this last distinguished from East Slav versions by the retention of the Greek -s nominative ending in a Hungarianized Polish version).

Names such as Mikołaj, Piotr and Paweł are ambiguous, in that they may be East Slav or Polish.\textsuperscript{131} But the name Nikiper, attested twice among the richest families (three times if we count Nikiperowa Rubisowa), is absolutely un-Polish. Firstly, it shows authentic Greek <\textit{N}>,\textsuperscript{132} where Mikołaj has the ambiguous replacement of initial <\textit{N}> with <\textit{M}> under the influence of the name Mikołaj (ambiguous because it is found in both Polish and colloquial west Russian dialectal usage). Secondly, it shows the popular East Slav resistance to the sound /f/, which enters Russian only after the devoicing of final /v/ consequent on the fall of the jers. Since western dialects of East Slav, including Belorussian, pronounced final /v/ as /u/, the devoicing did not occur and /f/ did not enter the phonemic array of the local language. Thirdly, it shows the change of post-tonic /o/ to [o], which the Polish-speaking auditor, for whom [o] was an empty sound, represented as <o>. A similar case is that of Apanas, representing East Slav <Апанас> (Apanas) on the basis of Greek 'Ἀπανάς. Unambiguous East Slav names are given in Table 6.7 below.

\textsuperscript{131} It should be remembered that the grapheme < şi > represents a hard [i], not [\textit{w}], a relatively new pronunciation that is still not used in Lithuanian Polish. A couple of years ago on a bus to Nieświerz I heard local Polish-speakers still pronouncing i in the old way.

\textsuperscript{132} Perhaps under the influence of refugee Orthodox clergy after the fall of Constantinople, although a movement to purge the confusion of initial <\textit{N}> and <\textit{M}> in proper names seems to antedate 1453.
TABLE 6.7: EAST SLAV NAMES AMONG MULTIPLE LANDHOLDERS, 1764

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nikiper</td>
<td>See text above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apanas</td>
<td>See text above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakim</td>
<td>Якім (Jakim) – colloquial East Slav version of high-register Іоаким (Joachim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrehory</td>
<td>Retention of Old Russian pronunciation of /g/ as [ɣ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiedor</td>
<td>From Greek Θεοδώρος (Theodoros) ‘gift of God’. Literary Russian form with /f/; cannot be Polish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tymofiev</td>
<td>Literary Russian form with /f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karp</td>
<td>Greek Καρπός (Karpós) ‘fruit’. Not a Catholic name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chwiedor</td>
<td>From Greek Θεοδώρος (Theodoros) ‘gift of God’, with Greek /θ/ Russianized as &lt;θ&gt; (&lt;f&lt;sup&gt;θb&lt;/sup&gt;&gt;), and with a further change to the Belorussian pronunciation of initial /f/ as [xў]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexicy</td>
<td>Literary Russian form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokop</td>
<td>Colloquial abbreviation from Prokopij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirid</td>
<td>Colloquial abbreviation from Spiridon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilipowa</td>
<td>Local /p/ for /f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osip</td>
<td>Colloquial East Slav version of Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasko</td>
<td>Colloquial, disparaging diminutive of Vasilij.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiellan</td>
<td>Shows akан’е and Belorussian doubling of intervocalic soft consonant + jer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dziemid</td>
<td>Greek Διομήδης (Diomedes) ‘counselled by God’ in a colloquial East Slav version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachim</td>
<td>Shows akан’е and the change [f] &gt; [xў], here simplified to [xў].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrey</td>
<td>Note that /r/ has not spirantized to Polish &lt;rz&gt; (= [ڑ]) and is therefore East Slav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jwan</td>
<td>East Slav version of Іоанн (John).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tables 6.8 and 6.9 we shall that among multiple landholders there is a correlation between having a Polish given name and holding more parcels of land. After the tables an interpretation of this correlation will be given.
TABLE 6.8: LANDHOLDERS WITH POLISH GIVEN NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of parcels</th>
<th>Landholder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jan Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theodozy Pohowewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stefan Kurakowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gabryel Koszko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jan Atroszczonek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Antoni Atroszczonek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teodor Minkiewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jan Zaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jan Rubis młodszy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Każimierz Szyszmymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Karwacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Ryłski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Theodor Piskulka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bazyli Komkowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jozef Nowicki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of holdings per person to two decimal places = 12.36 (12.35714)

TABLE 6.9: LANDHOLDERS WITH EAST SLAV GIVEN NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Holdings</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jakim Zdanko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hrehory Karaś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tymofiy Podosinowik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hrehory i Fiedor Zielenkowicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nikiper Rubis¹³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Karp Michieyko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chwiedor Hwozd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alexiei Sapun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prokop Szbubowski¹³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spirid Niewzor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nikiper Atroszczonek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pliipowa Chaynukowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wasko Huzno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Amielian Łakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Osip Czorny Pop¹³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dziemid Chaładziła</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trachim Chattana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jwan Kabun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andrey Karpowicz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of holdings per person to two decimal places = 7.21

Thus it emerges that multiple landholders with Polish given names own 58.3% more pieces of land than those with East Slav given names. We note that there is no necessary correlation

¹³³ Nikiperowa Rubisowa is not included on the grounds that we do not know her given name.
¹³⁴ Prokop's surname is unambiguously Polish, but the family has been in Newel since at least 1681; on p. 27 of 2615/1 we find Philip [sic] Szubowski in ‘the sidestreet by the Church of the Dormition’ (‘Zaulek przy Cerkwi Vspienia’).
¹³⁵ He belonged to a dynasty of local priests from the East Slav tradition; see below.
between given names and surnames. Among the latter, the vast majority are of the borderlands: Zdanko, Klipa (Kłypa, Kłypa), Maczkiewicz, Pohoiewicz, etc. Only one surname is unambiguously Polish, namely Szlubowski.

Does this correlation between the cultural origin of given names and the scale of landholdings constitute a causal connection? Caution. For example, the Zdanko family has one Polish given name and one clearly East Slav name (Jakim). The Rubis family, at least as catalogued here, has two (‘polonized’) Jans but also a local East Slav Nikiper. The position of the Atroszczonek family is similarly ambiguous: Antoni and Jan are Polish names, Nikiper and Apanas East Slav. I suggest that these well-to-do families were hedging their bets by giving traditional names to some family members and fashionable Polish names to others. They could thus speak as co-religionists to Catholics and Uniate or Orthodox. The process may well have been unconscious. When it comes to landholders who are not part of larger landholding extended families, there is little ambiguity. I suggest that the parents of these individuals were less willing to make a compromise with Polish cultural ascendancy (that there was such an ascendancy in Newel will become clearer hereafter). Some will call this loyalty, others stubbornness. But the correlation cannot be denied, and the evidence favours the idea that a Polish forename brought (or even bought) a degree of prosperity.

8

Because of the increasing quantity of evidence, much more mention has been made here than in any previous chapter of the part played by women in the life of Newel. A little more can be said of Newel women, who probably constituted more than half of the population: very few bachelors are mentioned, and no widowers. The lives of men were subject to more risks, some of them fatal. Thus men did all the fighting. They dealt with dangerous pieces of equipment more often than women. It will have been mainly men who rode on horseback. They also drank more, unless Newel was different from every other alcohol-drinking society of which we know. Combine a high horse or a sharp scythe with a flask of gorzalka and there will be fatal accidents, since a lack of health and safety legislation left men happily free to die in many ways closed to their modern congeners.
We know the real names of hardly any Newel women. There are hardly any cases where we know both forename and surname. One of these was Ahapka Kotlarzowna (‘Little Charity’ the Female Distiller’, or possibly ‘distiller’s wife, widow’) who in 1712 was ‘w Opiece P. Pan [sic] Bohdanowicz[a]’, i.e. she is under the protection of a nobleman, who is probably defending his investment in her liquor manufactory.

Another example is Agata Ulska. Her existence is recorded with dismissive terseness in the inventory for 1731. She lived ‘Około Rzeki Iemiona’ (‘near the River Iemion’ or ‘...the River Iemiano’). Her neighbours included one of the Koziol or Kazioł family, Abram, a brewer; Hryszko Otroczonek (i.e. Otroszczonek), another brewer; and Jan Rubis Kowal. So Agata lived in the area where brewing and metalworking were practised at the time. It is therefore probable that she too was a brewer, since making beer was almost the only work done by independent women in Newel. Nearby lived another unmarried woman, probably a widow, Fiedorowa Jlusszowa, and she too was probably a brewer. Agata’s Christian name is blatantly Polish: since the Greek original is Αγαθώς (‘Agathós’), we would expect to find Russian <φ> or Belorussian <η> in local versions of the name (see Ahapka Kotlarzowna above). Her surname refers to beehives. The mystery is how she managed to live and work without husband or widow’s weeds. She is not mentioned again. She may have been an incomes who returned to her own folk; she may have swept some lucky Newel man off his feet and disappeared from the record, hidden behind her surname. Whoever she was, she is unique in the annals of pre-Partition Newel.

136. Ahapka represents Azanka (Agapka, where <ε> is spirant ([y])), an East Slav name based on the Greek noun ἀγάπη (agapē), the word translated into Latin as caritas and meaning, in the New Testament, God’s love and the love between Christians. Given that in Newel both Greek <θ> and <η> may give /θ/, there may be contamination from the name Αγαθή (Agathē) (see Agata Ulska below). Nonetheless, those who see female purveyors of alcohol as necessarily Dickensian-rotund may recall the Russian noun oxapka ‘armful’ and the Belorussian verb axapic’ (axanyuš) ‘to embrace’.

137. 2620, p. 15.
138. Ibd., 14, which gives those three words as the general heading for this part of the town.
139. This lady outlived her husband by at least nineteen years, since she is recorded in 1692/2 of 1712 as widowed, probably but recently (p. 30); ‘Chwiedorowa Juszkova wdowa DoCzasu’ (Chwiedor Juszkows widow temporarily). Her (husband’s) first name shows /sy/ for /u/, but the surname does not have the expected doubling of intervocalic /l/ (that situation is reversed in 1731).
140. Russian ulej; the local word was evidently pen, which is used passim in the inventories. A man of the same surname, probably a forebear, is recorded in 1681: on p. 28 of 2615/1 there is mention of one Andrzej Vliski.
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Not far from Agata Ulska in 1731 a woman had a share in a kitchen-garden: the inventory names ‘Kazimierz Sakiewicz zapolonią Sufronowiczowną’, i.e. ‘Kazimierz Sakiewicz with Apolonia Sufronowiczowna’. Andrzej Safronowicz is the castle farrier; given the handwriting of the inventories, the apparent difference between the two surnames is illusory. It is clear that these three were much under Polish influence: all three given names are Polish (two of Greek origin). At the same time the surnames are of the borderlands, with their typical patronymic shape. This may have been a time when Catholic East Slavs were pushing into the the dangerous borderland, where more profit could be made.

Of another woman we know her given name and her husband’s calling. This is Maryna Popadzia. Popad’ja is the Russian for a priest’s wife. Popular wisdom makes her the apple of her husband’s eye in the saying berec’ kak pop popad’ju (‘to protect as the priest his wife’). This pious woman disappears as soon as she has arrived: the entry is qualified ‘domy puste’, ‘houses empty’ (‘domy’, if that is the correct reading, appears to mean ‘household’; there is a similar entry on the previous page). Two doors up from her lives ‘Mikotaiowa Popadzia’, and the two are probably one. It may follow that she was the widow of an Orthodox priest named Mikolay; or that her husband had been the incumbent at St. Mikolay’s church in Vlica Iahorowska (George Street). In 1749 Maryna was still remembered, and her old housing plot had found a new use: there is ‘¾ pręć’ (three-quarters of a square rod) ‘Pomarynie Popadzi, pod Szpitalem usplenskim [sic]’ (‘after Maryna the Priest’s wife, under the dormition Hospital’).

Meanwhile out in the countryside seven people have clubbed together to run the arenda for the quarrying village of Rudnia, in the Komsza woytowstwo. One of them is Pronia Puziecyczyna. Pronia’s given name is East Slav. This, too, derives from Greek: ἀφρον means ‘insentient; crazed; foolish’ (see Liddell and Scott s.v.). Her surname

141. 2620, p. 19.
142. 2620, p. 9.
143. Ibid.
144. 2622, p. 21.
145. Ibid., 59. This family were evidently not long-lived: on p. 7 of the same inventory we find a town house where ‘Eliaszowa Puziecyczyna’ lives out her widowhood. It is very likely that she too was a brewer.
146. The East Slav form is aphetic, i.e. the first syllable has been dropped (cf. such English forms as mend from amend). It will be noticed that East Slav Orthodox names often derive from unsuitable Greek originals, based
‘little belly’, from puzejko ‘idem’ seems at first glance very suitable for a pub landlady. When we look closer we see that the belly is not hers; the suffix -ixa/-yxa is used to form feminine versions of masculine nicknames. This pot belly is her late husband’s.

Yet Pronia is no pushover, even if she cannot call her shape her own. Her name appears at the head of the arendarzy listed, and so she is evidently the prime mover in the enterprise. Her idea it was to relaunch the quarry: ‘Rudnia Spustoszata reparacyj Potrzebująca’ (‘The Quarry Had been vacant needing Repair’). And she can control her fellow-businesspeople: Karp and Jokusz Sorokwasza; Hryszko, Alexander and Michayło Klepacki, and Macwiewy Młynarz. The contract included both ‘Karczma Szynkowa’ and ‘Mlyn Skarbowy’, as well as the right to the quarry, if it could be restored. For all this they paid B50 per annum, a very solid sum (the same inventory reckons eight złote to the taler bity (ibid., 48)).

When it comes to widows, the majority of women named in the inventories, there are many of them, and it appears that their number grows as a proportion during the century. Usually no detail is noted about them. In the 1712 inventory, however, we have a little supplementary information:

Pawłowa Braznikowa Wdowa: her surname tells us that (like Ahapka Kotlarzowna above) she is in the alcohol business; she makes a weaker drink, braga (Russian Əpaza), small beer.

Prudnikowa wdowa: she holds her house ‘temporarily, but it belongs to Wolk Mieszczhenik’. Another example of male protection of widows.

---

either on insults, as in the present case, or on pagan originals such as Zmitrok, ultimately from the name of the Greek goddess of agriculture Dēmētēr (Δήμητηρ, dialectal form of Gēmētēr, Γημήτηρ, ‘Mother Earth’). The explanation is that early converts to Christianity kept their pagan names, which were thereby ‘baptized’. Their bearers became saints and martyrs, and the Slavs took them out of piety and in complete ignorance of the original meanings.

147. ‘The Miller’; even at this late date he has no other surname.
148. 2619/2, p. 25.
149. Ibid., 31.
Dziemidzicha wóda: her house plot stretches 'az do drugiej ulicy' ('right to the other [or 'second'] street'); this argues prosperity.

The last inventory of all (1767) has the largest number of female householders, at least thirty, of whom at least ten are identified as widows. A certain prevalence of widows among brewers may indicate that they were better able than their late husbands to limit their sampling of the product.

How should we interpret the fact that, apart from work in the fields and vegetable gardens, brewing is the only occupation we know of as having been practised by Newel women outside their homes? The explanation is probably the most obvious. Women were used to the careful work required for cooking and therefore had little difficulty in learning how to make beer. They were accustomed also to providing food and drink for their families, to acting as hostesses on high days and holidays. Making beer and kvass came to them without too much difficulty.

At all events we can add brewing to the brief list of women's occupations given by Grickevič: 'V belorusskix častnovladel'českix gorodax ženščiny zanimalis' remeslom (v tkačestve, švejnom dele i xlebopečenii)',151 'In Belorussian private towns women went in for artisan work (in weaving, sewing and bread-baking').

150. Ibid.
151. Grickevič, Častnovladel'českije goroda Belorussii, 114.
We turn now to the question of Christianity in pre-partition eighteenth-century Newel.

In Chapter Five we saw that the first Bishop of Smolensk was less than perfectly sure whether Newel existed separately from Siebież. There is, as we shall see, a certain similarity in eighteenth-century Catholic attitudes.

The mid-century Bishop of Smolensk was Jerzy Mikołaj Hylzen, alias Georgius Nicolaus Hylzen, Hülsen, ab Hülsen, von Hülsen, etc. He was a more active bishop than some; for instance, he encompassed the building of a Latin-rite church in Newel (see below). He was consecrated to the bishopric of Smolensk on 10 May 1745 (NS). In 1747 the bishop sent his first relatio (diocesan report) to Rome.

The castle chapel had then been a Latin-rite Catholic place of worship for at least a century. In Hylzen’s belief it was the only such church in the town, until he made a démarche to Prince Radziwiłł, who began the process of restoring church lands to fund the parish. ‘...[N]am hactenus sacellum tantummodo in arce Nevelensi Romani ritus catholici habebant’ [‘...[F]or hitherto catholics of the Latin rite had but a poor sanctuary in the citadel of Newel’].

In this the bishop was mistaken. There had been another place of Latin-rite worship since at the latest 1731, when its presence is noted in an inventory. Thus the bishop, like his predecessor, had only an approximate knowledge of Newel, but he did his best to promote church interests there. Let us concentrate briefly on this forgotten place of worship, whose existence is here offered to scholarship, as far as I know, for the first time. The story is not without a certain import.

The crucial entry in the 1731 inventory runs as follows:

153. Ibid., 336.
př 10 pod Kosciolkiem S° Michała
př 11 pod Cerkwią S° Piotra z Mogilkami

10 rods occupied by the Small Church of St Michael
11 rods occupied by the [Slavonic-liturgy] Church of St Peter with Graves

That St Michael’s belonged to the Latin rite is clear: in Polish the term cerkiew is reserved for Orthodox churches, and also, in the usage of the inventories, for Uniate churches. It was small, since Kosciolkiem (nominative Kosciołek) is a diminutive. The site occupied ten square pręty (approximately 18.66 m²), a little less than the projected Latin-rite Catholic presbytery, mentioned in the same inventory: ‘11½ pręty wolne: Place prozne Jm, Xdza Plebana’ (‘11½ rods free [of czynsz]: vacant Sites His Grace the Catholic Priest’s Presbytery’).

Nor was St Michael’s short-lived. It is mentioned again in a much later inventory, which lists it with other properties under ‘Drugą Stroną Ulicy Bozodomskiej’.

The location of the two churches beside each other and a cemetery implies that St Peter was a Uniate church. The graveyard must have served both Catholic sub-communities. That, of course, would explain the anomaly of cerkiew and kosciół being neighbour-institutions. The main use of the chapel, then, would have been funerary, and it appears most probable that Newel Catholics of either rite were buried in the same graveyard, though their requiem masses were said in different languages and according to different liturgies.

We should note here that the ban (formal or informal) on cemeteries within the town pale was relaxed in the early eighteenth century. In 1712 the ‘Cerkiew Ste° Mikołaja’ is

---

154, 2620, 21. ‘Mogilkami’ is polonized; otherwise we would find <dz>, representing spirant [γ]. Graves are always mentioned thus, in a diminutive form, no doubt to make them less intimidating.
155, 2620, 7.
156, Bozodomska, from Boże domki, is another way of referring to graves.
157, 2631/1, 21. This inventory is undated in the AGAD catalogue, but at the end of the title page we find that it was ‘preze mnie niży wyrażonego ad normam Inwentarza w 1767 Męż Fe= / bruaný 12 D. sporządzony y podpisany’ (‘by me the undersigned on the model of an Inventory in 1767 of the M[onth] of February [on the] 12 D[ay] ordered and signed’). If the inspector did indeed sign the inventory, I have been unable to find the signature, but the dating is unaffected. This is the last inventory.
mentioned without a cemetery, but by 1731 we read of ‘Cerkiew St Mikołaja z zwonnicą y Cmena’ (‘Church of St Mikołaj with belfry and cem[tery]’) (2620, 6) (note the local version of the word for ‘belfry’, without <d>). It is still there in 1749. In the same inventory we read of ‘Cerkow murowana z Wiastowania [sic] Nasywhtszey Panny z Cmentarz’ (‘masonry Church of the Annunciation to the Most Holy Virgin with Cemetery’).

b) The Catholic chapel in Newel Castle.

The only surviving church building within the pale of Newel castle served as the main centre of Catholic worship in the town for at least a century, from 1645 at the latest until about 1747. A couple of liturgical objects of Orthodox type had been handed over to the Uniates: ‘Kielich y kryż cobył, X[iądz] Prezbiter do Cerkwi Wniatkiey [sic] w zezywaniu trzyma’ (‘The Chalice and cross that was, the Priest Presbyter to the Uniate Church on loan’). The cross will have offended Latin-rite Catholics by its three cross-members, one of which represents the inscription added to the cross at Pilate’s behest. This information offers a partial response to Barbara Skinner. ‘Questions remain, however,’ she writes, ‘on how parish churches obtained not only their images and decorations, but also the vestments, liturgical books, and other articles needed for their basic functioning.’ Evidently the Uniate clergy in Newel used items of cult lent by the Catholic authorities who had evidently confiscated them from the Orthodox whose church the castle chapel had originally been.

---

158. 2619/1, 22.
159. 2622, 23.
160. Note the Orthodox form, from Russian cerkov’. Significantly, there is no akan’je in this form, cf. Belorussian церквішка ‘little church’. This appears to be a sign of cross-border influence.
161. Ibid.
162. 2625, 110 (dated ‘1763 in Martio’).
163. Zezywaniu (locative case) is a deverbalative noun, apparently unattested otherwise, from an imperfective verb zezywać (scarcely attested). The corresponding perfective verb zezwać means ‘to call together’. The phrase may therefore mean ‘until called for’. It may be worth thinking of the Greek word for a church, which means ‘a calling forth’ (συγκλήσεως). If zezywaniu is (rather roughly) calqued on this word, then the phrase would mean ‘held in the [Uniate] church’.
164. Matthew XXVII:37; Mark XV:26; John XIX:20 (the only source mentioning the languages of the inscription, said to have been in Hebrew, Greek and Latin). Before the schism became permanent, Christian iconography was remarkably similar on both sides of the dividing line between the Eastern and Western Roman Empires. A glance at the work of Simone Martini or Cimabue makes the point. Pisa Cathedral was designed by a Greek.
165. Barbara Skinner, The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th-century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus and Russia, De Kalb, IL, 2009, 58.
What replaced the older church equipment conformed to purely western Christian types. There is ‘Obraz P. JEZUSA Vkrzyzowanego w ramach’ (‘Picture of L[ord] JESUS Crucified in a frame’) and an altar cloth (‘Obrus nowy Olenderski Cienki z korąką y rębkiem po brzegu Si / nim w Skrynie ołtarzowey’, ‘A cloth, new, Holland, Fine with lace and scalloping along the Violet-blue [?] edge [stored] in the altar Box."

Ornat materya Srodkim biala bokami Pomeranczowa z Galo / nem wazkim Srebrem zewszystkiem iak należy do odpra / wywania Mzy Świętey Rekwizytami’ (‘Vestments the material in the Middle white at the sides Orange with narrow Silver piping with all the Requisites as is appropriate to the celebration of the Holy Mass’). This equipment included ‘Mizał z pozłotem niewielki w oprawie Czarnej z Futerałem’ (‘Missal with gilding small in a Black binding with Slipcase’). The colour-sensibilities displayed here are of the Baroque, even the rococo, and thereby of west European culture.

We should note that by this time (1763), the chapel can have been active only at the greatest and most triumphant festivals of the church’s year, such as Easter and Christmas. It had only a white chasuble and a small missal. The other liturgical colours are absent: red for martyrs’ feasts, black (requiem), Lent or Advent (purple), Laetari or Gaudete Sundays (pink), or the average dull day (green). Those masses would also have required a much larger missal, since the proper of the mass is different on each occasion.

c) Elevation of the status of Newel; loss of income.

Bishop Hylzen was, like Pan Kunicki a century before, an active and enterprising person. He reformed the administration of his diocese. Since the loss of Smoleńsk the diocese comprised only three parishes: Nevel’ and Siebież, and Wieliz, evidently founded later than the mid-seventeenth century, and itself the subject of a dispute with the Bishop of Poznań. Bishop Hylzen shrewdly made Newel the centre of diocesan administration:

Alter parochia est in bonis principum de Radziwill in oppido et dominio Nevelensi. Regitur a sacerdote sæculari, qui simul et Officialis in dioecesi

---

166. The same word means also ‘shrine’, but surely not here.
168. The identity of this adjective with Possevino’s usage in the 1580s argues that Newel was spoken of and probably written of in Latin continually from that time until Hylzen’s.
mea est designatus, cumque altero sacerdote vicario suo, qui et Notarialis est consistorialis, ibi iugiter residet.

The second\footnote{169} parish is among the possessions of the Princes of Radziwill in the town and lordship of Newel. It is run by a secular priest, who at the same time has also been designated the *Officjal* in my diocese and resides there jointly with a second priest, his deputy, who is also the Notary to the consistory.

The *Officialis* was the bishop’s principal deputy within his diocese, and the notary was in effect the clerk of the diocese.\footnote{170} He presided in the diocesan consistory court (for which, alas, we have no records).

Given this elevation in status, it was unfortunate that in the mid-eighteenth century the Latin-rite parish of Newel had only the castle chapel as a place of worship (as well as St Michael’s chapel for their obsequies; but this had escaped official notice). This was all the more regrettable in that Newel’s Orthodox worshipped in a superior edifice: ‘Schismaticorum ecclesia in oppido Nevelensi est murata’\footnote{171} (‘The schismatics’ church within the town of Newel is of masonry’).

Moreover by the mid-1740s the income of Newel parish had fallen drastically:

Redtitus\footnote{172} et fundi eiusdem parochiae stante hostilitate et per diversas temporum fatorum\footnote{173} injurias tantum erant diminuti ut vix uni presbytero in

\footnote{169. This sense of *alter* is very old, e.g. it is found in Cicero.  
172. This is apparently a fourth-declension noun, for elsewhere in this text (p. 339) we find *redtitibus*. It seems to have the same meaning as *reditus* (first declension) ‘income, revenue’. Most probably we should understand a plural: *Redditus et fundi* ‘revenues and farms’, perhaps a hendiadys, ‘revenues from farms’. *Fundi* might be a loose modern usage, ‘funds’.  
173. Długosz reads: ‘*per diversas temporum factorunque injurias*’ (‘through the various depredations of the times and of actions’) (Długosz, *Dzieje Diecezji Smoleńskiej*, 73), emending *fatorum* and adding *-que*. Hylzen’s asyndeton (*per diversas temporum factorum injurias*) is rather elegant, the *-que* redundant. The emendation from *fatorum* to *factorum* makes the Bishop’s text more theologically acceptable.
The income from the farms of the same parish during wartime and through the various deprivations of the times and the fates had been diminished until they scarcely sufficed for one priest in his feeding [sic], but the present patron of that church, Prince Radivilius, has begun to procure not only the recovery of the lost farms but also the erection of a church from wood (for hitherto catholics of the Roman [sic] rite had but a poor sanctuary in the citadel of Newel).

d) The new parish church and other amenities.

By October 1749, the date of the inventory compiled next after the Bishop’s report of 1747, the new church was already in place: ‘Kosciol założenia Sº Jerzego Farny z Plebanu nowo Ery / gowane Kosztęm JamkiGh,176 in triangulo ufondowane’177 (‘A church dedicated to St George Parochial with a Presbytery has been erected at the Cost of their Graces, it has been founded in the triangle [Latin in original].178’)

In 1749, as well as the presbytery there was another new institution by the church:

---

174. The Latin form is more influenced by Lithuanian (Radvilas) than by Polish (Radziwil). Yet earlier in the same paragraph we find principium de Radziwil. The prince in question was Michael Casimirus (to adhere to Latin forms) (1702-1782).
176. The last two letters terminate in curlicues, which form an oval ring around the whole word, after the manner of an Egyptian cartouche. As for the ‘word’ itself, I suggest that in the mind of the inventor it contained the following elements: 1. J + m = ICH moiści. 2. The genitive plural of an adjective ending in -kich or -skich. The meaning would be ‘Their high graces’, or words to that effect. The inventorists’ servility, which cannot be doubted, is at times expressed but perfunctorily.
177. 2622, p. 21.
178. The ‘triangle’ may be compared to another geometrical reference in the same inventory: ‘Cerkiew Sº Mikolaia, z dzwonica z Cmentarzem w Samym Angule’ (‘Orthodox Church of St. Mikolay, with belfry and with Cemetery in the Very Angle’) (note this third cemetery within the town). I suspect that there was a triangular open space where one of the main streets issued from the marketplace, the lion’s share of which was now taken up by the Catholic church.

Hospital of the Parish Church, Newly Erected at the Erection of His [Highness?] the Prince His Grace the Sub-Cupbearer of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Lord and Kindly benefactor[,] Site after Hrehory Czerewko. Under the same Hospital, after Symon Zdanko in replacement of the Uspienski hospital.

This is to be understood as follows: Prince Radziwiłł has invested not only in a church and presbytery but also in a hospital, which replaces the previous Orthodox hospital (‘Szpital za Moskwą zbudowany’,183 ‘Hospital under Moscow built’) attached to the Uspienie Church (Church of the Dormition). That hospital is recorded in the inventories of 1712:184 ‘nad SAMÝM ROWEM Szpital Cerkwie Vspienskiey’, i.e. ‘RIGHT over THE MOAT the Dormition Church Hospital’ and of 1731, where it is said to be located in ‘Castle Street from the market’ (‘Ulica Zamkowa zrynku’) and the czynsz is paid by ‘Hrehory niemiece’ (‘Gregory the german’). The older hospital had occupied two house-plots. Of these one was loaned or donated by Hrehory Czerewko, the other by Symon Zdanko.

The importance attached to the institution of this parish church is emphasized by the fact that in or shortly before 1761 an organist came to live in Newel: the tenant of a certain house is noted as ‘Pokryckim Organista Teraz’185 (‘after Krycki[,] the Organist Now’). Although

179. The surname occurs in other inventories in the less unexpected form Czerepkow, e.g. at 2624, 18.
180. On a priest named Zdanko mentioned in 1731 see below ; this may have been Symon Zdanko.
181. The form ‘Ujięienskiego’ is what we would expect, yet the same page gives the street address as ‘Ujięienskiego’. This form, found frequently in the eighteenth century inventories, is East Slav; compare Russian zemlja with Polish ziemia. Less expected are ‘Uspienia’ (genitive) and ‘pod Szpitalem uj pien skim’ (both 2620, 9) Odder still is the version ‘Uj plaienskim’ (instrumental) on p. 20 of 2622, i.e. the inventory that announces the new Catholic church. This form has suffered contamination from the place name Vsoway or rather from the personal name Vswayski: ‘Nikifora Uswayskiego’ (genitive) is found on the same page. All this variation implies a greater distance between local people and the inventorist, for whom Orthodox church names had become alien.
182. 2622, 20.
183. 2615/1 (of 1681), 22.
184. 2619/2, 35.
185. 2624, 18.
this is not in itself proof of the existence of an organ, it seems improbable that the church would go to the trouble of hiring an organist unless there was such an instrument. The organist was still resident in 1764, for in that year’s inventory there is a reference to ‘Chata Organisty farskiego’ (‘the House of the parish Organist’). The area of the plot is known – 1 prę 1 pręćik, i.e. 20.53 square metres, which is very small. The name of the previous tenant is significant, as we shall see in a moment.

So Bishop Hylzen and the Catholic church did put serious effort into establishing a Catholic ascendancy in Newel: a new church, an organist, a new hospital. In 1764 it is even noted that the parish priest had the use of a country place, ‘JPP Łaskich pod dys / Pozyćią JX Proboszcze / Newelskiego’ (‘of their lordships the Łasce at the dis Position of His Reverence the Parish Priest of Newel’). Yet we should note that the church is of wood, the hospital also, and the other denominations and confessions manage to maintain many more church buildings. There is the masonry Orthodox church, ‘in pagis vero non infrequentes habent ligneas, non desunt tamen et ecclesiae greco-unitorum intermixtē’ (‘while in the countryside they [the Orthodox] often have wooden ones, nor is there a lack of churches of the Greek-Uniates intermixed’).

Within the parish there was a daughter church at Sokol’niki, which was administered by the Jesuits. The church was on the border with Russia, and in 1765 there was a customs post there, possibly under their supervision. The Society, however, wished to abandon their church, since it ‘has a slender endowment’ (‘ma szczupłe uposażenie’), but the bishop had kept them in place. This was probably done in pursuit of Hylzen’s plan to promote a second (major) church for the convenience of parishioners.

186. 2926/1, 33.
187. 2626/1, 133.
188. Relationes, ed. Rabikauskas, 337.
189. See: Belorussija v epoxu feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 348.
190. Długosz, Dzieje Diecezji Smoleńskiej, 73.
191. The Jesuits were in the Newel area by 1731, when they had a half-share in the fishery of Lake Nicklaczcz: see 2620, p. 118. There is also mention, as early as 1722, of a Franciscan monastery in the same village. The latter survived as a monastic church until 1832, when it was secularized. Finally it was handed over to the Orthodox church in 1865, no doubt as a reprisal after 1863. For details see Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich. Wydany pod redakcją Bronisława Chlebowskiego <...> i Władysława Walewskiego <...> Według planu Filipa Sulimierskiego. W., 1886, s.v. NewelF.
e) Size of Newel parish; quality of the populace

Bishop Hylzen speaks almost delphically of the number of Newel’s parishioners: ‘Numerus parochianorum in ea parochia septingenta non excedit, qui plerumque omnes sunt poloni nobiles’¹⁹³ (‘The number of parishioners in this parish does not exceed seven hundred, who are for the most part Polish nobles.’¹⁹⁴) The number cannot be taken at face value. If we envisage noble households with seven Catholic members, which is probably excessive, that requires the presence of a hundred such families. In point of fact there are very few Polish noble households in Newel town. There is a handful of town officials, some of whom are sometimes given the title Pan. One or two noblemen are mentioned in the castle, usually not by name but by title (e.g Ekonomowie, of whom there are two). Perhaps the largest number of nobles is specified as holding houses in the town in 1731: there are twelve individuals, of whom one is a woman (Pani Kuninska) and three members of the Komkowicz extended family. Even with these bourgeois gentlemen (for most of them are active in the town’s commercial life), we cannot be sure that they are Latin-rite Catholics; despite confessionalization, some of them may well have been Uniates or even Orthodox.

The position in the countryside is similar. The largest number of rural nobles is registered in an inventory of 1761,¹⁹⁵ and only because a number of Cossack officers are specified as being nobles. There are eight of them, even if we include a widow and an officer known only as ‘Pana Porucznika’ (genitive case), who may be one of the others registered a second time. There is nothing in their surnames that would rule out their being Catholics of the Latin rite, but also nothing that guarantees it. Otherwise we find only the occasional nobleman specified as a landholder.

If we imagine that the pictures given here for town and country are typical (bearing in mind that they are a generation apart), we come to the conclusion that we have perhaps thirty noble families in town and country. It is impossible that these, their spouses, their children and their house servants, could reach a total of seven hundred. A figure of seventy is far likelier.

¹⁹⁴. Ultimately it is impossible to tell whether this version is intended or ‘noble Poles’.
¹⁹⁵. 2632, on the dating of which see above.
We must therefore offer hypotheses. It may be that the report was dictated – we have seen evidence to that effect already. To mishear septuaginta as septingenta is perfectly probable, particularly if master and secretary both wish unconsciously that it were so. Or perhaps the report was copied from notes, using modern, ‘Arabic’ numerals, and a zero added in error. It should be noted that often in the eighteenth-century inventories the numeral <8> is written on it side, thus: <8>. If this convention was used in the preparation of the report, <78> could easily be mistaken for <700>. An ingenious explanation, but it makes the original oddly precise: ‘Numerus parochianorum in ea parochia septuaginta octo non excedit’, i.e ‘...does not exceed seventy-eight’. My own credulity is strained. Lastly, we may note that the likelier figure of seventy Latin-rite Catholics does not, indeed, exceed seven hundred. But bishops surely do not prevaricate, any more than (according to Trollope) they whistle. At all events, a figure of close to seven hundred must be regarded with extreme suspicion. Seventy will be much closer to reality.

His Grace had a low opinion of the generality of the Newel populace: ‘Plebs omnis fere est aut schismatica aut ritus græci unita, talique ut et alibi rudimentorum christianae fidei laborat ignorantia’196 (‘The common people are almost all either schismatic [= Orthodox] or uniate of the Greek rite, and labour under the same ignorance of the rudiments of the christian faith as elsewhere’).

In this opinion, as also in the importance attached by Hylzen to the confraternity of Christian doctrine, we may see a long-term result of counter-reformation thinking. The challenge to Catholicism presented by Luther and Calvin may be characterized as intellectual,197 for example in the reversion to Augustinian arguments held to support or not support doctrines of predestination, or in the reaction against the complacent acceptance of the Thomist synthesis. A mighty surge of Catholic intellectual effort followed (Newton, who lived in a period of religious ferment in England, might have seen it as an example of equal and opposite action and reaction), bearing fruit in diverse phenomena: the Council of Trent,

197. This is not to deny the emotional affect that was also found in early Protestantism(s), from John of Leyden to Oliver Cromwell.
the encoding of Catholic dogmata in detailed catechisms,¹⁹⁸ and the foundation of the Society of Jesus.

The problem for Catholicism, especially for the Latin rite, was that Protestantism had never been an important force in Newel, indeed it had probably never been any force at all, even though both Janusz and Bogusław Radziwiłł were committed Protestants, who used their resources to support their religion. Thus Hylzen was deploying an intellectual apparatus of no relevance to the task of proselytism.¹⁹⁹ Protestantism, one might say, finds its raison d'être in Catholicism. In the Newel of the Commonwealth period Latin-rite Catholicism had too little influence to provoke demand for reformation. Further, post-Tridentine intellectualism could hardly have been less relevant to Newel or to its rural hinterland. For example, to an Orthodox Christian the question ‘Are we saved by faith or by works?’ is scarcely comprehensible, the opposition would be seen as false, and the transcendence of God affirmed. It is possible that a few privileged bourgeois Nevelers went away to a Jesuit college, at Połock or Wilno, but there is not one concrete sign of any such phenomenon. The few direct representatives of the Radziwiłłs in Newel very probably had been educated in such institutions,²⁰⁰ but there are very few signs that they mixed with the populace. Yet Bishop Hylzen’s attitude is almost one of puzzlement: why are the people too dim to understand Catholicism?

Then again, Christianity in essence makes no intellectual demands at all of its adherents:²⁰¹ no slight is intended, for Christ’s appeal is to those who labour, those who are

¹⁹⁸ Antonio Possevino, old friend of Nevel’, was a noted catechist. Another was the Englishman Thomas Stapleton, whose Promptuarium was enjoined by Smołenisk synodal statutes in or before 1645 (Relationes, ed. Rabiauskas, 323).
¹⁹⁹ There is a curious parallel with the intellectualizing of the Bolsheviks in Nevel in the early years of the revolution, which was of little relevance to their target groups. Apart from the fact that they published M. M. Bakhtin’s first essay, one might point to the use by one of them of the pseudonym ‘Solness’ (Ibsen’s Master Builder) and to the orchestral concerts given under their auspices in the Nevel countryside. In the long term such initiatives, clearly, bore fruit.
²⁰⁰ The inventorists, whose connections with Newel were probably but external, are quite a good advertisement for education in arithmetic and accountancy, but a terrible advertisement for literacy, orthography and penmanship.
²⁰¹ It is worth knowing that the contemporary Lord of Newel, Hieronim Floryan Radziwiłł, was not an intellectual Catholic. For example, ‘wierzy w skuteczność egzorcyzmów i w cudowne ozdrowienie wskutek przykładania relikwii’ (‘he believes in the usefulness of exorcisms and in miraculous recovery from illness through the application of reliquaries’) (see Hieronims Floriana Radziwiłł Diariusze i pisma różne, ed. Maria Brzezina, W., 1998 [hereafter Hieronims Floriana Radziwiłł Diariusze, ed. Brzezina], 16). The latter custom is said by Mickiewicz to have saved his life in childhood (see Pan Tadeusz, I, II. 8-12).
willing to be born again, to those who accept that one coat is enough. He appeals to the meek, the peacemakers, and the wretched of the earth. Orthodoxy (itself well able to make compromises with political power, to put the matter gently) had not lost sight of Christianity’s essential client groups.

In the context of this contrast we shall hardly be surprised to discover that during the eighteenth century the Latin-rite church had become intimately involved in the economics of Newel. In 1717 the parish priest of Newel, who was also a minor canon of Smoleńsk, was involved in a lawsuit to recover his own from His Grace Pan Stefan Bobiatyński. The latter had assembled on 15 January of that year a considerable gang of bandits, armed with long-barrelled guns and other weapons, and attacked a wagon-train managed for Canon Dawgin by His Grace Jan Kisiel. Noteworthy from a theological point of view is the manifest of the wagon-train: four cartloads of vodka, comprising two tuns of aniseed vodka and two of unflavoured vodka. Each barrel contained eighty garny. They also carried six pooods of twist (a kind of tobacco).\textsuperscript{202}

Another kind of clerical-commercial activity consisted in a new variant of the A\textit{renda} system. The Newel A\textit{renda} dated back well into the seventeenth century,\textsuperscript{203} at least as far as 1681. In the mid-eighteenth century a new layer of what we might call ‘financial tenancy’ was introduced. The A\textit{rendy} continued (there were many in the Newel hinterland as well as the main town A\textit{renda}), but the Radziwiłłs no longer needed to deal directly with the gathering of the income from them or from the rest of Newel and the Newelszczyzna. It seems that a single tenant (or a single juridical person) becomes entitled to a significant part of the income (perhaps ten per cent) on condition that he or they pass on a substantial part of the income to the Radziwiłłs.

This system is first noted in the inventories of 1754. From the title page we learn that Prince Hieronym Floryan Radziwiłł is passing Newel and its hinterland to ‘Jasnie

\textsuperscript{202} See Belorussija v epoxu feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 343-344.
\textsuperscript{203} 2615/1, 49 (see previous chapter of the present thesis).
Wielmożne / mu Jmci Xiędzu Ludwikowi Riankou / rowi Biskupowi Pтоломядь" ("to His Serene Highness / His Grace the Reverend Ludwik Riankour / Bishop of Pтоломаяdь").

The bishop’s surname occurs in many variants, both in the inventories and in other documents: Riaucourt, Ryjokur, Riokur. He was a suffragan bishop, given that Pтоломяда is Akka or Akko in Palestine, modern Israel. To judge by a note in another inventory of the same year, the tenancy brought the bishop a sum slightly in excess of £10088. After a few minor deductions the pure profit was fractionally over £10049. At this time the exchange rate used in the inventories between the Złoty and the Thaler is 6:1, so that the bishop made more than 60000 Złote. Some part of this sum may have been used for the promotion of the Catholic faith, though there is no evidence on the point.

In modern parlance we might say that Ludwik Riaucour had commercial acumen in his genes, for his father was a French merchant, probably named Jacob. Ludwik’s mother Franciszka took over all her husband’s business operations on the latter’s death, taking care inter alia of the Warsaw business affairs of the Radziwiłłs. Ludwik began a Jesuit novitiate but did not remain in the order. He studied at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków and later in Rome, where he worked as a protonotary in the papal Curia. Given the family connection with the Radziwiłłs, he facilitated the latters’ affairs in Rome and passed information back to them. In 1729 he became Proboścz of Biała, a Radziwiłł possession. At the same time he was promoted as candidate for the archdeaconate of Poznań, the first of a number of intrigues in which he was involved. In 1733 he acted as a secret envoy to Stanisław Leszczyński. He also cooperated with Hieronym Florian, Standard Bearer of Lithuania, and also Lord of Newel (and many another place), in matters both political and financial.

Hieronym Florian Radziwiłł’s confidence in Riaucour is reflected in his diaries. The prince mentions the bishop on nine occasions. In March 1747, for example, Riaucour at the

---

204. 2623/1, 1.
206. There is an outline of her business career in the article on her other son, Piotr Riaucour, ibid., 268-269.
prince’s request, delivered the body of his (the prince’s) mother’s body to Mir for burial there. In his diary the prince refers to Riaucour on seven more occasions, referring to him as ‘człek doskonałych i przykładnych duchowieństwu przymiotów’ (‘a prsn of perfect attributes exemplary to the clergy’).

Nor is Riaucour the only church dignitary to profit from the wealth of Newel. The inventory of 19 October 1764 tells us that the Prioress of the Dominican Convent in Nowogródek, Zofia Lastowska, and all her nuns, are to receive the income from parts of two Woytowstwa, Zaworocienskie and Sieruckie, amounting to £ 15276.

From the last inventory of all it appears that Bishop de Riaucour had decided to surrender the tenancy, in that it is said to have been issued ‘przy postąpieniu WJmę Panu Ignacemu Korsakowi Horodniczomu Brzoscianskiemu w Arędowną Roczną Tenute’ (‘on passing to His Grace Pan Ignacy Korsak Mayor of Brześć in Annual Aręda Tenancy’).

There is one last connection between the Catholic church and the Newel economy, namely the fact that the mast-pine for the splaw to Riga was in the hands either of Bishop Hylzen or of a member of his family; see the section on the splaw below.

We should note that, although Hieronym Florian Radziwiłł continued to derive income from Newel, none of it was passed on to the goverment of the Commonwealth:

---

208. Ibid., 85. The reference in the book’s index to p. 56 should read ‘p. 57’. The reference on p. 142 tells us that Riaucour retained the livings of three Radziwiłł parishes, including those of Biała and Shuck, even after he was consecrated bishop, a suffragan’s post being unremunerated.
209. Alojzy Sajkowski, in his Od Sierotki do Rybętki (Poznań, 1965), imputes ignoble motives to Riaucour and capricious arbitrariness to his master: ‘Opuszczały go [Hieronima Floriana] kolejno żony, uciekała służba, odsuwali się krewni, i trzeba było nie lada sprytu (czy raczej podłości), żeby podobnie jak ksiądz Ryokur biskup ptolemayski [spelling sic - P.M.], wkręcić się w łaski bielskiego satripy i zyskać za jego protekcją trzy probostwa’ (p. 183)(‘He [Hieronim Florian] was left by his wives in turn, his servantry fled, his relatives withdrew, and one needed not a little cunning (or rather baseness) to worm one’s way, like the Reverend Ryokur bishop of Ptolemaya, into the good graces of the satrap of Biała and win under his protection three parishes’).
Knjaž' Ijeronim Florian Radziwill, imevšij vladenija v različnix mestnostjax Belorussii, [...] so vseh svoix vladenij voobšče ne daval v kaznu Reči Pospolitoj nikakix nalogov.210

Prince Hieronym Radziwill, who had properties in various localities of Belorussia, [...] paid no taxes at all from any of his properties into the exchequer of the Commonwealth.

f) The Uniate Rite

The Uniate rite of the Catholic church survived. As we saw above, it was misprised by Latin-rite Catholicism ("The common people... labour under the same ignorance of the rudiments of the christian faith as elsewhere") and despised by Orthodoxy. Extreme Russian opposition to the Uniates was manifested during Peter 1's incursion into the Rzeczpospolita early in the century. In October 1704 the Russian commander Boris Petrovič Šeremetev was greeted by representatives of the Witebsk nobility at the first convenient town on the border, namely Newel.211 The welcoming party included Pan Święciecki, dzierżawca or leaseholder of Newel,212 and other exalted persons such as Konstanty Mikołaj Zaba,213 Cupbearer [of Witebsk?] and his sons-in-law, Rotmistrz Zaba214 and 'a good few more'. The conversation seems to have started in a friendly enough tone. Šeremet'jjev215 inquired of Konstanty Zaba whether he had children, and, on hearing that he had a daughter who was a

212. Leaseholding is normal for Newel later in the century. Pan Święciecki leased Newel from Princess Elżbieta Augusta, to whom, according to the title page (p. 2) of 2618/2 (of 1700), her father Karol Philipp had passed the benefit of the 'Neuburg possessions'. This followed the premature death of her mother Ludwika Karolina in 1695.
213. There was an important Newel extended family of this name, resident since at the latest 1684: cf. AR XXV 2615/2 (of that year), p. 28, where Osip Zaba is noted as living at Dym No. 332. By the middle of the following (eighteenth) century there were several of the family in the town, including Jan Zaba, who held ten sets of premises in Newel town and suburbs.
214. It is not clear from Fr Likowski's account how many members of the family were present. At first he mentions (in the dative case) "PP: Konstantemu Mikołajowi Cześniikowi y Rotmistrzowi Zabom", the natural interpretation of which is that there were two Zaby present, one the cupbearer, the other a captain. Later he writes (in the accusative-genitive) of "Konstantego Zaby Rotmistrza", i.e. 'Konstanty Zaba the Captain' (both extracts in Edward Likowski, History of the Uniate Church, 271).
215. Some of this clan are Šeremet'jjev, others Šeremetev.
Basilian nun in Minsk, commented ‘Your Grace is a catholic, but you’ve handed over your Daughter to those Dogs’. 216

After the Russian tide had, for the moment, ebbed, the Catholic church embarked on a programme of conversion, and over the years 1715-1720 some forty Orthodox churches in the areas of Newel, Siebież and Kopyś, 217 i.e. in the so-called ‘Neuburg Possessions’ which had passed to the Elector of the Rheinland, were forcibly converted to Uniate Catholicism. As we have seen, one’s funerary ceremonies could be performed according to the Uniate rite, in a recension of Church Slavonic, at the little church of St Peter’s, although it appears that one must then be buried alongside persons of the Latin rite. St Peter’s had its own presbytery. 218

Newel belonged to the Uniate deanery of distant Siebież. Immediately before the First Partition there was only one Uniate church in Newel town, apparently dedicated to the Elevation of the Holy Cross (Podwyższenie Krzyża Świętego). 219 There were others in the Newelszczyzna. There was one at Dolysy, another at Hultzaje (= Gul‘tjał, now no longer part of Newel’ district, but then a Cossack area); another at Jazno (at the western edge of the modern district), and another at Kolpino. Another is said to be at ‘Rykszyn’, which is nowadays Rykšino, the ‘Rykszyno’ of the Radziwiłł records. 220 The mistake may be an example of hierarchical indifference to small places.

Before dying, a Uniate Christian might be tended during a final illness in the old ‘East Slav’ hospital, which still exists, although it has been forced to move. Its location is given as follows: ‘Pomarynie Popadzi, pod Szpitalem usplenskim’ 221 (‘After Maryna the

---

216. ‘...Wmci katolik, a do tych Sobaków Córke swoją oddałę.’ Edward Likowski, History of the Uniate Church, 271. The mistake with the gender of Russian sobaka argues that the story was at the least second-hand.
218. ‘Plebania Cerkwi Sł‘ Piotra’ (‘Presbytery of the [non-Latin-rite] Church of St Peter’) (2626/1, of 1764, 32).
219. See Witold Kotbuk, Kościoly wschodnie w Rzeczypospolitej około 1772 roku. Struktury administracyjne. Lublin, 1998. For the Newel Uniate church’s existence, see p. 164; for its name, p. 378. The ‘Newel’ mentioned on p. 326 is a much smaller place in the Pilsk area. The Elevation is not mentioned by name in the Newel inventories.
220. E.g. 2615/1 (1681), 53.
221. XXV 2622 (of 1749), 21.
Priest’s wife, three-quarters of a [square] pret under the dormition Hospital}). This testifies to the religious conservatism of Newel’s population: some patients at least preferred to be treated by persons of Slavonic liturgical tradition, even though this hospital is now associated not with the Orthodox Christian religion but with the Uniate Catholic rite. The size of the ‘new’ hospital is terribly small: of the order of four metres by something over three (smaller than the organist’s cabin). This can hardly have accommodated more than three or four patients.

Priests for the Church of the Dormition (the one associated with the Uniate hospital) seem to have come from a single family for at least seven decades. As long ago as 1681 there had been an Orthodox priest named Krycki in Newel. We know this indirectly because of a reference to his wife, in all probability his widow (‘Popadia Krycka’). There is no reason to think her husband was a Uniate, since there is no mention of that rite in the seventeenth century inventories. Now according to Orthodox and Rusyn tradition, sons inherited their calling from fathers. Hence it is no surprise to find references in 1731 to ‘Plac O Kryckiego Płatny’ (‘Premises of F[ather] Krycki Taxable’). The same inventory tells us: ‘Domowi Swieszcezenika Uspenskiego placic ma / Jozef Krycki placic powiniene’ (‘For the house of the Priest of the [church of the] Dormition is to pay Jozef Krycki is obliged to pay’). Father Krycki thus seems to have been made to pay czynsz for two lots of premises in the middle of the town. At this stage he may still have been an Orthodox priest, whence the unsympathetic treatment of him in respect of czynsz.

222. The Dormition of the Virgin is the Orthodox interpretation of the end of the Virgin’s earthly life. The modern Catholic dogma on the point is that of the Assumption, which, however, had not at the time been declared ex cathedra.
223. Despite its small size, the hospital survived at least until 1767: see 2631/1, of that year, p. 13: ‘w Trzecim Zauktu / Pod Szpitalem Cerkwi Uspienskiej’ (‘in the Third Sidestreet / Under the Hospital of the Dormition Church’).
225. The lack of Belorussian and Polish affrication looks like a Russianism. One would expect a Belorussian version papaddzia (i.e. with akm’je and with both affrication and doubling of the consonant before /j/) or a Polish version popadzia, where <dz> = /dd/.
226. 2620, p. 9.
227. Ibid., 7.
228. Like pop, the Russian word svjaščennik in various Polish transcriptions is reserved for clergymen of Slavonic liturgy (whether Orthodox or Uniate).
229. Jozef is absolutely not an East Slav form (we would expect either colloquial Ośip or formal Iosif). We may suspect that the inventorist Polonized the clergyman’s name out of habit.
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In 1749, however, a piece of land is noted as ‘w [≡ Belorussian <ў>; a localism] Oyca Kryckiego / Prezbitera Unickiey230 / pod Zabudo/waniem y Sadem’ (‘in the possession of Father Krycki the Presbyter of the Uniate [church] under Structure and Orchard’)231. Later inventories do not name names but refer, e.g., to ‘Plebania X[iadza] Vniatkskiego’232 (‘Presbytery of the Uniate Priest’). The Uniate church had its own endowments233. Thus in 1764 the inventorist notes a small234 piece of land as being ‘do Cerkwi Uniackiey Funduszowe’235 (‘endowed for the Uniate Church’). We saw above that a Krycki was the previous tenant of the Catholic organism’s house; the culturally dominant Catholic rite was able to put pressure on Uniate Catholicism.

Let us suppose, then, that in 1681 the widow of Fr Krycki ‘the First’ held her house after her late husband had been incumbent for a solid period, perhaps twenty years, including several years under Russian rule, which takes us back to 1660. Thus the Krycki dynasty were incumbents, probably at the Dormition church throughout, for ninety years, and possibly longer.

Fr Krycki was not the only Uniate priest. The 1731 inventory mentions also that one Athanazy Korzeniewski has a lodger named ‘Pop Zdanko’.236 It is highly probable that this Zdanko was a Uniate priest. On the one hand he is not of the Latin rite, for in that case he would be not Pop but Xiadz. On the other hand it is difficult to imagine an Orthodox Pop lodging with the Polonizing Athanazy Korzeniewski (had his landlord been ‘Apanas Kornejev’, things would have stood otherwise). On the other, Fr Zdanko’s association with the leading Newel burgher family makes it even more probable that he had chosen to compromise with Catholicism. And we saw above that the Uniate hospital, before its

230. The feminine ending seems to refer to cerkwi understood (or omitted) by the inventorist.
231. 2622, p. 21.
232. 2624 (December 1761), p. 19.
233. Długosz emphasizes the desire of the Catholic church establishment in Smoleńsk not to put pressure on Uniate Catholics to ‘convert’ to the Latin rite (Długosz, Dzieje Diecezji Smoleńskiej, 19). Similarly Orthodox church lands were to go only to fund Uniate, not Latin-rite, churches; ‘cerkiewne majątki prawosławne mają iść tylko dla unitów’ (ibid., 21).
234. ‘Small’: we do not have the figure, but the measure-word is pręciki, a pręcik being one-tenth of a square rod.
235. 2626/1, p. 35.
236. 2620, 20.
transfer to new, smaller premises in or about 1749, stood on a site partly belonging to a Symon Zdanko, who may have been the ‘Pop Zdanko’ mentioned in 1731.

In 1749 we find mention of another priest, ‘O[je]c Zbrodowski Swiaszczennik’.237 His name is associated with the ‘Cerkiew S° Eliasza z Cmentarzem S° Spasa’ (‘Church of St. Elijah with the Cemetery of St Saviour’). We must assume that the older church of St. Saviour had been destroyed or deconsecrated, leaving a single priest to take care of its cemetery and of another old Newel church. He was still active in 1761; from an inventory of that year we discover that he was ‘Jakim Zbrodowski Pop’.238 His first name and title seem purely Orthodox, although his surname seems suspiciously Polish.

Three more priests from the Slavonic tradition are mentioned in the inventory of 1764. Of one piece of land we are told that ‘Osip Pop Mi / kolski ten Dwor trzyma’239 (‘Osip the Priest of [St] Mikołaj holds this Farmstead’). We can presume that he is the same as ‘Osip Czorny Pop’,240 who holds three more pieces of land on the outskirts of Newel. And in the last inventory, dated 1767, we find, in Ulica Jahorowska, ‘Stefan Czarny Pop / po Tomaszu Komkowicz’241 (‘Stefan Czarny the [non-Latin-rite] Priest after Tomasz Komkowicz’). Once again we see that vocation was hereditary.242

Another priest, named simply Pilip, is found found living in a house previously occupied by someone called Kudzin.243 The house is close to the Uniate church, and ‘Pilip’ may have been the new incumbent of the church. Bishop Hylzen’s criticism of the standards prevailing among the Uniate clergy may find confirmation in the fact that this priest was

238. 2632, 49.
239. 2632, 35.
240. Ibid., 38.
241. 2631/1, 11.
242. This priestly family has a surname that might be taken as a reference to the ‘black’ (monastic) clergy. Since monastics might not marry, this must be coincidence and the surname a personal reference.
243. Ibid., 37. Kudzin must have died recently; one Fiodor Kudzinowicz holds two pieces of land nearby, noted on p. 35. This is the first and possibly the only case of the modern Russian form in the inventories (Fiodor, Фёдор). Nevertheless it argues some cross-border cultural influence from Russia (as also, for example, the folk etymology of Lake Ivan, earlier Niewan).
evidently unable to pronounce the sound [f]. There is also a ‘Hrehory Pop’ on the same page.

We have already mentioned the church of St Peter, on the outskirts of Newel and next to a graveyard and to the Catholic chapel of St Michael. They too were both extant in 1767, when they were noted in the last inventory. So the Uniate rite survived in Newel until the end of Commonwealth rule.

g) Orthodoxy
The position of Orthodoxy as represented in the inventories is more ambiguous. In 1721 the igumen of the Newel' monastery complained bitterly to the Russian Senate about active persecution which had left one priest close to death (there is no evidence that this was Newel clergyman). The Catholic authorities are compared with the roaring lion of the Gospels, roaring day and night: ‘...ježeli ukroščen ne budet, to vpred' ne tol'ko imenij, no i imeni našego ne ostanetsja', with a deft play on words (imenij... i imeni): ‘unless it [the lion] be tamed, in the future not only will our estates not survive, but nor will our name’. The reference to estates hints at an economic subtext to the dispute.

For in the previous year the monastery Church of the Annunciation had burnt down. The old church is mentioned in 1712 in 1731 the same institution is registered, but in 1725 the old building had been replaced with a new building of stone.

244. Theologically important names that he would find difficult include those of the evangelist St Matthew, of St Joseph the husband of the Blessed Virgin, of Christ's birthplace Bethlehem, and of the garden of Gethsemane, since all are spelt with either <∅> (<f^o>) or <φ> (<φ>) in Church Slavonic, both being (normatively) pronounced [f].
245. I have heard this pronunciation myself in Newel'. During the Second World war the Newel' underground movement had a Phillips radio set. In 2003 an informant, a relative of members of the group, Nikolaj Semjonovič Aleščenko, b. 1925, referred to this radio as a 'Pilips'.
246. 26311/1, p. 21.
248. 26192, 23.
249. 2620, 7.
The entries from 1749 argue that the monks were part of the local fabric of Newel society and little acculturated to Polish norms. Take as an instance the phrase ‘Po Białowockim Czency Białowieszczenicy’\textsuperscript{251} (‘After Białowocki the monks of the Albannunciation’). In the word ‘cerncy’ we find local cokan’e. If this form was offered by the monks when asked who they were, this is perhaps a sign that they were drawn from the simpler levels of Newel society.\textsuperscript{252} This phrase also contains a curious error, viz. Białowieszczenicy, which I have translated as ‘Albannunciation’. Here the theological term ‘annunciation’ (OCS. blagoveščenije) has been contaminated in the mind of the inventorist by the name ‘Białowockim’, occurring in the same phrase.

Similarly in an inventory of 1761, where we find extensive lands in the Prydacki dziesiątek of which it is said that “Tych Służb Używają Czency Ne” / welscy bez płatnie\textsuperscript{253} (‘These Służby are Used by the Monks of Newel un paid’). Here for the moment the inventorist has forgotten any relationship between this word and the Russian čjornyj ‘black’, černec ‘[black-robed] monk’. This implies the remoteness of Orthodox monasticism from the Polish-speaking inventorist’s cultural experience.

This alienation is finally confirmed by a note in the last inventory,\textsuperscript{254} of 1767. True, at times we find ‘correct’ forms, such as ‘Pod Cerkwią Czerców’, ‘Pod Klasztorem tychże Czerncow’, ‘Cįż Czernce’ (‘Under the Church of the [Orthodox] Monks’, ‘Under the Monastery of the same Monks’, ‘The Same Monks’). Elsewhere, however, we find a reference to the monks’ orchard as ‘Sad Czeńcow’.\textsuperscript{255} Here we find not only the loss of <r> but also the palatalization of /n/ to /ń/, implying a[n otherwise unattested?] nominative “czeniec. Three pages later\textsuperscript{256} the /ń/ is restored in the phrase ‘Chat dwie w których Bobyle należące do Czerniew’, ‘Of cabins two in which [there are] Landless peasants belonging to the Monks’. Even so, the form ‘Czerniew’ again shows the inventorist’s alienation from

\textsuperscript{251}. 2622, 23.
\textsuperscript{252}. There is another example on the same page: ‘Klasztor Cerncow teyze Cerkwi’. The use of <sz>, representing /ś/, shows that the inventorist himself did not practise nazorzenie, i.e. the phenomenon was a localism that he was reporting, not a feature of his own pronunciation.
\textsuperscript{253}. 2632, 113. On the dating of this inventory see above.
\textsuperscript{254}. 2631/1, on the dating of which, again, see above.
\textsuperscript{255}. 2631/1, 20.
\textsuperscript{256}. 2631/1, 23.
Orthodox monasticism, since the Russian form is ěrnek, genitive plural ěrnekov, whereas Czerniew implies a nominative Czereń or similar.

We may note here in parenthesis that the word bobyl is a localism corresponding to Belorussian babył, Russian bobyl'. The older sense of the East Slav word is ‘landless peasant’, as opposed to the modern meaning ‘bachelor, person without family who lives alone’. The preservation of <o> seems to imply Russian influence. We have seen other examples of such influence: the name Fiedorow, the presence of ikan'je, and the change of the hydronym Niewan and variants to Ivan (see Chapter 2 of the present thesis). Such influence argues that Orthodoxy, too, was influential: recollection of earlier okan'je may result from hearing the liturgy recited in Russian-recension Church Slavonic, which preserves unstressed [o]. Indeed, to some extent Orthodox and Russian influence may have been the same thing.

h) The Bohomolcy

There is a curious note in Bishop Hylzen's report of 1747 concerning the neighbouring parish of Siebież:

Hæreticorum fere nulli, si Ruthenos schismaticorum schismaticos, Bohomolos sic dictos, excipiam, qui in fundis et bonis nobilium inter alios ruricolas sparsim degunt, tamen publicum plane exercitium religionis suæ non habent.

Of heretics there are almost none, if I except the Ruthenians in schism from the schismatics, who reside scattered among the other country folk on the farms and properties of the nobles; however, overtly they have no public exercise of their religion.
Here we have another sign of hierarchical ignorance of Newel, because in 1748 and successive years we already have traces of 'Bohomolcy' well-established in the Newel area but not mentioned by the Bishop in his report of the previous year.

The references are found in a volume257 that, uniquely in the Newel documents in dzieł XXV of the Radziwiłł Archive, is not an inventory but a regestr Birczy, a register of tax collection. This one covers two years, 1748 and 1749, and in both sections we find reference to the Bohomolcy.258 The first reference is in the section for 1748, where we read of 'Bohomoli Sieruccy [Ż.] 10',259 i.e. 'Pray-Gods of Sieruckie'. The area in question was a subdivision of the województwo called 'Psowskie', i.e. 'Hound'. The Commonwealth attitude to Newel is visible again in the heading at the top of the page, which speaks of the continuation of 'Województwa Pskowskiego'. On the one hand the administrator cannot be bothered to get the name right; on the other hand Batory's failed siege of Pskow seems still to be lodged in his mind.

Another reference260 locates Bohomolcy as resident in the village of Kupszyno in the województwo of Topory. Lastly, in the section of the register dealing with the year 1749 we have a reference261 'WTym ze Dziesiątku Bohomołowie' ('In the same decurium there are Bohomołowie'). The decurium in question is Uswayski, i.e. on the shores of the large Lake Uswaya (modern Usvoje), to the west of Plissy and Newel itself. The heretics were good payers:262 of the three homesteads obliged to pay, all had paid by the time when the register was compiled.263

257. 2621.
258. We should point out the obvious confusion that must have arisen in Latin-rite Catholic minds between the relatively new Bohomolcy and the much older Catholic Bogomils (found also in many variants). The latter were insufficiently austere for Catholic taste.
259. 2621. p. '7', actually page 9. On the microfilm this page is repeated in error.
260. 2621. p. '14', actually page 16. On the previous page we may note for the history of religion in Newel' that 'Niewierowo Do Cerkwi' ('[the village of] Unbelief Belongs to the Church').
261. 2621. p. '132' (actually p. 130).
262. Probably because they took very seriously the notion of rendering unto Cesar what is Cesar's (Matthew XXII:21).
263. The majority of tax-payers were quits with the system by the same moment. Very occasionally one finds an area where a majority is still to pay; these are usually pustosze, more remote from roads and population centres.
Since these Bohomolcy were demonstrably resident in the Newelszczyzna, we need to say a word about them as a religious community. According to Fr Rabikauskas,

Videtur agi de secta peculiari schismaticorum (raskol’niki), qui in suis ducibus Deum incarnatum videbant et se homines Dei (ljudi bożie [sic]; bogomoly) appellabant, ab aliis vero plerumque ‘chlysty’ 264 (a ‘Christus’) vocabantur. 265

It seems to be a question of a special sect of the schismatics (raskol’niki), who in their leaders saw God incarnate and used to term themselves men of God (ljudi bożie [sic]; bogomoly), but were called by most others ‘chlysty’ (from ‘Christus’).

Old Ritualism survives in Nevel’ to the present day, though it will probably not survive much longer.

i) Summary

We can sum up the history of Christianity in eighteenth-century Newel as follows. As far as Latin-rite Catholicism is concerned, at the beginning of the century the only Catholic place of worship was the castle chapel. At some time early in the century a small Catholic church or chapel was erected beside a Uniate church and graveyard, so that economies of scale were applied to entry into the afterlife. Bishop Hylzen of Smoleński introduced a certain spirit of activism into Newel Catholicism. He made it the effective centre of the diocese (his see being now in the hands of schismatics). He also mobilized the wealth of the Radziwiłłs to provide a new church building, a presbytery and even a new ‘Latin-rite’ hospital. At church Newel’s Catholics could worship in Latin and have their thoughts raised closer to God by the music of an organ, played by an incomer whose name is not recorded and who lived in a very small house, less than a quarter of the size of the first projected Catholic presbytery, or about a tenth the size of the second project. A substantial

264. Outsiders misunderstood the term and believed that they were flagellants (Russian xlestat ‘to whip’).
church with a rather put-upon organist, a hospital nearby, a chapel in the castle, rather run-down, a funerary chapel outside the town, all persist until the end of the Commonwealth period in Newel history.

In the early period of the Smoleńsk diocese, the highest ecclesiastical authorities, including the newly-formed Congregatio Propagandy and even the Pope himself, discouraged proselytizing among the Uniates.\footnote{Długosz, Dzieje Diecezji Smoleńskiej, 19-20.} It seems that in some degree the Latin-rite establishment in Newel, which in mid-century had the direct support of the bishop, did not discourage the Uniate rite. The theoretical grounds for this are absolutely straightforward. The Uniates professed belief in the same doctrines as the Latin rite, particularly as regards the theology of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary. The fact that these truths were professed in Church Slavonic did not affect the Catholic orthodoxy (with a minuscule $<\alpha>$) of their faith. The tolerance, however, was limited. A cross and a chalice might be passed on loan, but the Uniates could be removed from their hospital, their priest from his rather humble abode, to make way for the Latin rite, its healers, its organist. Nonetheless the Uniate rite survives and apparently thrives until the time of the last inventory (1767); but with a single church, as far as can be discerned from the inventories.

Yet we cannot imagine that Newel’s Uniate congregations felt at ease with their Latin-rite fellow-Catholics. Practical, economically active burghers such as the Rubis, Zdanko, and Atroszczonek families, who must also have acted as leaders of their community, cannot have been content with their treatment. We must suspect that those families had joined the Uniate rite because it allowed them a compromise between the liturgically familiar and the economic advantages of Catholicism.
During the eighteenth century another religion, older than Christianity, makes its appearance in Newel. Its presence, too, is expressed in the establishment of a place of worship and a cemetery and in the introduction of a specific form of music. With that religion came an unfamiliar way of life and a community that from the late nineteenth century until the Second World War was the largest grouping within Newel town and constituted the majority of the population. That religion was Judaism. Moreover the arrival of Judaism meant the introduction of a new way of life, which could be witnessed by Newelers of other religions.

Newel’s long Jewish summer begins with a single swallow. In 1712 we find the entry:

Dym № 230  Łowin Rubis
Leyba Zyd

(Household № 230  Łowin Rubis
Leyba the Jew)

Although Leyba’s lodging with a gentile became a precedent (as we shall see below), the next inventory, of 1731, shows that Sukino, just across the lake from Newel town, has become the nucleus of the Jewish community. The first Jew whom we meet in this inventory is ‘Michel Judowicz / Zyd zosobna posiedzielnego / ma płacic tall. 1’ (‘Michel Judowicz / A Jew with an exemption from residence tax he is to pay $1’). Although Michel has a patronymic of East Slav pattern, we can tell that he spoke the variety of High German now known as Yiddish. The inventorist did not perceive the last sound in his given name as [I], but as a clear [l], the standard High German way of pronouncing the single liquid phoneme of the language. At least three other landholdings of his are twice noted, and in two cases

267. 2619/2, p. 34. On Burgher Rubis’ apparent forename Lowin see above; Lewin was probably meant.
268. 2620, 29.
269. Another Jewish Michael, the former British Home Secretary and leader of the Conservative Party Michael Howard, likewise used a clear [l] where speakers of Received Pronunciation expect a dark /l/. This feature of his south Welsh background was beyond the ken of English pressmen and satirists. The Polish-speaking inventorist had what they lacked: a letter designed to convey the difference, <I> instead of <L>. 
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he is called ‘Michał Judowicz Zyd’, \(^{270}\) I suggest because the inventorist lapsed back into a dogmatic slumber, noting what he expected to hear.

Nearby lived ‘Jakub Leybowicz zyd. Cyrrulik Excepto\(^{271}\) prętow iego od Innych powinnosci\(^{272}\) (‘Jakub son of Leyba[,] jew. Barber his pręty Excepted from Other liabilities’). It appears that the castle authorities encouraged Jews to settle at Sukino. The patronymic may possibly indicate that this is a son of Newel’s first Jewish resident ‘Leyba Zyd’. A minor puzzle arises from his trade. Why did Newel Jewry need a barber? This is the wrong question. Whom did he shave, whose hair did he cut?\(^{273}\) Possibly he shaved the uncircumcized. These may have included guests at the Sukino inn (see below). We cannot easily imagine Newelers taking the ferry to Sukino for his professional attentions. More probably there was another stream to the Newel rush hour mentioned above, and Jakub, bearing a case with razors, strops and soaps, brushes and pomades, sailed daily on the Newel ferry to ply his trade peripatetically. Beside him on an uncomfortable thwart, and fore and aft of him as well, sat other residents of the liberty. In the opposite direction the ferry carried Newelers who had business of their own at Sukino.

The possibility that Leyba Zyd established a dynasty is made more likely by the fact that another Sukino resident, at Dym No. 16, was Abram Leybowicz,\(^{274}\) whose residence was subject to the same conditions as that of Jakub Leybowicz. Jakub lives close beside the Karczma Skarbowa or ‘official inn’, and he may have operated it. This in turn may imply that Leyba was indeed his father and that Leyba was an arendator. The co-occurrence of these possibilities (Leyba an arendator, Abram running an inn, Jakub shaving the guests) sketch a picture that is much more likely in its implications than the more conservative version (none of these were related and the analogy between their trades but coincidence).

The Dymy where Michal, Jakub and Abram lived were, I suggest, close to the landing stage where the ferry arrived. I wish to draw attention to their neighbour (at Dym

---

\(^{270}\) 2620, 33 (Michal), .

\(^{271}\) This interesting example of an ablative absolute (attempted) provides a measure of precisely how deep the knowledge of Latin was among relatively well educated members of the Szlachta.

\(^{272}\) 2620, 29.

\(^{273}\) He may also have performed some surgical procedures.

\(^{274}\) 2620, 29.
No. 14), Leon Lewin.275 He is not noted as a Jew. We should, however, entertain the possibility that his names are of Jewish origin. There is, of course, an East Slav surname Levin,276 the surname, for example, of the positive hero of Tolstoy’s Anna Karenina. It is also found, however, as a slavicized version of the Jewish title or surname Levi (borne by members of the Levite sub-priesthood, from Hebrew לוי). Leon or Lewin are versions of Latin or Slav forenames meaning ‘lion’, but there may also be a pun here on the Levite order. When we juxtapose this name with that of old Leyba’s landlord three decades before, Łowin or Lewin Rubis, we may begin to imagine that there were in Newel some conversos. If the Rubis family were such, it would mean that one very important family of Newel burghers was of Jewish origin.277

There is one more undoubted Jew resident in Sukino in 1731, Jsay or JSay Zyd,278 who holds at least three pieces of land. If Jsay had other work, it is not noted. All the Sukino Jews held patches of land outside the settlement at Sukino, in exactly the same way as Newel burghers held land outside the town on the other side of the lake.

A number of Jews are economically engaged in the countryside. Thus in the Woytowstwo Zaiewanskie (north of Lake Niewan or Bol’soj Ivan) there were three Arendy. One was managed jointly by ‘Jwan + Michol’.279 ‘Michol’ is quite probably identical with Michel Judowicz. His cooperation with the clearly goyish Jwan is obviously significant. Another Arenda is run by one ‘Megier Judowicz’, and ‘Megier’ (the inventorist’s spelling of Meyer) is probably a brother of Michol or Michel. The Arenda at Zubarowo, worth 35, is run by one Pinchas Hirszowicz.280 Another, for Szynki at Pletni and Niemcowo, was let to

275. 2620, 29.
276. Traditionally pronounced Liovin, although only as an exception to the rule ([j]³+C³−Ø > j³+C³−Ø), i.e. accented /ə/ changes to accented /o/ when placed before a hard consonant or zero.
277. There are both a precedent and an epigon in Newel or Nevel’ history. The precedent is Antonio Possevino, who was in all probability the son of an Italian converso (if we may use a Spanish term in this context). The epigon is the Evreinov family, who were very important in nineteenth-century Nevel’. Nikolaj Ivanovič Evreinov was the marshall of the nobility, founder of almshouses, etc., and there were other prominent members of the family. As their surname implies, they were of Jewish origin. A forebear who had been useful to Tsar Peter I had converted and then been ennobled (other well-known Evreinovs are members of different branches).
278. 2620, 32.
279. 2620, 39.
280. 2620, 87. The charge may arise that we are assuming individuals’ religious affiliation on the basis of names only. Pinchas is based on the Hebrew original of Phineas, and is unattested among Christians in the East Slav lands.
Johym or Juhym Abramowicz and Szymon Leyzorowicz (value B 25). Two Karczmy (Smolaninowo and Płoska) were run by a certain Mowsza (no patronymic), one at Sazykino by Michayło (probably Michel Judowicz again) and Łazar'. It is possible that the Dawid Łapun who held the Arenda for the inn at Trochalowo, worth B22, was a Jew. The name David is exclusively Jewish in modern Russia, but that was certainly not the case in mediæval Rus'. Lapid sounds hostile: it consists apparently of Russian lapa, which is now exclusively 'paw' but earlier meant 'human foot', and a derogatory suffix -ún (cf. gorbún 'hunchback', sosún 'sucker' (cum sensu obsceno)). Given Belorussian and standard Russian akan'e, the surname may derive rather from lop 'unbaptized child', cf. lopar 'Saame'; 'one who does not respect Christianity, pagan'. In dialects, including those of the province of Pskov, the reference is to greed. On balance I think that Dawid was Jewish and that the sense of the surname may combine hostile connotations of greed and paganism.

It is worth asking why a Jewish arendator was attracted to Newel, probably with Radziwiłł blandishments. Jewish businessmen were widely respected in the Commonwealth (also hated; Bohdan Chmielnicki's rebels were said to have hanged a Catholic priest, a Jew and a dog in every new town they occupied). In the 1731 inventory we find the following rueful note on the decline in the liquor trade:


Tonnage from the export of spirits abroad to Moscow when there was free trade. Made zł Nº 2000 of Income. but now the border is closed in the

281. Evidently a form of Joachim.
282. Ibid., 111.
283. Ibid., 153.
284. Ibid.
285. 2620, 167.
286. There are useful articles in Ganzhina, Dictionary of Surnames, on surnames deriving from lapa (274) and lopar' (287-288).
287. 2620, 28.
Export of spirits. this revenue is vacant until the happy hour when the trade opens on the border.288

It seems that the recruitment of a Jewish arendator was expected to recover at least some of the shortfall. In the long run this policy justified itself amply: in 1766 the income from the Newel town Arenda amounted to a little over 25,880.289

There is no sign in the 1731 inventory of any religious establishment, but if we allow for adult male offspring (i.e. anyone over the age of thirteen), then there were probably ten Jews in Sukino and therefore a minyan, enough people for a prayer-room. By the time of the next inventory, that of 1749, Jewish life is much better established.

Indeed, we witness the process when we read that Dym No. 10 is ‘Matwieia Borocha Jankiel Szłomowicz kupił uniegeo’,290 i.e. ‘of Matwiey Borocha[,] Jankiel Szłomowicz has bought [it] from him’. The name ‘Matwieia Borocha’291 makes one ask whether this is not a person of Jewish origin. Matwiey is, of course, a Jewish name. Borocha looks very like the Hebrew name barukh ‘blessed, Benedict’ (from the triconsonontal root b-r-ch ‘bless’), while there is no obvious Slav etymology.

Behind Dym No. 14 there were ‘2 prę Szkoła Zydowska w tyle nad Jeziorem’ (‘2 prę[t]y Jewish schul at the back above the Lake’). The Ashkenazy term for a synagogue, schul, based on the German word for a school, is already in use. For the moment the synagogue is tiny, 37.32m², i.e. very slightly more than 6 metres along both sides. But someone (perhaps Jankiel Szłomowicz, the last person mentioned) has bought more land

288. There is a note of very similar content in one of the two 1712 inventories; this was the year when Leyba Zyd’s residence is noted. The content of the note is broadly similar and the amount of lost revenue (2000) is identical, but the precise text is very difficult to establish. We can read ‘z Całego Miasta płaconą przedtym za Wywoz do Moskwę / Goralék Co Rok po 2000...’ (2619/1, 56). Furthermore, there is a note (very hard to read) at the bottom of the same page on Muscovite incursions that affect the use of lakes (ibid.).
289. 2631/4, 29.
290. 2622, 52.
291. The case is genitive; the name occurs later, also in the genitive, as ‘Matwieia Borochi’, in the entry for Dym No. 20, which he had also owned and had now sold to one Siemion Pibajż [?]. The nominative was evidently Borocha, and the inventorist was unsure whether a masculine noun of feminine appearance should be declined. Matwiey himself lives at Dym No. 35.
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beside the synagogue: ‘Do Szkoły przypuścili Przykahanów Tameczny’, i.e. ‘[In addition] to the Schul he has bought the kahila there [?]’. The kahila, Hebrew kāḥāl, Polish kahal, Russian kagal, was the Jewish community’s self-organized body; it was still in place at the moment of the First Partition. Beyond the entry for Dym No. 24 we find one for ‘Mogilki Zydowskie nad Jeziorem’, ‘Little Jewish Graves above the Lake’. As usual in the inventories, Death’s sting is drawn by the use of the diminutive.

Three more Jews are noted in the liberty at Sukino in 1749. One is Zelman Leybowicz, presumably a (younger?) brother of Jakub and Abram. Another, Chonon Szlomowicz, holds one and two-thirds of a pret beyond Dym No. 38. At Dym No. 36 lives someone with an important name: Zrol [sic] Chazan. A chazan is a cantor. In Ashkenazy tradition a chazan is a professional, while a rabbi is a wise member of the community who probably lives by plying some lay person’s trade. So Zrol Chazan brought music to the Jewish community apparently some years before the organist came to the Catholic church of St George (see above).

The 1749 inventory notes also one or two Jews living elsewhere than Sukino. Just outside the pale of the town we find a plot ‘Berki Ickowicz’ Cyruleika pusty do Zabudowania (‘of Berka Ickowicz the Barber empty for Building’). Since Jakub Leybowicz, the barber from the 1731 inventory, is not mentioned in 1749, it appears that he had moved on or died. The fact that Berka lives in the faubourg, as do about half the population of Newel town, confirms our hypothesis that the barber’s clientele came from the non-Jewish population. Jakub is the only Jew resident in the suburbs.

Only one Jew lives inside the town walls, such as they are. This is the Newel Arendz, Mendel Jakubowicz. He also holds the Arenda of a ‘small inn’ (Karczemka)

---

292. 2622, 52.
294. Ibid.
295. Elsewhere in the inventories we have always Srol.
296. Berka’s patronymic implies that his father’s given name was Yišaqaq (anglicized as Isaac).
297. 2622, 25.
298. 2622, 19.
at the *Folwark* of Sorokwaszyno. Mendel may be another member of the family that produced, if we take the maximal position, Leyba Zyd, Jakub Leybowicz, Abram Leybowicz, and Zelman Leybowicz. Mendel is an extremely important figure in the economic life of the town and its immediate hinterland, and no doubt his income was very considerable. The authorities obviously thought so, for they built him a house close to the Luck (Velike Luki) gate. Here is the entry:


Mendel Jakubowicz Publican of Newel House at Treasury Cost Built, from Which the Whole of the Annual Income is to be [paid] to the Treasury – Talers $B100$ dico$^{301}$ [złoty] $800.$

This is an enormous sum of money, and the tale of Mendel’s rent conforms to the archetype of an anecdote. Rent collector: ‘That’ll be $Z\cdot800,$ please... We don’t see many Jews in Newel’. Mendel Jakubowicz: ‘I’m not surprised, at $Z\cdot800$ a year’. $^{302}$

One of the 1754 inventories gives extensive details of the Newel *Arenda*, which at that time was still let to Mendel Jakubowicz. For Newel town he collected the taxes on grain, salt, and small beer, as well as the rent on lakes; for *Woytowstro* Zapliskie, the taxes on salt and small beer and the rent on lakes; with two mills in Newel town, with inns at a string of some eighteen villages. Many other facilities were managed by Mendel, for example the quarries at Komsza and Syruckie and a mill at Poplowo. Many other locations

---

299. 2622, 9. The placename occurs also as *Syrokwaszyno*, ‘Damp and acidic’, which is definitely the older form. *Sorokwaszyno* has been contaminated by Russian *soroka*, ‘magpie’; the bird is found *passim* throughout the Nevel’schina.
300. 2622, 19.
301. I.e. ‘I mean’ (this sense is found as early as Cicero; see Lewis and Short, s.v.).
302. Adam Teller writes of the Saxon period that ‘Żydzi nie odrabiali pańszczyny, ale płacili za to często wyższe czynszę’ (‘The Jews did not perform *corvée*, but they did often pay higher rents’). See *Radziwillowie a Żydzi w czasach saskich in Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje*. Ed. A.K. Link-Lenczowski and M. Markiewicz. Kraków, 1999, 151.)
are also named without any facility being mentioned, and these placenames presumably refer to inns.\textsuperscript{303}

The main Jewish population is still to be found at Sukino. The community is expanding, though at no great speed. Jewish residents include Mousza Jakubowicz\textsuperscript{304}, Szaya Jakubowicz\textsuperscript{305} (perhaps relatives of Mendel; Mousza is a version of Moses), Berko Szama\textsuperscript{306} (or Borko Szamesz\textsuperscript{307}), Zelman\textsuperscript{308} or Zeyman Leybowicz,\textsuperscript{309} and Chonom Szlovowicz\textsuperscript{310} (possibly a relative of Jankiel Szlovowicz). The last-mentioned also occurs in a variant ‘Chonon Smolowicz’. Here the given name is more correct, but in the surname there is confusion with Polish \textit{smola}.\textsuperscript{311}

One more resident is referred to as ‘Jankiel Arčaraz Sukina’\textsuperscript{312} or ‘Jankiel Arčaraz Sukina’,\textsuperscript{313} i.e. ‘Jankiel the Publican of Sukino’. This may be the Jankiel Szlovowicz met above. More importantly, Sukino had become important enough to have its own \textit{Arenda}. It should be emphasized that in Commonwealth times Jews were always a small minority of the population of Sukino.

Seven years later, in 1761, there is one new name at Sukino, viz. Ousiey Zelmanowicz,\textsuperscript{314} who was probably the heir of Zelman Leybowicz. If we are right in thinking that Zelman was a son of Leyba Zyd, this is the third generation of Newel Jews. Given the origin of the name Ousiey, a Belorussian variant of Greek \textit{Eδορεβείος ‘pious’ spelt without \textit{akan’je}}, it appears that the custom has arisen of giving Jews an exonym for use among the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{315}

\textsuperscript{303} All these details will be found on p. 13 of 2623/3.
\textsuperscript{304} 2623/1, 41.
\textsuperscript{305} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{306} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{307} 2623/3, 44. This version of the surname is preferable; it derives from the Hebrew segholate noun \textit{šemeš ‘sun’}.
\textsuperscript{308} 2623/1, 42.
\textsuperscript{309} 2623/3, 45. This inventorist heard the [l] as [j], because it was softer than its Polish equivalent in his own idiolect.
\textsuperscript{310} 2623/1, 42.
\textsuperscript{311} 2623/3, 45.
\textsuperscript{312} 2623/1, 41.
\textsuperscript{313} 2623/3, 44.
\textsuperscript{314} 2624, 40.
\textsuperscript{315} This custom survived until very recent times. Pavel Igdalov, an important informant in Michael Rose’s
The religious life of the community, too, has been enhanced at some stage in the last few years, for there is now a miqveh or ritual bathhouse.\textsuperscript{316} It is used for religious purification, for example after menstruation and parturition. Men too have to make ritual ablutions, and in modern times the Nevel' miqveh had a male and a female section\textsuperscript{317}. The early modern bathhouse was very small, occupying five pręciki. The bathhouse is sited in the suburbs of Newel town, in a left-hand turning off ‘Bozdomskiey Ulicy’. In the same street there was another laznia, run by Jan Owsianka. It is likely that there was a handy water supply for both institutions, most probably the River Jemenka itself. It is even possible that both buildings were situated where the laznia was before the Commonwealth took over Newel in 1619.\textsuperscript{318} What is noteworthy about the siting of the Jewish bathhouse is that it is inconvenient for the Jews of Sukino. Its primary clientele, therefore, must have been the Jews of the town, of whom more in the next paragraph. Perhaps Sukino Jews used the ferry service to come to town to use the miqveh, or perhaps they had their own on the lakeshore at Sukino.\textsuperscript{319}

By 1761 a new phenomenon has arisen: a number of Jews are living in Newel town, without paying the exorbitant rent charged Mendel Jakubowicz. They are referred to in the genitive case as ‘Zydow Komornikow’ (‘Jewish roomers’). They pay a tax called powrotne, which is levied at £8 per annum. Their names are not given; probably their landlords and landladies were responsible for collecting and passing on the tax. Thus we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tu Zyd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teodor Minkiewicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szymon Kłypa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piotr Borysowicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podosinowikowa wdowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{316} Nevel’ researches, d. 2008, had the Jewish name Pinchas.
\textsuperscript{317} 2632, 38.
\textsuperscript{318} In the 1920s the miqveh was kept by the parents of the distinguished mathematician Boris Zvijagin.
\textsuperscript{319} 2612, 40: ‘Zamiastem tuz miljny 2. narzecze yminienie zep / sowane odw Yol. browar laznia podzam / kiem’ ‘Just outside the town mills 2. on the River Ymiena spoilt with two wheels, brewery bathhouse below the castle’.
\textsuperscript{320} Since the bathhouse appears in the last inventory, of 1767 (2631/1, 22), it is most probable that the modern bathhouse was on the same site as the early modern version.
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Tegoż po Apanasu
Fiedor Koszko
Janowa Czerepkowa
Zmitrok Bannik
Cierech Bielinski
Michał Popkowski
Karp Micheyko

Zyd
Tu y Zyd
Tu y Zyd
Tu y Zyd
Tu y Zyd
Tu y Zyd
Tu Zyd miej zka

It is worthwhile to correlate those landlords who have a Jewish tenant with their (the landlords') economic position as indicated by the number of their landholdings. This is set out in Table 6.10.

322. 2624, 18.
323. 2624, 20. The association of the bathhouse with a Jew is probably not a coincidence.
324. 2624, 21.
325. 2624, 22.
Table 6.10: Jewish-Gentile Cooperation

The first column shows Nevelers with Jewish tenants in 1761, the second – the same group in 1764. The third column shows the total number of those landlords' landholdings in 1764.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landlords</th>
<th>Landlords</th>
<th>Landholdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teodor Minkiewicz</td>
<td>Teodor Mienkiewicz</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szymon Kłypa</td>
<td>Pilip Kłypa(^{326})</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piotr Borysowicz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podosinowikowa wdowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharyasz Lewoszkiewicz</td>
<td>Zacharyaszowa Leoszkiewiczowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=Tegoż po Apanas)</td>
<td>(=Teyze po Apanas)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiedor Koszko</td>
<td>Fiedor Kaszko</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janowa Czerepkowa</td>
<td>Janowa Czorpakowa</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zmirotok Bannik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cierech Bielinski</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michał Popkowski</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karp Micheyko</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symon Byhowiec</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrey Karpowicz</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piotr Kuneyko</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table needs some explanation. The best record of landlords is found in 1761, although there is a fairly good record in 1764. On the other hand 1764 is by far the best record of individual burghers' landholdings. In all, we have a record of members of fourteen Newel non-Jewish families who let rooms to Jews. In three cases it appears that between the compilations of 1761 and 1764 two landlords have died or become economically inactive:

\(^{326}\) From 2626/1, p. 25, we learn that Filip or Pilip Klipa has two Jewish tenants.
Szymon Klypa is replaced by Pilip Klypa; Zacharyasz Lewoszkiewicz has died, and his widow, known officially as Zacharyaszowa Leoszkiewiczowa,\textsuperscript{327} has replaced him.

Of these fourteen landlords, seven hold no other land. Those seven include two women. One is the widow of a Jan Czerempko (the version Czorpakowa is garbled in a polonized way), and it is likely that she needed the income from a tenant. She contrasts starkly with the other woman in this group, the widow Podosinowikowa. Although she holds no land as such, she is related to Tymofiej Podosinowik, who holds seventeen pieces (see above, Table 6.4). Fiedor Koszko did not hold other land, but he was probably a relative of Gabryel Koszko, who held fourteen pieces of land (see above, Tables 6.2, 6.4). Of the remaining three, Zmitrok Bannik kept a bathhouse, no doubt the main source of his income, while the other two, Cierech Bielinski and Michał Popkowski, are otherwise quite unknown (Michał Popkowski may have come from a priestly family).

As for the seven people who have both multiple landholdings and Jewish tenants, one holds only two pieces of land and another, the widow Leoszkiewiczowa, three. The remainder are more serious landholders. Two of them hold nine pieces each. The rest have from ten to twenty-three pieces each.

Thus the set of all landlords with Jewish tenants falls broadly into two groups: those who are not landholders or who have only trivial holdings, and those who have very significant holdings. What is most noticeable is that the second group consists only of landholders who are not members of landholding families in the sense defined above in connection with Table 6.4. We must therefore ask the question: why does this group of powerful individual landholders let to Jews, while the multiple-landholding families do not? Is there a correlation between being an individual landholder only and being the landlord of a Jewish tenant? And what would such a correlation imply?

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that there is an alliance between Jews and 'non-dynastic' landholders. At first blush one might hypothesize that these landholders were less wealthy than the 'dynastic' landholding families. Letting to incomers might bring additional

\textsuperscript{327} Leoszkiewiczowa in the 1764 inventory lacks the first \textit{<w>} of her late husband's surname.
income, especially if some premium could be squeezed from the tenant, on the model (but hardly on the scale) of the rent that Mendel Jakubowicz was charged. This, I suggest, was probably a minor incentive. These ‘non-dynastic’ landholder-landlords were not paupers looking to make a few extra groszy. Two of them were burgomasters: Teodor Minkiewicz or Mienkiewicz, who was also a brewer and a nobleman;328 and the shopkeeper Symon Bychowiec or Byhowiec, whose father had also been burgomaster. In fact we have plenty of evidence that these individuals actually belonged to families that were bustling and active in the Newel economy. Szymon Kłypa was a merchant329 and a brewer,330 and he had two shops.331 Though Podosinowikowa held no land, Tymofiej Podosinowik had seventeen parcels (see Tables 6.2 and 6.4). He was also a stallholder.332 Bazyl Podosinowik had the town’s only commercial a stable (staynia).333 ‘Podosinowikowa wdowa’ herself, apart from letting to her Jewish tenant, kept one of the group of seven swironki mentioned above,334 as well as three kramy.335

Given that these families were if anything more commerce-minded than the big landowners such as the Zdanko and Rubis families, and more enthusiastic about money-making, it appears that they cooperated with the Jews because it was to their commercial advantage. Probably some at least of the Jewish tenants were distillers. We have no note in the eighteenth century of commercial manufacture of gorzalka. It follows that Newel gorzalka was either produced locally by persons working for the Arendator or imported from elsewhere in the Rzeczpospolita under the Arendator’s auspices. The Arendator would also have needed agents to enforce the Arenda, which entitled the Arendator to take a proportion of all grist; if detected, infractions resulted in the confiscation of all the grist, of which half went to ‘the castle’ and half to the Arendator.336 Private sale of spirits was possible for a fee; infractions led to a fine of B5, i.e. 40, a serious punishment.337

328. 2624, 22 (‘browar’); 36 (‘Burmistrz’); 35 (‘P[an]’).
329. 2624, 17.
330. 2624, 23.
331. 2624, 22.
332. 2624, 17. He is also a brewer (ibid., 38).
333. 2624, 20. ‘This was apparently the only stable run as a business. The castle had its own stables.
334. 2624, 23.
335. 2624, 22.
336. 2631/4, 49, ‘1m6’ (i.e. Primo ‘in the first place’).
337. 2631/4, 49, ‘3tio’ (i.e. Tertio ‘in the third place’).
We should mention that tobacco, too, was part of the Arenda. If a burgher sold tobacco brought from the Ukraine, he or she had to pay złoty 2 to the Arendarz, who at the time (viz. 1763338) was Eliasz Jckowicz (possibly a relative of the barber Berka Jckowicz, mentioned above). ‘[Y] ten tytur razem przedawać Sotniemi y papu / żami pod czas Jermarku lub tez targow pozwałasie’339 (‘and this tobacco may be sold together in sotnie or in packets During the Fair or also during markets’). As David Andress remarks of coffee, ‘Artificial stimulants had as significant a role in late-eighteenth-century urban life as today, and people were just as unwilling to do without them’340 True, Andress was speaking of Paris in the revolutionary period, but the town of Newel was by local standards quite urban, the largest settlement for many miles.

Thus it appears that, while half the families who let to Jewish families did so primarily as a way of making money directly, the other half had chosen to cooperate closely with the Jews, motivated by mutual interest. There are signs that such families used their own ‘business model’. Those families were less dependent on land for their income. We may imagine the heads of such families starting each day with a conference at which tasks are distributed to members of the family and to paid agents. One of those tasks would be liaison with the Arendator and his agents.

In the last inventory, of 1767, there are signs of a further extension of Jewish economic activity. One of these is to be found in the unexpected fact that the inventorist could not lay hands on a copy of the Arenda, because the Arendarz Eliasz Jckowicz was away. So the requisite information was gathered ‘z Swiadectwa Zyda Omana Ziędia Eliaza Jckowicza [...] także z Swiadectwa Dziesiątnikow Włoscińskich Newelskich...’341 (‘from the Testimony of the Jew Oman Son-in-law of Eliaz Jckowicz [...] also from the Testimony of the Newel Rural Dziesztnicy’). The inventorist shows tangible respect for Newel Jews (a) by his willingness to accept Oman’s word for what he remembered of the details of the Arenda and (b) by his assumption that it was perfectly reasonable to ask Commonwealth

---

338. The inventory in question, 2631/4 (full reference below), dates from 1766, but makes reference to an earlier agreement of 1763 covering the tobacco trade.
339. 2631/4, 51, article 7.
341. 2631/1, 47.
office-holders, albeit very minor ones, to give an account of the activities of their non-Christian Arendarz.

Another indication of the growing importance of Jews in Newel is a note of the residence of one ‘Janko Popczonek Bobyl w Chacie Jsaka / Zyda Monosa’\textsuperscript{342} Browar’.\textsuperscript{343} If the noun-cases are correct, this means ‘Janko Popczonek Bachelor, Brewer, in the Cabin of Jsak the Jew Monos’, inasmuch as Bobyl and Browar are both nominative, so that we cannot very well assign the older meaning ‘landless peasant’ to the word Bobyl. If we emend Browar to Browara, the meaning would be ‘Janko Popczonek Landless Peasant in the Cabin of Jsak the Jew Monos, the Brewer’. Clearly the latter version is easier to understand: Jsac Monos is a brewer and he has let a cabin to a landless peasant. However, rather intimate acquaintance with the inventories has given me the strong impression that, although mistakes and slips of all kinds occur in the inventories passim, case-errors are extremely rare, to the point where I have not made a single case-emendation in any citation used in this thesis. Thus it appears that an unmarried brewery-trade worker finds it acceptable to rent from a Jew, as eight Jews have found it acceptable for years past to rent from the Goyim.

Thus in the course of the eighteenth century a moving picture flickers before us, in which we are witnesses to the establishment of a small but flourishing Jewish community. In time that community establishes its own synagogue with chazan, its kahilla and miqveh. Over the same period there is growing Jewish participation in the Newel economy and growing cooperation between Newel Jews and leading Newel Christian businesspeople. We should, however, emphasize the small size of the community, which cannot have greatly exceeded a hundred souls by the end of Commonwealth rule. Beyond doubt it is the relatively late establishment of a Jewish presence that inhibited its growth, and that in turn doubtless resulted from Newel’s exposed position on the border. There were anti-Jewish outrages when Ivan IV conquered Polock, as there were during the Thirteen Years War,\textsuperscript{344} and only bolder spirits were prepared to settle so close to Russia. The Newel Jewish community becomes fully established only after the end of Russian military incursions.\

\textsuperscript{342} For what it is worth, we may note that there was a Jewish Monosov family in Newel’ in the 1920s.  
\textsuperscript{343} 2631/1, 15.  
\textsuperscript{344} See Frost, The Northern Wars, 185, where the author notes that Jews took up arms against Muscovites. He also mentions massacres and other forms of mistreatment against many other groups as well.
We shall now deal briefly with an aspect of Newel’s business life that exemplifies such cooperation and extends its Christian dimension into the prelacy. Curiously, this commercial venture will also lead us into a discussion of high culture in Newel life, to the limited extent to which it can be reconstructed.

At least during the middle decades of the century, and probably both earlier and later, Newel took part in the Baltic timber trade. The earliest record of the trade that I have found is in an archive other than AR XXV, namely AR XX 80. There is a file containing a small group of documents in a file, AR XX 80, which is inscribed ‘Rachunki pieniężne i towarowe’ s. handlu masztami z purecz siębięskiej i newelskiej, prowadzonego w Rydze przez Jakuba Dowbora plenipotenta radziwiłłowskiego 1745 1746 (‘Reckonings monetary and in kind from the trade in masts from the riversides of Siebież and Newel, conducted [i.e. the trade] at Riga by Jakub Dowbor or Dowbar, treasurer of Polock and plenipotentiary of [Prince] Radziwiłł’). However, the cover of the first document, which has been folded to make a booklet, takes us back one more year: ‘Aufsztag’ na Sprzeda / rze Maszty w Rydze w Roku 1744 przez / pą Dowbara (‘[Account] for sales of Mast-pine in Riga in the year 1744 by Pan Dowbar’). The

---

345. British students and academics may remember that they owe a certain debt to Riga and its wood trade. The scholar Isaiah Berlin’s father was a timber merchant there.
346. The letter in question, which is followed by a full stop, is perhaps an upper-case <P> or <p>. The <s> is the word ‘from’, devouched because of the following /h/ (<d> is not [y] here).
347. AR XX 80, file envelope.
348. At the first mention the reference is definitely to Polock (AR XX 80, p. 3), but thereafter, e.g. at p. 10, p. 12, the documents mention Plock, which is much farther away, in Poland proper. The documents were probably compiled by a borderlander, who was much more familiar with Polock than with Plock.
349. The best interpretation of this ‘word’ is as German Aufzug, ‘account’ (indeed, the account for 1746 has ‘Auszug’ (AR XX 80, p. 14)). Pan Dowbar, who was evidently responsible for these accounts, may have associated the word with the prefix Auf and the noun Stück ‘piece, item’, and perhaps also with Aufstieg ‘ascent, anabasis’. This last would show a telling preoccupation with Riga as regional centre. Mazurzenie will also have played a part. We shall see below that Dowbar confused the sounds /ç/ (German <ç>) and /s/ (German <sch>), also <s> before <p>, <t>.
350. AR XX 80, cover (‘2’). The left-hand inner page is numbered ‘3’, the right-hand – ‘1’.
351. Mast-pine, also called Riga pine, a variety of Pinus sylvestris, has an undivided trunk long enough to form the lower mainmast of a seagoing ship. It is still plentiful in Newel district, for example at Kanašovo, the old Žukovskij estate. The bark is of a vivid red, and the tree has only a small crown of dark needles very high up. The cutting of pine for shipbuilding was associated with many superstitions and magical practices: see Reet Naber, Lucky Voyage! Old Beliefs Met With in Shipbuilding in Folk Belief Today, ed. Mare Kõiva and Kai Vassiljeva. Tartu, 1995. 334-345.
earliest date mentioned is 15 May of that year, when, Dowbar notes, ‘Gotowemi Panu Korzeniewskiemu Burmi,, / strzowi Newelskiemu wyliczyłem na expens,, / sa Towarow 200..’ (= In Cash to Pan Korzeniewski the Burgomaster of Newel I have paid out for costs of Goods 200..’). Later documents in the same file do indeed concern the Splay in 1745 and 1746.

That was not the end of the trade, however, for it is noted in two inventories of 1761 that ‘Lasy do Słapwu Ryskiego w Woytostwach 2 u JWJP Hilzena’352 (‘Forests for the Riga Splay in 2 Woytowstwa are in the possession of His Highness His Nobility Hilzen’).353 It is not clear whether this was Bishop Hylzen of Smoleńsk or perhaps his brother Jan. What is clear is that the Hylzen family was connected to the Newel splay because Jerzy was the bishop and had identified the opportunity.

The value of the trade was very considerable. In 1744 the income from floated timber of all sizes and kinds was B2065–gr45.354 In 1745 the income rose to B3250. In 1746 the income rose again. The third account gives useful details of income and expenditure, and it is also possible to extract some account of life on the water network and beside it as Pan Dowbar accompanied the timber to Riga and then rode back. We shall therefore dwell on it a little.

Expenses specified for that year include payments for nine steersmen: ‘Zaplaty Kornikom 9. kazdemu z 12 Molodyam’355 a po Talarow 36 Facit [B]324356 (‘Payments to Steersmen 9 to each with 12 strapping fellows357 and at Thalers 36 Facit [‘it makes’] [B]324’). This is a substantial workforce, numbering 117 men in all. They travelled via

---

352. 2624. 21.
353. The variant in 2632 reads: ‘Lasy do Słapwu Ryskiego w Woytostwach 2 • co w J W³o Jm. P. Hilzena w Poj se [y]i’, where the second <w> is a localism for u (w J W³o Jm. P. Hilzena = u Jego Wielkości Jego mości Pana Hilzena).
354. AR XX 80, p. 1 (the third ‘page’ of this folded sheet, but so numbered).
355. From Russian molodeam, nominative singular molodec. For the intrusion of -y- (= modern Polish -j-) cf. Polish ojiec versus Russian otec.
356. AR XX 80, p. 18.
357. The ‘strapping fellows’ were probably not local. A.P. Grickevič notes in Častovladel'českije goroda Belorussii, 83, that in the eighteenth century some towns had resident ‘plotogony’ (‘raft-chasers’), but none such are noted at Newel.
‘Dynoburk’\(^{358}\) (Dvinsk, modern Daugavpils).\(^{359}\) Had we been on the bank as they travelled, we might have heard some of their special language flying to and fro: \textit{na bakier!} (= a-pect, to the left); \textit{na sztiber!} (to starboard, to the right); \textit{bierz mocko!} (turn her about), \textit{odłóż!} (stop).\(^{360}\)

There is mention of nine rafts and their ‘Aparamenta’: apparently each team had its own raft. Other craft in use with the timber flotilla were ‘czolny szkulki’, sculling boats, number not specified, cost \(\textbf{B}13\text{-}gr5\).\(^{361}\)

Extra help was needed ‘No Porohy Kryeborskie’ (‘For the Kryebor[g?] Rapids’, reading \textit{No} as \textit{Na}): ‘naymując tamęcznych lu / dzi do przeprowadzenia do kazdego Płyta po / Ludzi 4 a po \textbf{B}2 gr15 Kazdemu Talarow 9’. Simply to negotiate the cataracts added a considerable sum to the costs. \textit{Pan} Dowbar had to pay his own transport costs: ‘Na Swoy Expens do Rygi z ludzmi y konmi nay / mnieszey rzeczy nie mąaić z Zamku na niedziel / trzy Talarow 15’\(^{362}\) (‘At My Own Expense to Riga with men and horses not having the least thing from the Castle for sunday[s] three Thalers 15’).

There was also a payment to the government of Riga on presentation of a bill from ‘cłła Rosienskiego’,\(^{364}\) i.e. for customs. Other personnel included two ‘Szafarzy’ (supervisors) and two watchmen to guard the rafts at Riga. Money was spent on beer for them\(^{365}\).

From these and other hints we can give the following picture of the life of Dowbar and his numerous labour force on the trail and in Riga. Mast-pine was felled in quantity in

\(^{358}\) AR XX 80, p. 18.
\(^{359}\) It is worth noting that the mid-century holder of Newel, Hieronim Floryan Radziwiłł (as he is named in Newel inventories), founded not only a private army but also a private inland naval flotilla. \textit{See Hieronima Floriana Radziwilla Diariusze}, ed. Brzezina, 8.
\(^{360}\) See the collected works of the remarkable scholar Oskar Kolberg: \textit{Dziela wszystkie}, Tom 52. Białoruś-Polesie. Wrocław-Poznań, 1968 77.
\(^{361}\) AR XX 80, p. 18.
\(^{362}\) AR XX 80, p. 19.
\(^{363}\) This is most probably a Russianism: \textit{nedelja} ‘week’.
\(^{364}\) AR XX 80, p. 19
\(^{365}\) AR XX 80, p 20.
wintertime. Some part in this was played by ‘Mędel Dyspozytorz Newelski’,\textsuperscript{366} i.e. Mendel Jakubowicz, who needed to pay his rent, and by Abram Siebieski, i.e. the Jewish Arendator of Siebież. With the thaw the timber was put into Newel watercourses linking to the River Dwina (Zapadnaja Dvina, Daugava). Nine teams, each of thirteen people, grouped the logs into masses directed from nine rafts. A number of sculling boats could be used for additional tasks on the water, including liaison between the teams. When the timber convoy reached Livonia, they passed through customs control. On the rapids local guides were recruited. When the expedition arrived in Riga the timber was stored and guarded – stored, most probably, in the water, since there is an item for ferry costs for two supervisors to the rafts at the islands (presumably in the lagoon on the landward side of Jurmala). Pan Dowbor\textsuperscript{a} remained in Riga for four-and-a-half weeks, and for one of those weeks his men and horses also remained.\textsuperscript{367} During this time the timber was gradually sold, through the good offices of the Newelers’s local partner in Riga, Röttger Bekker.\textsuperscript{368} Numerous reports were sent home, and at some cost (\textbf{B}1–gr\textbf{7}½; each despatch cost 35 shillings to send) [precise].

Post was but one of the administrative costs incurred by the Newel timber expedition. Much more significant, it appears, were payments for customs and for passports. These three items together surpassed \textbf{B}315,\textsuperscript{369} so that postage constituted a relatively trivial sum. To clarify our picture we need firstly to ask what is meant by the phrase ‘Na Cla’. \textit{Clo} is defined as ‘payment for the import and export of goods across frontiers’.\textsuperscript{370} Boryś does not specify whether such payment is necessarily official, and it is clear that Pan Dowbar’s relations with the customs authorities were ambiguous. As evidence we shall cite in the first place the following passage:

\begin{quote}
Za Skło w lucie Kalibockiey dla J:O:Xiecia Imci / Dołhorukiego vice Gubernatora Ryskiego za Protek / cyą y Ochronę przesco Płytw w Porohach Kurlan\textsuperscript{r} / kych y Inflanskich na ktorzych od innych Hand /luacych brano po
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{366} AR XX 80, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{367} AR XX 80, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{368} AR XX 80, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{369} AR XX 80, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{370} ‘Opłata od przywozu i wywozu towarów przez granice’ (Wiesław Boryś, \textit{Etymological Dictionary}), p. 86, s.v. \textit{clo}. 
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Talerow kilkadziesiąt a Ja / nic nie Zapłacił ni przeszłego Roku ani teraz / zate na Przysługę Zapłaściłem Talarow 10 – –371

Before offering a translation we need to point out two difficulties. One is the word Skło. This form is attested from the fourteenth century onwards as a by-form of szkło.372 We cannot conclude, however, that Dowbor paid ten thalers for broken windows in a smelting plant. We know that Dowbor had difficulty with the German loanword Aufzug, which in 1744 he represented as Aufzrug, to be interpreted as [auf] tuk or even [aufstuk], given that Dowbar seems to speak with a degree of mazurzenie. If in that case he heard [e] as [j] or [s], I suggest that he had a similar problem with the word clo. As for the ‘smelting plant’, huta is German loanword deriving from Hütte,373 and I suggest that the German sense of ‘cabin’ is here attested. These prolegomena made, we may now translate:

For Customs at the cabin [= customs post] at Kaliboka [?] for His Highness the Prince His Grace Dolhoruki374 vice-governor of Riga for Protection and Guarding of the passage of the Rafts at the Rapids of Courland and Livonia, at which from others Trading there is taken several tens of Thalers whereas I have Paid nothing either last Year or this for these for the Favour I have paid Thalers 10.

The general import of this is clear. Dowbor has saved the Radziwills a considerable sum by paying a bribe of B10.

If Dowbor paid so trivial an amount for the complaisance of customs officials, it follows that by far the greater part of his expenditure on bureaucratic services went on passports – about B300. It appears likely that every single member of the party had his own document, so that the tradition of official pettyfogging on this border, which now divides Russia and Latvia (I speak of what I know) is at least two-and-a-half centuries old.

371. AR XX 80, p. 20.
373. This is the only sense mentioned by Boryš (Wiesław Boryš, Etymological Dictionary), p. 197, s.v. huta). Note the very early (from the fourteenth century onwards) Polish association of Germans with technology. 374. <Dolhoruki> is the Polish way of writing Russian Dolgorukij.
The return journey to Newel and Siebież also presented opportunities for the true entrepreneur, as opposed to ‘others trading’. One of the largest sources of income from the expedition is listed as money ‘Za Utajone Towary’ (‘For Concealed Goods’), in other words, for contraband. The sum in question was over 663, almost 4000 at the then-current exchange rate. Dowbor the smuggler had a certain right to self-congratulation: thanks to this single coup he saved more than twice as much as he had spent on official papers and procedures.

We need to place this account of the annual Newel-Siebież expedition to Riga in its physical context. Near the beginning of its course the convoy would at times have been strung out over several miles of territory, because of the narrowness of the waterways. Crossing some of the larger lakes, on the other hand, would have entailed careful use of the rafts and sculling-boats. In the evening, as the members of the workforce ate easily prepared food (e.g. dried ryebread, buckwheat porridge, perhaps fresh fish), they received the attentions of that north Eurasian plague, the mosquito.

There remains one more detail about the timber expeditions to be considered. This will be found in the next and final section of the present chapter, where we shall consider the question of high culture in Newel’s eighteenth century.

Beforehand, however, we ought to mention that by the 1760s Newel was a noted centre of smuggling (indeed, it was no doubt always such a centre). A report of July 1765 to the Lithuanian Treasury Commission describes the legitimate places where traders might cross the Russian-Commonwealth frontier, but adds (we cite a Russian translation\textsuperscript{375}): ‘Однако купцы обычаи как летом, так и зимой проходяят тайком, обходя таможни, а также таможенной пункты, но городов Nevelia i Sebeža obojti ne mogut’\textsuperscript{376} (‘However, merchants usually pass by, winter and summer, in secret, avoiding customs, and also the customs posts, but the towns of Newel and Siebież they cannot avoid’). There were customs posts among other places at Sokolniki and Pupowiczy. However, the confident assertion that

\textsuperscript{375} The full text, in Russian translation, will be found on pp. 348-353 of Belorussija v époxe feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al.

\textsuperscript{376} Ibid., 348.
Newel cannot be avoided by the smugglers is belied by a subsequent heading, 'Specification of forms of foreign overseas goods smuggled through the aforementioned frontier places between Newel and Siebieź'.\textsuperscript{377} The twenty-one categories include 'copper and steel in sheets – banned goods', iron from Siberia and Demidovo, iron cooking pans, tea, wax, tallow, furs of many kinds (including sable, bear, and albino wolf), rolls of nankeen cloth, and fish, even zander\textsuperscript{378}. The smuggling of goods via the Dvina is mentioned specifically.\textsuperscript{379}  

Brickmaking, as is well known, requires straw. When we consider the topic of high culture in eighteenth-century Newel, we must largely dispense also with clay. We have only the faintest traces to interpret. Can we answer the question 'How stood the arts?'?

There was a relatively long tradition of goldsmithery in Newel. It is first recorded in 1712, although its presence may have antedated that year. At the time one Leon Karpowicz Złotnik is registered as living in the street known as 'VLICA IDAC NA PLAC POPISOWY OD TEYZE BRAMY IAHOROWSKIEY PO PRAWEY STRONIE'\textsuperscript{380} ('STREET GOING TO THE PARADE-GROUND FROM THIS SAME IAHOROWSKA GATEWAY ON THE RIGHT-HAND SIDE'), i.e. just outside the town pale to the southeast and close to the northern shore of Lake Newel. This denotes some confidence, probably misplaced, in the military security of Newel. No other details are given. The patronymic 'Karpowicz' makes it perfectly clear that 'Złotnik' is a profession, not a surname. It may possibly mean that Leon followed his father in a family business. Four decades later, in 1754, there is definitely a dynasty of goldsmiths in Newel, for there is a reference to 'Kuzma Złotnik ... Anton Złotnik'.\textsuperscript{381} That Anton was probably Kuzma’s son may be the implication of the fact that in 1764 Anton Złotnik was still resident,\textsuperscript{382} but there is no trace of Kuzma. The succession

\textsuperscript{377} Ibid., 349.  
\textsuperscript{378} Smuggling zander to Newel is an example of smuggling coals to Newcastle.  
\textsuperscript{379} Belorussija v époxu feodalizma, ed. Azarov et al., 349.  
\textsuperscript{380} 2619/1, 36.  
\textsuperscript{381} 2623/1, 14.  
\textsuperscript{382} 2626/1, 35.
of an old-fashioned East Slav name and the ambiguous name Anton, which can be taken as Orthodox or Catholic.

However, by the date of the second entry concerning Anton, another Newel goldsmith had appeared. This was ‘Alexander Zdanko Zlotnik’, mentioned in 1761. This is noteworthy, firstly because it implies that there was work for two goldsmiths in Newel. They need not necessarily have been rivals; they may have been business partners. It is also highly significant that Alexander belonged to the preeminent Newel Zdanko family. One may wonder whether he served his time with old Kuzma or journeyed afar to learn his trade, to a larger centre, such as Połock or even Wilno. Payment for indentures, livelihood during his apprenticeship, and later the capitalization of his business or buying into (Kuzma’s?) Anton’s firm, – all this was very expensive, and possible only for one of the richest Newel families.

Goldsmiths’ costs in general must have been very high. The raw materials, gold and precious or (more probably) semiprecious stones, are not cheap at the top of the mineshaft. No significant gold deposits were exploited within the Commonwealth. Some stones may have come from the Carpathians, at the far end of the state from Newel. Amber from the Lithuanian coast should have been relatively inexpensive, but we must remember the myto, the tax on the transportation of goods. Thus jewellery for the person, even a plain gold ring, must have been, relatively, extremely expensive, and larger pieces even more so. We lack any other evidence for conclusions a posteriori. We do not know, for example, whether the Newel goldsmiths could make or even repair watches or other timepieces. Yet it is clear that there was a market, and this must have consisted in the main of members of the leading Newel burgher-families, not only Alexander’s relatives but also the Rubis, Atroszczonek, Komkowicz and Kliypa families and others. There may have been some demand for ecclesiastical metalwork, such as icon-covers, which are used in Orthodox homes in the ‘fair corner’, the family shrine. We can be fairly sure that the nobles who inhabited or visited the castle ordered their jewellery elsewhere. Yet Newel was not without a clientele who appreciated beautiful (or perhaps ostentatious) objects.

383. 2624, 32.
We can be sure, too, that fine art, painting, was not unknown in Newel. Here is a
description of the main room in the Newel courthouse in 1761:

...w Izbie [...] na Scienie Portretow JO X’cia Jms’ci Chorazego JOXiczny
Jfiscy Neyburskiey Dwa...

...in the House [...] on the Wall of Portraits of His Highness the Prince His
Grace the Standard-Bearer [and] of Her Highness the Princess of Neuburg
Two [i.e. portraits]...

Whose portraits are these? They are probably not a pair. The obvious ‘candidate’ for the
male is Prince Hieronym Florian, who was indeed Standard-Bearer of Lithuania. The
Princess, however, is not his wife Teresa née Sapieha. Nor is it his wife Magdalena née
Czapska. Nor is it his wife Angelika née Miączyńska. None of these ladies was Princess of
Neuburg. Most probably this is a portrait of a much earlier forebear, namely Princess
Elżbieta Augusta,

We have here a yoking together of high art with politics, a syzygy well known to historians,
regretted sometimes by aesthetes, but familiar at least since the time of Mæcenas, Vergil and
Augustus. Everyone brought before the majesty of the law in Newel found themselves
followed round the room by the eyes, not of King Stanislaw August Poniatowski, but of the
head of the Nieświąż Radziwiłłs and a previous, female, owner of the Neuburg possessions.
This is a measure of the weakness of the monarchy eleven years before the First Partition.

We can offer one more glimpse of the graphic arts in eighteenth-century Newel. In
one of the last inventories, 2631/4,\textsuperscript{384} we find the only image in thousands of pages of
inventory entries (see the coloured illustration at the end of this chapter). Those pages, as we
may hope to have shown, yield quantities of useful knowledge to the historian; yet they may
on occasion be susceptible to the charge of a certain relative (disons le mot) dullness.

\textsuperscript{384}. It is unnumbered; it follows the title page and precedes p. 1. I am extremely grateful to the authorities at
the Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych for agreeing to provide me with an electronic image made directly from
the original.
Readers who have placed the author in their debt by following him through the extensive thickets of those pages deserve more than the slender reward of being shown the image in question; but at least that much they have deserved.

It is a hand-coloured woodcut print,\textsuperscript{385} or rather a fragment of one, made up of lively black lines. It shows three ladies dancing. The print is framed by another piece of paper. As I surmise, this ‘framing’ paper is the title page of the inventory. It appears that the inventorist was interested in the print primarily to stiffen the title page. Yet he was interested in the print for itself: the frame has been carefully nudged to make visible the whole face of the lady at the far left of the composition as we have it. All three women are looking leftwards, with large, expressive eyes, perhaps to a dancing master or musician, or another group of dancers; they have small, full-lipped mouths that smile prettily. With her right hand, the woman in the middle (B) holds the left hand of the woman at left (A); with her left hand, B holds the right hand of the woman at right (C). But the left hand of C is at her waist, which shows that on that side the composition is complete. The whole is splendidly realized, so that one might easily imagine another group of three looking to the right.

The three ladies wear low cylindrical headdresses, which, however, do not completely cover their dark curls. Their skirts reach almost to the ground. Their feet are just visible, in geometric shoes. Two of the women (A, C) wear something like sarafans over their dresses; the one in the middle (B) has a lighter-coloured skirt and a tighter bodice. All have sashes, and there is much evidence of pleats, patterns and textures represented by cross-hatching, stripes, and the like. The composition is enhanced by two rose-bushes of ‘standard’ habit. These appear in the gaps ‘between’ the three women, but are to be imagined as being farther than them from the viewer. The foreground is occupied by a number of flowered hillocks.

\textsuperscript{385} I have not been able to examine the image personally. I believe that it is a print because of certain breaks in the continuity of lines, e.g. in the flowers at the ladies’ feet. This is the result of the paper not having been hammered home onto the block hard enough. On the other hand it must have been an early ‘pull’ in the run. Later copies of a woodcut show wearing of the image, so that the grain of the wood comes through. Further, there is no sign of running where colour has been applied over the black lines. This shows that the printer’s ink had had ample time to dry. Black waterpaint would have run when the other two colours were applied.
The two colours used on the print are indigo and madder (two shades that have their own unique places in the eternal history of globalization). It may be worth recalling that a coloured print usually, and here too, takes advantage of the colour of the blank paper, which we shall prosaically call ‘white’, and of the black ink of the basic woodcut printing process, so that we are in fact dealing with four colours. Madder is used for the hats and shoes of all three; otherwise the two colours are used for various elements of the three women’s costumes. It is noteworthy that much of the colouring, particularly in the lower third of the print, occupies whole fields, rather than being kept within the bounds of the black lines. This technique was regarded as bold and even controversial when introduced in western Europe by Raoul Dufy in the twentieth century.

We may enquire further whether it is possible to determine in what kind of dance the ladies are participating. Here we are helped by the fact that the print is inscribed. The inscription reads ‘ЗОЛЕСКІЙТАНЕЦЬ’ (‘ЗОЛЕСКІЙТАНЕЦЬ’). This is not hard to interpret. If we add a single vertical line at left and divide the whole into two, we have the two words ‘ВОЛЕСКІЙ ТАНЕЦЬ’ (‘ВОЛЕСКІЙ ТАНЕЦЬ’), or in a modernized version ‘ВОЛЕСКІЙ ТАНЕЦ’ (‘ВОЛЕСКІЙ ТАНЕЦ’), i.e. ‘WALLACHIAN DANCE’.

On balance it appears likely that the print, which may have come from an album presenting different aspects of life in the Commonwealth, turned up in Newel by chance and was used functionally to stiffen the title page of the inventory. However, that it was left exposed seems to tell us that the inventorist appreciated the image for its vernacular beauty.  

We turn lastly to the question of high musical culture in Newel in the eighteenth century. We have already mentioned the organist who played in the Catholic church. We do not know his name, nor can we say exactly how long he stayed in Newel. The

---

386. I considered the idea that ‘Zacharyasz Lewoszkiewicz Malarz’ painted pictures rather than walls (for him see 2624, p. 18, of December 1761). On reflection I concluded that Lewoszkiewicz, noted also as a brewer, was probably an artisan rather than an artist. Both he and his widow have been mentioned above.

387. My best endeavours have turned up no literary reference to Newel before the nineteenth century. There is a story in Jan Barszczewski’s Szlachcic Zawalnia (see previous chapter).
tradition of organ music lasted into the twentieth century, disappearing more or less at the time of the October Revolution.

There is one other testimony to musical life in and around Newel in the eighteenth century. When, in 1746, Pan Dowbar was in Riga dealing with the sale of Newel timber, he incurred the following two items of expenditure:

**Marty 5**

Gotowemi przez Jeomi Pana Szyca 14 66
Muzykantowi Ottowi płacono
Jeszcze przez JM Pana Szyca
temuz Muzykantowi płacono 3 __388

(March 5

In cash through His Grace Pan Szyc 14 66
to the Musician Otto paid
In addition through H[is] G[race] Pan Szyc 3 –
to the same Musician paid)

Thus far there is no clear Newel connection, except insofar as Pan Dowbar was plenipotentiary to Prince Radziwiłł. It appears that Mr Szyc obtained the services of Otto the musician to entertain Dowbar and the musician's fee was paid to Otto through Szyc. The amount of money (in thalers) is notable. At least two occasions are mentioned, and there is a considerable discrepancy between the two fees; most probably the payment of three thalers represents a single performance or evening of play, and the earlier entry perhaps five performances. The payment is entered in the account and is therefore clearly above board. Hence the prince, the final paymaster, must have felt that this was a legitimate cost. Possibly

---

388. AR XX 80, p. 12 (the left-hand side of the sheet in question; the right-hand side, confusingly enough, is p. 11). The same item is repeated on p. 15 (left-hand side of that sheet; the right-hand side is 13).
Pan Dowbar spent some time entertaining Röttger Bekker and other Rigan contacts and business partners, including Sycz.

But there is also a final entry concerning the same musician. Although unfortunately no fee is show, we do at least learn (approximately) what instrument he played:

Klawicymbaliscie Ottenowi w Rydze y z Newla do
Słucka na drogę z brytanami

To the clavecine player Otten in Riga and from Newel to
Sluck for the road with the mastiffs[.]

Otto or Otten is clearly a Riga German, and he plays an instrument based on a harp-shaped array of strings plucked with quills, which in turn are operated by a keyboard. The harpsichord, with its two manuals, would be too large for use on campaign, so this was probably something smaller, a clavichord or a clavecine. As a German and probably a Protestant, his repertoire may well have included J.S. Bach’s keyboard music. Otto seems to have travelled, unpaid by the Radziwiłł estate, from Riga to Newel. Possibly he had business in Newel or on the way. At Newel Jakub Dowbar was no doubt the guest of the governors and invited them to listen to the performance of the Riga virtuoso, perhaps with a few other members of the Newel szlachta, such as Pan Teodor Minkiewicz, and the parish priest, who longs for a proper church, and his own organist...

We can say, then, that in eighteenth-century Newel the arts were not a dominant presence, but something that might appear from time to time and then disappear. Goldsmithing was a relatively early arrival; shortly after the construction of the Catholic church, religious organ music became a permanent part of Newel Catholic life. Painting was scarcely known, though we may suspect that there were icons in the Orthodox churches.

---

389. AR XX 80, p. 25 (by position; the page is actually unnumbered).
390. The church at Plissy has an eighteenth-century icon of the Virgin, but it is unsure when it was acquired.
He then accompanied Dowbar on a journey from Newel to Sluck, which town is well
to the south of Minsk\textsuperscript{391} (we saw at the beginning of this chapter that there was a major
Radziwiłł fortress at Sluck). The musician’s role must have been to divert Pan Dowbar in the
evenings during the journey. Every morning Otto must have supervised the packing of his
instrument and seen it stowed safely with the baggage; kept his eye on it during the day’s
journey; and unloaded and unwrapped it for his evening’s performance, in a Karczma or a
goscinny Dom, or perhaps in some official house or even a castle.

Dowbar, tired not only from a day spent travelling but also from the months of
exertion during the Splat, calls on Otto to play. A musician of German culture and a
troubled master – we may imagine that Otto plays the sarabande that begins the Goldberg
Variations. Dowbar stares into the fire. His reflections are gloomy, for surely he can see that
the future promises the Commonwealth little good. Otto’s expert fingers move over the
white and black keys, now slow for the stately theme, now at dizzying speed in the
variations, headlong, breakneck. The music hurries forward as the Commonwealth hurtles
towards dissolution. One of the two great dogs lolls before the fire; the other sits with his
head on the treasurer’s knee, staring at him with lugubrious obsidian eyes, until the last note
of the returning sarabande dies and silence arouses Dowbar from his sombre meditation. A
splinter crackles, and one of the dogs starts to keen.

The loom of partition is just beyond the horizon. Newel will become Nevel’. Not a dog will
bark.

\textsuperscript{391} Stuck was an important Radziwiłł residence, with an important fortress, and this may have been why
Dowbar visit the town. He may have been delivering the mastiffs to the Neurgung Nimrod, Hieronim Florian.
CONCLUSION: THE MADDER MOON

It's gone, the household's time of toil,
under the cross, Dafydd; good was the custom.

Dafydd ap Gwilym (fl. 1340-1370), The Ruin\(^1\)

\(^{1}\) Aeth taln o waeth y teulu,
Dafydd, â chroes; da foes fu.

Dafydd ap Gwilym, Yr Adfail

Gwaith Dafydd ap Gwilym, golygyd gan Thomas Parry, Caderdd, 1979. p. 381
At the beginning of our expedition through the past of Nevel' we set ourselves certain tasks. Apart from more specific aims, we set out to encompass the following:

1. To launch Nevel' as a specific topic of scholarship. This would require us
2. To recreate a living picture of Nevel' in the past.
3. To explore the use of toponymy, and specifically of settlement names, as a tool to date the naming of the landscape, and if possible to move back the 'horizon' of the historical period;
4. to discover the reasons for the rise in the relative importance of Nevel' during the sixteenth century and its continuance in the seventeenth;
5. to use linguistic information to deepen our knowledge of Nevel', for example by examining the linguistic anomalies in the Radziwiłł inventories;
6. to consider the importance of unimportant towns;
7. to estimate the degree of change experienced in Nevel' during our period.

We hope that the reader will already feel that some or all of these pledges have been redeemed. In this Conclusion we shall attempt, to an extent, to put the dot on the i,\(^2\) as the Russian saying runs.

\(Da\ foes\ fu\): good was the custom. Thus the ruined house to Dafydd ap Gwilym in the mid-fourteenth century, as both look back to a time before plague and famine despoiled their country. Dafydd had known the house of old, for inside he had lain in the arms of a lovely girl.\(^3\) We have often seen Nevel'-Newel similarly destroyed, despoiled and burned over the

\(^2\) The reference is to the old \textit{i desjateriẽnoje}, Cyrillic \textless i\textgreater, which we have transliterated as \textless i\textgreater.

centuries. Can we say of the way of life thus periodically ravaged, 'Good was the custom'? What can we say, for and against?

The pros are in the prosaic. For a healthy person of sound bodily strength, life in early Nevel' was, we may surmise, as good as could be had in northern Europe, for example in the middle of the first millennium of the common era. We are speaking of a couple of dozen people who could farm cleared land with the technology of their day. That required hard physical labour, but it must have been deeply satisfying to see the change from forest to rock-strewn scrub, from scrub to a home field to be fertilized with manure from the homesteaders' few animals. They may have used the slash-and-burn technique that survived to the end of the nineteenth century in Aunis Karjala (Olonec Karelia).

We saw in Chapter Two that a lot can be told about life in the areas where Finn met Balt by looking at the loanwords that entered the Baltic Finnic languages from Baltic. They spoke of a meeting between hunters and fisherfolk on the one side with early agriculturalists on the other. That mixed way of life (attested also by the signs of intermarriage inherent in the family loanwords) is not at variance with evidence from Chapter One.

No apology is made for the failure of our attempt in Chapter One to push back our knowledge of Nevel' by examining village names. We might have discovered dozens of early Baltic Finnic names. The fact that we did not, and that the village names are on the whole so very late, make it clear that the sixteenth century represents a period of intensive Muscovite settlement in the Nevel' area. Previous inhabitants were probably fewer in number. Any surviving Finns among them were quickly marginalized (we remember the pustosze with Finnic names) or absorbed. Let us hope that nothing worse befell them. As for the local East Slavs, they had at least a common language and religion with the conquerors.  

4. When Nevel' and Polock came under Lithuanian rule, Moscow was a distant and not yet a very important town, so that nationalist notions of Nevel' being 'gathered' will not stand scrutiny. Polock was only in a restricted sense part of the Kievan superpolity.
We must remember, too, that we were able to say something of sixteenth-century Nevelers’ sense of humour, with its ticklings and its teasing of the crook-nosed and the facially hirsute. That redeemed a question from our Introduction.

Our failure in Chapter One was, then, a great success, and that technique can be thoroughly recommended as a way of attempting to retrieve a palimpsest loaded with information. In other contexts it would certainly have found evidence of the previous population; for example, to the east of the Welsh border many place-names testify to the previous (to the absorbed) population.

In Chapter Two, by contrast, we were able not only to establish systematically that Baltic Finnic people once lived in the Nevel' area, but also that they were a relic population of the Häme, who figure much in early Rus' records. The strength of the argument here was its structured nature. Firstly, Lake Nevan was part of a navigational route, and Nevel' was the ‘place of the neva’. This presented the opportunity to unmask a fraud of Russian nationalism (unconscious, no doubt), namely Lake Bol’soj Ivan, accepted locally as a tribute to Ivan III. Secondly, the string of names containing the element Jemen-, Jamen-, Jann-form a structure that is most easily interpreted as a boundary between ethnoses. Ockham’s razor should be applied: what simpler explanation can be found than the one proposed, namely that a group of Häme lived in this territory along a waterway that was a trade route?5

We were able in Chapter Two to say something of prehistoric Nevelers’ diet, way of life, and cultural and spiritual concerns. Early Nevelers’ life was demonstrably varied. At various times of the year works and days would go in step a while: at ploughing and sowing (tasks for one person alone), at haymaking and harvesting – these latter the season for the ‘cooperative labour’, modern Finnish talkoo or usually in plural talkoot, noted by Kalima.6 The word was borrowed from Baltic, cf. Lithuanian talkà, Latvian tāka, both of which refer not only to the work undertaken together but also to the party afterwards. At the party we

5. Since this geographic area is close to Jam Pol’skij (‘Field Hollow’, of course, and nothing to do with Poland), of treaty fame, one might consider that the watercourses were ‘pitted’ (Russian jam). This, however, would ignore the variation je – ja, neatly explicable by the existence in Baltic Finnic of the vowel [æ], now written <ë>, and in early East Slav of the vowel <ër> (ё, ё). The n, too, is left unexplained, whereas it is easily explained as the Finnish genitive case ending, occurring also at the end of the hydronym Nevan.
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hear the *kannel* or *kantele*, the dulcimer, in those days probably with seven strings rather than the much larger numbers found on the modern instrument. Its gentle sound, plangent or cheerful, gives a strange pre-echo of Otto the musician of Riga.

As we have already noted, some aspects at least of Nevel’ life before the advent of East Slavs to the area survived into the sixteenth century. Indeed, as we hinted in choosing as epigraph to Chapter One a passage from *Evegenij Onegin*, some of those elements survived into the nineteenth century. We bear in mind that Pushkin was in some sense native to the same soil, for his father’s estate at Mixajlowskoje is in the same modern oblast’ as Nevel’.

One of the great delights of *Onegin* is following the agricultural activities of the sub-Pskovian locality where the novel is set. The herds that browse in Pushkin’s Chapter 1 (and in ours) have been brought indoors by his Chapter 4, so that the herdsman’s horn (made in fact from birchbark) no longer calls the cattle into a circle at noontide (XLI, 8-11). The same herdsman, grey-haired and frail now, sits by Lenski’s unsanctified tomb, sings, and makes his bast shoes as of old (Chapter 7, VII, 12-14). All these activities (dairy farming, cow-whistle making, and the use of bast) are present in the Nevel’ toponymy that we discussed in detail in Chapter One.

To revert to the sixteenth century: we saw in Chapter One that there is strong evidence of a cadastral origin for much of early modern Nevel’ toponymy. The land has been taken; at the time there existed a Nevel’ *Landnámabók*, a book of the taking of the land. Not, of course, in the sense of a literary work, but a book that registered the assignment of parcels of land to Artjom and Avdej, to Pjotr and Pavel, to Vlas and Vasily, and all the other Orthodox East Slavs commemorated in local nomenclature; and also to many other landholders whose names are not thus preserved, but whose farming practices are thus jotted down in the toponym and kept for four centuries. Nor should we overlook the fact that when that generation of East Slav landholders took their land, they were not the first

---

7. Let us mention for lovers of historical oddities that Pushkin’s antepenultimate letter was on the subject of General Mixel’son (who was granted land at Ivanov outside Nevel’ by Catherine the Great, as a reward for the capture of Pugachev). It was written to Count Karl Fjodorovič Tol’ on 26 January 1837 (OS). The letter makes perfect sense in its praise of Mixel’son and rejection of calumny against him; every word has a double sense, given the moment of its writing. The last words before the formalities are ‘Genius uncovers the truth at one glance, and truth is stronger than a tsar, says holy writ.’ Would that truth had been told to many a king and many a tsar that used Nevel’ as a gaming counter.

8. The real *Landnámabók* describes the origins of about four hundred settlements, as does the map of Nevel’ district on which Chapter One was based. See E.V. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Norse*, p. xxv.
to have written title. We know that Nevelian Jazno\(^9\) and the 'little estate' at Plisa\(^10\) (modern Plissy) were registered as landholdings in the fifteenth century.

As we have said, the sixteenth-century nomenclature presupposes entirely different landholding arrangements from those obtaining in Finnic times, but agriculture has not moved on greatly. In the seventeenth century we meet something similar. The Commonwealth landholding system obtains in the earlier part of the century, that is, Nevel is granted at first to an individual who has deserved well of the king, a grant that can be revoked. From the middle of the century, in an unusual arrangement, the town and its hinterland are passed to Janusz Radziwiłł as *bene merenti*, and to his heirs. Still, whoever holds ultimate authority in Newel, agriculture carries on as before, without noticeable innovations. The town lands are still divided into an enormous number of small parcels.\(^11\)

The countryside, too, continues the old ways. Occasionally we find landholders who have more than one horse, but individuals such as Ausiey Fiedorow with four horses are very rare, and Kondrat Maximow with six horses is probably unique in the records. Most country landholders have one horse or even none. And again, there are hundreds of these very small rural enterprises, passed down in the same family for generations. The need to feed family, livestock and possibly landless labourers is the first call on these enterprises; then comes the twice-yearly round of taxes. Nothing in this life encourages departure from precedent. And once again, we are dealing with very large numbers of holdings. In 1754 there were eleven *woytowstwa* of different sizes. They are constituted by 2106 *dymy*. The average number of *dymy* per village is very close to three.\(^12\)

Let us return to our sheep and other livestock. We were trying to establish whether one could call the Newel way of life good. That way of life involved hard corporal work for most of the population. Those who aver that hard work never killed anyone are often those

\(^9\) *PG*, II, No. 156, pp. 49-50 (of 1475).
\(^10\) *PG*, III, No. 273, pp. 8-9 (of 1507, but the previous tenure there mentioned must date back into the fifteenth century).
\(^11\) Let us remember, for example, that in the second 1700 inventory (2618/2) the catalogue of parcels stretches from p. 32 to p. 47, in double columns closely written. All the better inventories include such a catalogue.
\(^12\) *Woytwostwo Zaiewanskie*, for example, has sixty-two villages and 180 *dymy*. *Syрукie* has thirty-one and ninety-three respectively, and the prosperous *Zaworocienskie*, just east of the town, has 152 villages and 493 *dymy*. See 2623/3, 53-143.
who have an interest in making people work hard. They also show an ignorance of physiology. The skeletons of Roman legionaries show crushing of the vertebrae from shouldering the pack. The aetiology of longer life expectancy in later twentieth century western Europe was in part connected with the decline of hard physical labour.

On the other hand we should not forget the beneficial effects of hard physical work. Skilfully performed, tasks of ploughman and reaper develop the human frame and make the best of it. The male Neveler did not necessarily look like Michelangelo’s David, but he had no doubt a well-developed musculature on a strong skeletal framework; to a good number of householders plentiful calcium would have been available, thanks to the cattle. From the females we should probably not expect small-boned delicacy; we can imagine that they too were well developed physically. The demonstrable role of women in the brewing industry and in suburban farming testifies to the point, and we can infer with certainty that their country peers were as strong, if not stronger.

In this context we may mention a little about human fertility in the Newelszczyzna. In 1754 (and this reflects earlier inventories rather well) there are more sons than dyny in most wojdowstwa. In Zaiewskie, for example, there are 292 sons in 180 dyny; in prosperous Zaworocienskie there are 726 sons and 493 dyny. Only Psowskie reverses that picture: it has 102 sons in 144 houses. Daughters, of course, are not mentioned. One would expect that sons were slightly more numerous among the newborn, while the numbers would even out as males drowned after trying to cross unsound ice in late winter, or fell on their own scythes when drunk, or otherwise behaved as men sometimes feel called upon to behave. At all events, at this time, towards the end of Radziwill control in Newel, there were enough children to maintain and probably to expand the population.

A precondition of good physical development is a good diet. Once again, we can say something on this subject, because we have some lists of plantings and stock at three different folwarki. The oldest was at Sukino, which as we know became Newel’s Jewish liberty. Before there were any Jews in Newel, however, there was a castle farm there. It is mentioned as early as 163613. The farm is still there half a century later, and on this

13. 2614, 4-5. The position in the inventory makes it perfectly clear that the farm belongs to and works for the
occasion the inventory gives a little more detail,\textsuperscript{14} and we learn that there is no ploughland in use on the farm, but that there are fields suitable for ploughing, a vegetable garden, and land for haymeadows.

In the following century the folwark at Sukino is no more, but a new one has been founded at Dubasowo. For the year 1731 we have useful details of plantings.\textsuperscript{15} There are grain fields and five vegetable gardens. The former are mainly down to rye (forty-four Czwierci). Oats and barley are grown in some quantity (six-and-a-half and five-and-a-half Czwierci respectively). There are four-and-a-half Czwierci of ‘Tatarki’, a localism for buckwheat.\textsuperscript{16} As for the vegetable gardens, they abound in variety: cabbage, beetroot, poppy (for the seeds, used in breadmaking and the like), ‘ogurek’ (cucumber, with the correct original spelling, before the odd analogy with górka was made), onion, turnip, parsnip and peas. No livestock is mentioned.

Later in the century Dubasowo disappears and Doroszkino appears, not far to the east of the town.\textsuperscript{17} They may be one and the same, a change of name the explanation. In any case the area down to rye in 1754 was identical with that at Dubasowo in 1731, namely 44 Czwiar’ (as the term is spelt throughout the inventory of that date). Winter wheat, summer wheat, and peas were all sown, albeit in much smaller quantities (one Czwiar’ each). Seven quarters were down to barley, four to buckwheat and thirty-eight to oats. These circumstances tell a healthy, though not entirely sober, story. Rye, well suited to climatic conditions and to the acidic soil, is the staple, from which is made bread that will almost alone provide a healthy diet. Wheat makes a finer bread for important persons. The main use of barley is for beer; we should recall that before the universality of tea and coffee the most respectable persons drank small beer (beer with a very low alcohol content, perhaps half of one per cent) at every meal. Kvass could also be made to the same end, using rye

\textsuperscript{14} 2615/2, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{15} 2620, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{16} Two inedible crops are mentioned: a Czwierć of flax and half a Czwierć of hemp were grown; the former perhaps for linseed, a useful feedstuff for livestock, and for linen-making; the latter for fibres to turn into twine, rope, sacking; it also provides hempseed and hempseed oil.
\textsuperscript{17} Doroszkino figures in a number of inventories. The present details are from 2623/3, of 1754, 11 ff.
crumbs or stale rye bread. 18 Buckwheat and oats both make excellent porridges. Oats will also be fed to horses, whence in part the discrepancy with buckwheat in quantity sown.

Doroszkino was also a livestock farm. Here it is not the quantity but the species that are of interest (few individual husbandmen will have had six cows19). Doroszkino has six cows in milk, six calves (a logical consequence; note, however, that no cow had twin calves), two heifers and a bullock. There are sheep – fourteen old, five young – fourteen goats and no fewer than twenty-seven swine. As for fowl, there are ‘Gęsi Sztuk 10 / Jędyczek Sztuk 5 / Kaczek Sztuk 10’ (‘Geese Pieces 10 / Small Turkeys Pieces 5 / Ducks Pieces 10’). Here we should be cautious about comparisons with ordinary Nevelers, from town or country, who probably did not keep the turkey, with its peacockian tail recalling the map of the Newel town lands. But we may surmise that small-scale dairy farming was common, that sheep provided wool, mutton, and possibly cheese. Whether ‘young sheep’ means ‘lambs’ is unclear. The inventory was completed ‘Dniu Dwudziestego trzeciego Kwietnia’, on St. George’s day, and the year’s lambs should have been born by that date, even in this cold-comfort climate.20 Fowl were certainly kept, and we recall the huge numbers of hens’ eggs produced in the area. A fried goose egg fills a dinner plate.

We can safely extrapolate that most of the vegetable elements mentioned in our accounts of the two farms were also available to Nevelers in both town and country. A diet based on these foodstuffs compares very favourably with the diet of the modern British, in terms of high protein content in wholemeal rye and in peas (grown largely for drying21) and in the low fat content of the food items. Rye and oats contain different types of fibre which balance each other; there is fat in oats for a cold day. Meat will have been seldom eaten in the countryside, where a cow was first for life and only then for a special feast. Milk will have been drunk as such, allowed to sour to make kefir-like products, and of course separated to make cream. Some of that will have been soured, some churned to butter, and

18. Anyone trying this at home should bear in mind the dangers of storing rye at length.
19. Ibid.
20. The inventorist may have been unsure of the declension of the word *jagnię* and preferred to hedge his bets with the phrase ‘Owiec młodych’ (‘young Sheep’).
21. For those rich enough to eat meat, soup from dried peas was no doubt a Friday variant for Catholics, and for the Orthodox a general expedient for endless abstinence and fasting.
cheese both hard and soft will have been made. Whey, spoiled for the British by the rhyme of Miss Muffet, is rather pleasant to drink.\textsuperscript{22} Nothing is wasted.

The prevalence of pigs at the folwark probably did not apply to the generality of the population; unfortunately they do not figure elsewhere in inventories. However, in the nineteenth century Nevel\textsuperscript{1} was noted for its production of pig bristle,\textsuperscript{23} and the first factory in Nevel\textsuperscript{1} (in fact a number of workshops scattered through the town) processed the bristle.\textsuperscript{24}

Fish, obviously not mentioned in the description of Doroszkino, will have yielded yet more healthy protein. Given the ubiquity of waterways in the Newelszczyzna, it was probably impossible to prevent local people from taking fish, whether or not that was allowed. Some at least of the official catch from the fisheries was marketed, because preserving fish in large quantities was not possible.

To all this we must add berries (bilberries, cranberries, and lingon such as saved Jevgenija Ginzburg's life as she strove to meet an unmeetable timber norm), giving important vitamins, mushrooms, and the hazelnuts 'mentioned' in the VN Oreškovo. And out of the treetrunks came forth sweetness: pien (understand pień) is the regular word for a beehive in the inventories, and there were hundreds of them in the Newelszczyzna. There were also forest apiaries called Barcie.

Thus we can say that a Neveler with access to available food sources (in exchange for his or her own labour, or as a farmer, or through the market) could eat highly nutritious and delicious, if unpretentious, meals. As long as he or she was strong enough to work, or rich enough not to, there need be no malnutrition. Access to hunting was strictly controlled, as we saw in Chapter Five; so was fishing in the many lakes. Concessions to the fishing rights in groups of lakes (though not usually in the rivers) were let to publicans. Thus Nevelers in

\textsuperscript{22} It is marketed in Finland as herajuoma.
\textsuperscript{23} Alas, good bristles – poor pork. 'While the local pigs do not give abundant meat or fat lard, they do give long, hard bristle in quantity. This sells well to the trade and earns Nevel up to 9000 roubles annually.' Translated from Nevel'skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 100 (quoting Vitebskije provintsial'nyje vedomosti, August 1895).
\textsuperscript{24} Nevel'skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 189.
the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had less access to wild protein than their remote predecessors.

Again, if a Neveler had a family, he or she might be supported into old age; and, in extremis, there were two hospices in the town, where a very small number of people might die quietly under the care of co-religionists. One must suspect that in cases where these circumstances did not apply life was very hard: people physically or mentally disabled, people without family, people too sick to work, people mutilated in war. But the same would be true of places outside the Radziwiłł latifundium.

Here we may aptly cite the popular saw ‘It’s a good life if you don’t weaken’. One could have a good life in Newel as long as one was prepared to work hard the year round, resting on Sundays and Catholic feastdays, and keeping out of trouble. However, in a town so proficient in the manufacture of gorzalka, weakening was easy.

For the moment we may feel that the pledge has been redeemed to recreate a living picture of Nevel’ in the past, at least as far as the countryside is concerned. We turn now to the town.

The life we have depicted hitherto required hard work and good health. The hard work was not all agricultural. We have seen that artisan production was an important element in the Newel economy. The town was not without variety. Had we nosed around its streets at any time in its recorded history before 1772, we should have seen burghers busy at their various occupations: some keeping shops or market stalls, others occupied in the many breweries, tanneries, saddleries, tailors’ workshops, and so forth. The few members of the szlachta will have dressed according to the norms of Polock, Vilno and even Warsaw and Kraków, or have attempted to do so. The more prosperous burghers no doubt gradually adopted Polish fashions, while poorer Nevelers dressed for practicality. Occasionally a soldier might pass, infantryman, Cossack, hayduk or gunner. Perhaps a few foreigners might be seen, dressed a
little differently, a Swede or a German. A Jew might have just arrived from Sukino on the ferry; he is dressed very much as anyone else, for the costume of Orthodox and Hassidic Jews, which now looks archaic, was in those centuries a sober version of what many men wore. Their hairstyles, with peyot or peisy (uncut sidelocks), and their beards, worn fuller than by other men, would have distinguished them from the ordinary run of Newel males.  

We should also have seen clergymen of different faiths and sects: the Catholic parish priest, perhaps, with many obligations, because the bishop of Smolensk is far away and the Evil One is everywhere; an Orthodox priest from the stone Annunciation church, or monks from the Orthodox monastery, who outnumber all the other religious in the town; and perhaps one of the Uniate priests, Fr Czarny or Fr Krycki (both apparently members of priestly dynasties), or Fr Zdanko, or even humble Fr Pilip, though not on the same day. If we are walking on a Sunday, as we pass the Catholic church (which we can only do in the latter half of the eighteenth century), we may hear organ music swelling from the doors.

Nowhere in the inventories is there any sign of a school, although all the premises in the town are catalogued assiduously. In 1778 Catherine’s government arranged a survey of educational facilities and needs in her (quite) newly acquired lands. A report of 19 March of that year by Nevel’ magistrate states baldly: ‘V gor. Nevle škol nikakix netu, obučajutsja tol’ko obyvatel’skije deti v svoix domax azbuki’ (‘In the town of Nevel’ there are no schools, only the townspeople’s children are taught the alphabet in their homes’). On the following day the Nevel’ county commissioner amplified:

V Nevle nikakix škol ne naxoditsja, a obučajutsa [обучаются] [sic] obyvatel’skije deti, každoj v svojem dome, rossijskoj i polskoj [sic] gramote, a šlaxetskije deti obučajutsa [sic] v gor. Polocke v jezuickom kljaštore raznyx nauk.

25. Jews with a knowledge of Hebrew will have rejoiced to live in Newel (as in Psalm 97, verse 5), since in that language nevel means harp.
27. 2631/1 (of 1767), p. 37.
29. Ibid.
In Nevel no schools are situated, but the townspeople’s children are taught Russian and Polish literacy, each in his own home, while children of the szlachta are taught various subjects in the town of Polock in the Jesuit cloister.

A mystery is here made plain. Given the commercial and artisanal activity that we saw in Chapter Six, and to an extent in Chapter Five, we should have expected that there would be a degree of literacy, and particularly of numeracy, in the town. Otherwise how could a master keep track of his prentices’ work, his clients’ payments, or money owed to his suppliers? The results of this home schooling were no doubt primarily of practical use. One may quibble with the commissioner’s use of the word i: did the same household use both Russian and Polish for reading and writing? I suggest that the magistrate had closer contacts with the townsfolk than the commissioner, while the latter wants to put a better face on things. Most probably persons of primarily East Slav culture learnt ‘Russian’ literacy, while Catholics learnt to read and write in Polish. Let us recall that there are only two Cyrillic inscriptions in all the Newel archives, a signature from 1629 and the caption on the print of Wallachian dancers.

If literacy was a thing passed down through the generations, then account must be taken of the law that all messages get garbled in transmission. If few Nevelers ever attended a real school, and if each generation forgets a little of what it has been taught, then a grandchild’s literacy will be much more imperfect than his grandfather’s. Clearly, there will have been little reading for pleasure or for erudition in Nevel.

In seeking signs of a vibrant cultural life in Radziwill Newel, we will search at length and find little. If the advantages of living in Newel are from the realm of the practical, Martha will be happy, Mary unhappy.

30. The Russian, of course, says nothing of the sex of pupils, but one suspects that few girls were allowed to benefit from literacy.
31. It can be done. Denise Schmandt-Besserat has analysed an enormous number of clay tokens (at least 10,000 of them) that were used in pre-literate times in Elamite Iran, in Iraq, Syria and elsewhere, at dates going back to the early Neolithic era (c. 8000 BC). This work has enabled her to establish the systems represented. See Richard Rudgley, *Lost Civilisations of the Stone Age*, L., 1998, pp. 48–57. The continuing use of the word score to mean ‘twenty’ reminds us that shepherds and others kept totals on a tally, which they scored for every twenty items counted.
32. 2613, p. 78.
Moreover there are in fact severe restrictions on the possibility of attaining a satisfactory material life, even if one is young and fit. The rest must be warned not to be old, not to be sick, not to be poor. But everyone must beware of the threats to the rural or semi-rural idyll we have depicted here, to see which we must half-close our eyes. One threat was the constant requirement to pay taxes of all kinds, on which we have commented *passim*, and the other was the danger of war.

We may now feel that we have redeemed our promise to create a detailed picture of life in Newel town.
They charged fiercely; they gathered spoil.

Aneirin, *Y Gododdin.* 33 Sixth century. Tr. H.I. Bell

Life in Radziwill Newel could be bearable for the able-bodied and the hard-working. What were the disadvantages of that life for the ordinary Neveler? Here we are not looking for conditions that would apply anywhere in early modern eastern Europe, but for what is more or less specific to Newel and the borderlands: to that ‘interstatus’ of which we spoke in the Introduction.

After the Great Northern War the town and the countryside enjoyed a peaceful time. Those were the years when the able-bodied might live a life rather like that imagined by Gray in Stoke Poges. Before that time we can hardly count the number of occasions when Nevel was turned forcibly into Newel and back. For centuries, armies marched and countermarched, inland fleets sailed to and fro on the watercourses, and the boom of artillery, such fun in a film or a reconstruction, struck deep terror into the hearts of Nevelers. They must have been grateful for those occasions when, as in 1580, the castle was in the end surrendered without excessive destruction. Its strategic borderland position was the reason for Newel’s prestige in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it was one of the two main disadvantages of Newel life.

And yet we have seen that Newel had a certain pacific air. The tactically important moat is allowed to dry up. For a century or more (we may at least suspect) the lazier sort of Neveler had thrown organic matter – cabbage stumps, turnip tops, and perhaps worse – into the moat’s clouded water. As the flow, unable to penetrate the debris, grew slower and slower, the banks became muddier, silt accumulated, and the vegetable peelings rose again, transformed long since into a richer loam. And the townspeople rented the new-found land, grew food for themselves and paid rent to the Radziwill.

---

33. Krei kyrchyn; kynhullynt reawr.

Aneirin, *Y Gododdin.*
Meanwhile across the lake, as we saw above, the hayduks had their own village; they also had land in the Newel suburbs, as did the castle cannoneers and the Cossacks.\textsuperscript{34} Up in the castle the armament, it seems very likely, was rusting away, as we saw in Chapter Six.

Yet in 1619, when the Commonwealth took back the town stolen by Ivan III in 1503 (or when Mixail Romanov received a temporary setback in the process of recovering the lands once ruled by Rus'), the castle was rather well equipped to withstand a siege. In the Cekawz there were no fewer than twelve szpichlerzy or stores for grain and other foodstuffs. Victualling in 1619 was extremely difficult because of the constant warfare of the last many decades, but in principle the inhabitants of Mikolska w\l o\textasciêsc were supposed to supply the castle annually with two hundred quarters of rye, three hundred of oats, and ninety roubles in money. ‘This grain and money had long been reserved for the strel'cy, that is, when the volost' had not yet been devastated; but at the moment not even a sixth part has been given’.\textsuperscript{35}

The Cekawz was also the place where much of the castle’s portable armament and ammunition were stored. Among them were twenty-four arquebuses. We saw in Chapter Six that some of them at least survived until the First Partition, more likely to kill the men firing them than the enemy. In 1619 there were in total 14,000 arquebus bullets. There were more than 16,000 ball for artillery pieces of differing calibre; but, as Pan Siwicki wrote ‘Jdzial tych niemasz’ (‘but you haven’t got these guns’). The 1619 inventory specifies also the cannon on the towers. There are three larger pieces on wheeled carriages. Five field guns are listed and five small iron guns.

To propel all the projectiles there were 36 pooods of gunpowder. How much was that? The \textit{Słownik geograficzny królestwa polskiego} offers the equivalences ‘1 pud = 40 funtów’ and ‘1 funt polski = 405,504 gramów’\textsuperscript{36} giving a weight in kilogrammes of (36 pudów $\times$ 40 funtów $\times$ 405,504 gramów $=$) 583,926 kg.\textsuperscript{37} I suspect, however, that what

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} 2615/1, p. 48 (misnumbered ‘26’, instead of ‘24’, on the basis of double pages.
\item \textsuperscript{35} 2612, p. 55.
\item \textsuperscript{36} \textit{Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich.} Wydany pod redakcją Bronisława Chlebowskiego <...> i Władysława Walewskiego <...> Według planu Filipa Sulimierskiego. Volume IX. Warszawa, 1888, p. 2.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Corrected to three decimal places, i.e. whole grammes.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Siwicki and Meszczeryn saw was thirty-six powder kegs, each rated at one pood, and that would probably mean one *Russian* pood. Alas, we cannot exclude the possibility that some of the powder had been left in a hurry by retreating Polish-Lithuanian forces on some previous occasion. If, however, we imagine that all the powder had been manufactured and accurately measured by Russians, then we have thirty-six Russian poods. A Russian pood weighed 16.38 kg, so that we would then have \((36 \times 16.38 =)\) 589.68 kg. The difference is hardly momentous; in either case, ill-dowsed dottle from a clay pipe would have caused a very loud bang indeed.

Again, if bullets had run out, the *Cekawz* held nine poods of lead, which to a Pole meant the equivalent of 145.981 kg (to three decimal places, i.e. whole grammes), and to a Russian the equivalent of 147.420 kg. If we use, anachronistically, the traditional measure employed by the NKVD, i.e. nine grammes of lead per person, we find that by Polish measure this would suffice to kill 16,220 human beings (ignoring 0.11 of a person left over), and by Russian measure 16,380 whole human beings.

We have seen that Nevel' in the sixteenth century became a salient protruding broadly southwards into Lithuanian territory; later Newel was a salient thrusting northwards into Muscovy-Russia. Commanders cannot resist a salient. The same topic arose during the First World War. Robert Graves writes on the subject:

> Opposite our trenches a German salient protruded, and the brigadier wanted to ‘bite it off’ in proof of the division’s offensive spirit. Trench soldiers could never understand the Staff’s desire to bite off an enemy salient. [...] We concluded that a passion for straight lines, for which headquarters was well known, had dictated this plan, which had no tactical or strategic excuse.\(^{38}\)

Independently, elsewhere on the front, Edmund Blunden noted the same phenomenon:

> The German front ran out in a small sharp cape here, called the Boar’s Head. (The line here had several such – the Pope’s Nose, Cæsar’s Nose, Duck’s Bill.) This was to

---

be 'bitten off,' no doubt to render the maps in the châteaux of the mighty more symmetrical.39

Nevel', however, long had a certain tactical and even strategic significance. That position explains the speed of its rise in the sixteenth century and its importance as a sticking point in the negotiations facilitated by Antonio Possevino. That significance seems to have lasted another hundred years, to judge by the weight that Bogusław Radziwiłł and the Commonwealth negotiator Jan Chrapowicki placed on not surrendering Newel to Muscovy in 1666-1667. Yet both had also a proprietied interest in Newel, and that may have influenced their insistence.

There are other ways to pass from Warsaw to Moscow or from Vilnius to Moscow, but Newel' presents one passage through the forests, marshes and lakes. After the Commonwealth conquest of Livonia, Newel' sat on the Commonwealth's right (northeastern) flank, in a position corresponding well to the phrase a thorn in the side. In general, for our present conclusory purposes, the point is that a salient is one of those temptations that the powerful find irresistible, as usually they find wealth irresistible. The straight road from Dolyssy to Newel – in twenty kilometres there are only two bends – is another work on which one may look with despair, recalling as it does the seven hundred kilometres of straight railway from Petersburg to Moscow. All lines must be straight; people (subjects, citizens) exist for the ruler, in two senses of that word.

As we saw in Chapter Six, by the end of the seventeenth century Newel and the sister-fortresses at Siebież and at Wielisz were essentially indefensible. So it proved in the period 1703-1705, when Newel was in the hands of Peter the Great's forces. If after the Great Northern War Newel was in essence becalmed, Nevelers no doubt welcomed that; Russian attention had turned in other directions. In the eighth decade of the century Russia assumed control of Newel' by treaty.

Although we are not told as much anywhere in any detail, we can assume with safety that the armies who passed through or near near Newel left the usual Goyescas behind them:

fire, destruction, plunder and rape. Occasionally a soldier may have been left behind to make his home in or near Newel. That much we can judge by occasional surnames in the inventories: the Szwed family, for example, Isak and Alexiy, of whom the former has a common Swedish given name (of Hebrew origin, of course). They were perhaps father and son, and lived in the ‘best part’ of Newel town in 1731,\textsuperscript{40} close to two of the burgomasters of that year.\textsuperscript{41} Another possible example is found in the inventory of 1636, where we find ‘Jasko Moskal na wolności’,\textsuperscript{42} i.e. he is exempt from taxation. This may possibly be a concession made to a relatively important defector. In 1754 one Roman Szacilo lives with his sons, the eldest named as Siemion, at Dym No. 200 in the village of Szady. Roman, with his ‘Russian’\textsuperscript{43} given name, is marked as ‘Strzelec’.\textsuperscript{44} Of these lingering soldiers some, we may suspect, were left in Newel because they had left a limb on the battlefield.

But in general we must believe that many a woman in the Newel countryside or in the town itself regretted that fate had given her birth in the borderlands. She would have cried for her dead as Heledd wept for Cynddylan: ‘I weep at whiles; then I stay silent’.\textsuperscript{45} She contemplates the silent, plundered chamber to which her beloved will never return, a room ‘without fire, without candle’.\textsuperscript{46} The Nevel widow prays for the souls of her dead; we may doubt if she worries much whether God is Orthodox or Catholic. And the next day she starts to clear up as best she can: she has met one of life’s certainties, death, but there is still the other, taxes.

\textsuperscript{40} 2620, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{41} They may have been somehow connected with Fiedor Szwed, who ran a still in 1694 (see 2617, p. 80).
\textsuperscript{42} 2614, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{43} It derives simply from Latin Romanus, of course; it gives the Russian imperial dynasty its surname, and may perhaps be knitted into the mythology of the ‘third Rome’, which, however, should not be exaggerated. Filof\textsuperscript{44}ej of Pskov’s thesis was not on the lips even of Russian courtiers at this time.
\textsuperscript{44} 2623/2, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{45} ‘Wylaf wers; tawaf wedi.’ \textit{Canu Llywarch Hen}. Ed. Ifor Williams, Caerdydd, 1978, p. 35. The songs date (probably) from the ninth century, but refer to events perhaps of the sixth.
\textsuperscript{46} ‘Heb dan, heb gannwyl.’ \textit{Ibid.}
They have fangs, they have teeth!
Shout the loud bells of Neath.

Idris Davies (1905-1953), Gwalia Deserta XV

Where monarchs used Neveller instrumentally in their military policy, the Radziwills used them instrumentally for self-enrichment. Of all their money-making schemes, those connected with gorzalka betray the extremity of noble cynicism. Money is made as the liquor is made: the operation of a still can be done only under licence, and that licence is not cheap. When this innovation is successful, the cost of the licence is raised sharply. Retailing must be done through various arendy, and the arendarzy pay handsomely for the privilege. There are arendy all over the Newelszczyzna. Even the export of spirits is heavily taxed, and that trade, while it lasts, has the consequence (intended or otherwise) of undermining the fighting spirit of those beyond the border.

On several occasions over the course of the present thesis we have imagined Newel street scenes. A late evening in Newel, especially on the eve of the Christian sabbath, must have been a rowdy affair. The taverns would not have functioned without clients; some of those clients will have become very drunk. That is, inductively, the likely result of a policy that encourages townsmen and country folk to drink. If one owns a town where liquor is made, one will want to sell as much as possible. Logic dictates that a line will be drawn somewhere; otherwise fighting, alcoholism, illness and death will result, and as a Radziwilt one should not forget that the drinkforce is also the workforce. But that matter was indeed forgotten (to the point where the very inventorists were drunk), and there must have been serious consequences.

Nevellers under Radziwilt rule had serious reasons to be discontent with their lot. As one would expect in such a case, their gaze strayed across the border; their gaze, and probably their feet as well. We have noted in Chapters Four and Five cases of persons crossing to Russian Nevel', and later crossing from Commonwealth Newel to Muscovite

47. Those Radziwills such as Jan and Boguslaw who held high office under the crown could do both.
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Velikije Luki, with the aim of defecting. We find East Slavs in the Grand Duchy willing to spy for Moscow, at personal inconvenience and for small reward. Smuggling was practised in the Newel area, and we make bold to assert that some of the smugglers were Nevelers. On a frontier so porous, it would be safe for them to cross into Muscovy-Russia, exporting without tax, trading on the other side, within a few verstis of home, and then returning with whatever they could pick up. These opportunities arose because of Newel's 'interstatus', its position in the border zone.

There is reason, too, to think that Nevelers did not necessarily think of Russians (earlier, of Muscovites) as their enemies. The occasional Muscovite, even Muscovite soldier, made his home here. Purely East Slav names are far commoner than clearly Polish ones. Again, in the inventories we have a body of evidence about how Nevelers spoke. There is very little evidence of polonization. On the contrary, we find specifically local speech habits, such as the rejection of /l/ as a phoneme, and its replacement in loanwords that 'should' have /l/ by either /xl/ (spelt <chw> in the inventories, e.g. Chwiedor) or /p/ (as in Pilip, where the first <P> replaces Mediæval Greek /l/ (<φ>). Similarly with the spirant pronunciation of <g> as [ь]. That is a very old pronunciation, marking Kievan Russian, Russian-recension Church Slavonic, the southern and western dialects of Russian, and also Ukrainian and Belorussian. We also meet akan'je, a phenomenon that straddles the Commonwealth-Muscovite (Russian) border but that is never found in Polish or Ukrainian. We find some features that imply Russian influence, for example such names as Fiedor, Tymofiy, Alexey.

*Par contre*, it is hard to think of a single example of Polish speech habits influencing what local people said, even if a Polish-speaking inventorist will sometimes unthinkingly adjust the local name, personal or toponymic, to match his Polish expectations. Rather we frequently meet forms such as Andrzej, testifying that Polish Andrey was unusual.

There is evidence, then, that a good number of Nevelers in town and country were not hostile to Russian influence. The Uniate church was not particularly successful, having only a funerary chapel in the seventeenth century and later a church and hospice (originally Orthodox). No doubt some Nevelers came to regret bitterly the definitive change of imperial
power in 1772; but before it happened they had few reasons to thank the Commonwealth or their Radziwiłł lords.

Jan Barszczewski, in the introduction to his *Szlachcic Zawalnia*, contrasts these territories with those immediately to the north. In the latter the traveller passes large, prosperous villages, stone-built manor houses, cheerful inhabitants who are industrious when working, happy in their innocent pastimes on Sundays.

No kogda putnik približajetsja k granicam Sebeža i Nevelja, to vidit vdali pered soboj razdol'nyje tjomnyje bory, poxožije na tuči navisšije na gorizonte, mež lesov – solomennyje kryši domov bednyx seljan. [...] Redko nabredjosh' tam na dobrotno postrojennyj panskij dom; ne mnogo i cerkev takix, v kotoryx byli by zametny vkus arhitekta ili ščedrost' bogatogo osnovatelja; i ètot ugrjumyj i dikij pejzaž, načinaja ot reki Lovat', prostrajetsja do beregov Dviny, gde končajutsja Polota i Drissa. [...] V ubogix derevnix i v prazničnyje dni, i v budni – vsegda carit kakaja-to ponuraja tišina; redko poslyšitsja pesnya žneca ili paxarja, ibo neurožaj zdes' často obmanyvajet nadeždy trudoljubivogo zemledeľca...⁴⁸

But when the traveller approaches the bounds of Sebež and Nevel', then he sees afar before him broad dark evergreen forests like stormclouds hanging on the horizon, and amid the forests the straw roofs of the poor country-dwellers’ houses. [...] Seldom will you stumble across a well-built manor house; few, too, are the churches where you may notice the architect’s taste or the generosity of a rich founder; and this gloomy, wild landscape stretches from the River Lovat' to the banks of the Dvina, where Polota and Drissa debouch. [...] The impoverished villages, on working days and festive, are dominated by a depressive quiet; rarely will you hear the song of reaper or ploughman, for in these parts the industrious husbandman’s hopes are often deceived by a failed harvest...

The publication date of the Polish-language original was 1844, so that Barszczewski is reporting, perhaps with literary licence, the face of the Nevel' countryside after seven decades of Russian rule. We may suspect, however, that little has changed over those seven decades. For example, his strictures on the quality of ecclesiastical architecture and the lack of patronage are borne out by the experience of Newel. We have seen that in all the years when the town and its considerable hinterland belonged to the Radziwiłłs, we have evidence only for a single act of generosity, namely the endowment and construction of the town's Latin-rite Catholic church. Writing for publication in a Russia that censored literature, all the more so in the years after the Polish Uprising of 1830-1831, Barszczewski does not attribute agricultural failure to feudalism, but we have seen evidence in quantity about the endless demands for money faced by the rural population.

Yet to a modern sensibility the Nevel' landscape is, in its quiet way, beautiful. George Crabbe would perhaps have valued it more highly than Wordsworth, for it lacks crags, and its lakes are broad and shallow, not deep, sombre or brooding. Under the shifting Nevel' light one recalls the view framed by R.S. Thomas's window:49

...the colours
Are renewed daily with variations
Of light and distance that no painter
Achieves or suggests....

...All through history
The great brush has not rested,
Nor the paint dried; yet what eye,
Looking coolly, or, as we now,
Through the tears' lenses, ever saw
This work and it was not finished?

Insofar as Nevelers were left alone in their landscape to get on with things, they worked very well. Their cattle were probably sufficient to their needs, but too few to poison waterways

with slurry. Manure was too precious a resource to waste, anyway, given the poor soils. If in July you stand in a haymeadow in the Nevel’ countryside, you see something that cannot be found in prosperous modern Britain: the flowers that supplement the basic nourishment to be had from the grass – cornflower, poppy, vetch, campion, and forty others.

In such a hay meadow near Dolyssy, twenty kilometres from Nevel’, one afternoon in July 2007, my wife and I stood talking with Stanislav Ignat’jevič Kučinskij. He lives a life very similar to the life of an eighteenth-century Newel farmer of a very small piece of land. On one side is Lake Dolyssy, on another we can see the ruins of some outbuildings from the old Dolyssy estate. Stanislav Ignat’jevič can identify the lilies of the field by their Russian and their Latin names, but at this moment he is telling us about the dangerous animals that live in the vicinity – wolves and wild boar. If you keep sheep, then you need to worry about wolves. But a wild boar, too, is a force of nature, and he recounts the story of one that attacked the walls of his log cabin in snowy midwinter.

I asked him if he was not afraid. He knew the attack would stop when the boar got nowhere – ‘Kaban tože ne durak’ – ‘A wild boar’s no fool either’. He went on: ‘As for me, I’m sorry for every animal that’s just trying its best to feed itself. I was sorry for the grass snake I cut the head off today when I was mowing’. Mowing, of course, with a scythe. Stanislav Ignat’jevič does not own the land he works. He keeps bees, he grows vegetables in a polytunnel, and his forty sheep or so graze outdoors in summer, fattening up to be sold, usually to those who appreciate what many do not: the joy of mutton fat.

Although Stanislav Ignat’jevič has a mobile telephone, a portable radio, and his books, there is much in his life that would have been recognizable to Barszczewski, to a Newel husbandman in 1772 or in 1619; to a Muscovite settler after 1503. The life of Mjakal, who worked near Lake Jazno in the 1470s, was not utterly dissimilar. No doubt he too lived in a small wooden house amid meadows by the lakeshore; and we can project that way of life even farther back into the past. Has Nevel’’s long journey been merely the progress of Martinson’s bubble in the glass?
Not entirely, for there are differences. Stanislav Ignat'jevič served in the Soviet air force; he has experience of working with jet engines. As we noted above, he has a practical knowledge of Latin. Of old he did responsible work in the collective farm system. The thirst for education characterized not only the Soviet era but also the closing decades of the nineteenth century and the pre-revolutionary twentieth century. See, for example, the report of the country inspector of education N.I. Zorin (he who first hypothesized that Nevel' is a Finnish name) on education in Nevel' ujezd (1916):

Here I cannot but recall the wise advice given to the Muscovites in the 17th century by Païsiios Ligorides. This learned Greek arrived in Moscow in 1660, in a difficult period of chaos in Moscow. Muscovites approached him with the request that he give his opinion on the reasons for this chaos. Païsiios Ligorides told them with his usual directness ‘I have long sought the causes of your discontents, and have at last reached the conviction that all the evil comes from two causes: 1) that their are no schools for the people and 2) there are no public libraries. If I were asked,’ he went on, ‘what the pillars of church and state are, I would answer: in the first place, schools, in the second place, schools, and in the third place, schools.’ ‘And therefore,’ he concluded, ‘if you really, not only in words but in deeds, love your Russian realm, then you must encourage the opening of schools in it in every way, sparing no sacrifices or labours.’

Unfortunately there are simply no traces in Nevel' before the later nineteenth century of that burning love for educational enlightenment elicited by Ligorides. The nearest library to Nevel' that we know of during our period was burnt by Batory. Biblioteku zaţgli.

For long periods, then, little changed in Nevel'. We have detected some slow improvement during the eighteenth century, but on the whole Nevel' was always the object of policy, not its subject.

---

50. Quoted in Nevel'skaja starina, ed. Maksimovskaja, 124. This sets an early date on the maxim that a state needs ‘education’ three times over.
We sat long into the evening, listening to the cries of unseen cranes. Suddenly, towards midnight, three cranes flew into sight above the lake, and a moon the colour of madder rose among stars and examined itself carefully in the water. My wife quoted the poem by Mickiewicz on such a moon and such a lake:

...Gwiazdy nad tobą, i gwiazdy pod tobą,
I dwa obaczysz księżyce.\textsuperscript{51}

...Stars overhead and stars underfoot
You shall see, and a redoubled moon.

At that moment we could see that the life of the Nevel’ countryside might last forever, if there were the people. Perhaps it ill becomes a Londoner to praise Nevel’ life, but at the least that life can stand as symbol and beacon to the rest of us. We in Britain have extirpated the wild flowers from our meadows, because there is more money to be made that way; and we need money to pay our debts – our mortgages, taxes, credit cards. The voice of the rich and the powerful drowns out the cry of the cranes. Mandelstam shuddered at the very sight of Trotsky. Nevel’ is the capital city of the meek; we do not know when, but apparently they are to inherit the earth.

APPENDIX I

Nevel' District Toponymy

What follows is a list of all the names of villages and hamlets on a modern map of Nevel' District. The map in question is the latest available and the only one which is of practical use. The details are:

Невельский район Псковской области. Карта изготовлена Объединенной комплексной экспедицией №186 филиал ФГУП “Новгород АГП” Роскартографии на основе карты масштабы 1:200000. РОСКАРТография, 2001 (Nevel District, Pskov oblast’. Map has been prepared by the United Complex Expedition № 186, FGUP “Novgorod AGP”, Roskartografija, on the basis of a scale 1:200000 map. ROSKARTOGRAFIYA, 2001).

The toponyms are listed in alphabetical order in an English transliteration. Letters with haček are taken as following the same character without haček. The soft sign, transliterated <ч>, is taken as following <ч> (which itself follows z).

In all the names number 382.

1  Akulino
2  Aljablevo
3  Antipenki
4  Antropovo
5  Artjomovo A
6  Artjomovo B
7  Asnica
8  Avdejkovo
9  Avinišče
10 Babinskije
11 Bagury
12 Balakirevo
13 Balasi
14 Barkany
15 Barsuki A
16 Barsuki B
17 Bašmakovo
18 Begunovo
19 Beloje
20 Berj佐ovo
21 Bisjurevo
22 Blinki
23 Bobrovo A
24 Bobrovo B
25 Bogdanovo
26 Bogozino
27 Bojarskoe
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bojdolovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bojkovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bojok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bojovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bokanovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bolšaja Budnica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bolšoje Ovčino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Boriskovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Borisovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Borki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Borodino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Borok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Boroukha-Kubeckaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Borouxa-Loveckaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Borovički</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bor'kovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Brudovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Bugry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Burakovščina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Burmakino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bykovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Carevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Cerkovišče</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Cvilevka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Čerepy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Čereukhino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Černecovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Černjai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Černonosy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Černuxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Červjacovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Červojedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Čiževščina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Čjornyj Dvor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Čjorne Stajki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Čuprovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dedov Kamen'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Demeškovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Deršino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Deržitino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Djogtevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Dolyssy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Dominikovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Drozdovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Druganovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Dubinino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dubišče</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Dubokraj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
124  Karmolenec
125  Karulino
126  Kaverzy
127  Kazakovo
128  Kazjonnye Lešni
129  Kiseli
130  Kiseljovo
131  Kisloje
132  Klinovoje
133  Kljastica
134  Kokorevo
135  Kokovino
136  Kolki
137  Kolpino
138  Konnovo
139  Kopačjovo
140  Korovčino
141  Korsakovo
142  Košeljovo
143  Kosilovo
144  Koscy
145  Kos'kovo
146  Kovalixa
147  Kovaljovo
148  Kožemjačkino
149  Kozlovo A
150  Kozlovo B
151  Kozly
152  Kozyrevo
153  Krasnobaixa
154  Kresty
155  Krivicy
156  Krivonosovo
157  Krutelevo
158  Kubok
159  Kublanovo
160  Kudinovo
161  Kuxarjovo
162  Kulići
163  Kurilixa
164  Laxny
165  Laškovo
166  Lasino
167  Laskotuxino
168  Lazoviki
169  Leonovo
170  Leoncevo
171  Lepešixa
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Ležonovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Lixolet'je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Lîtvînovî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Ljoxovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Lobačjovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Lobok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Loktevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Lomizëno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Lomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Lopovka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Lovec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Lutno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Lûži</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Mackevići</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Mačulišće</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Makary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Makulino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Malen'kaja Budnica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Maloje Ovcino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Mamon'kino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Mar'ino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Masljuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Mičinovka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Migušino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Misnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Molokojedovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Morozovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Moržino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Mosejevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Moščnino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Motovolixa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Mumino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Mjakinčino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Mylendi A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Mylendi B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Narično</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Nekune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Nevel'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Nikonixa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Nikonovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Niv'je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Noskovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Noščino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Novaya Izocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Novoxovansk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Obuxovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Ol'xovec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Ordovo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
268  Ručelevő
269  Rudicy
270  Rudinja
271  Rukavec
272  Rykaljovo
273  Rykšino
274  Rytovka
275  Ržesiden’je
276  Saltykovo
277  Sapuny
278  Savino
279  Seleznjovo
280  Sel’cy
281  Semjonovo
282  Senjutino
283  Sinichino
284  Sivcevo
285  Sluki
286  Smol’niki A
287  Smol’niki B
288  Somino
289  Soročino
290  Soroki
291  Spas-Balazdyn’
292  Stajki
293  Stajkino
294  Stanki A
295  Stanki B
296  Staroje
297  Starosel’je
298  Staryje Karavai
299  Stepan’kovo
300  Stolbovo
301  Studenec
302  Sukino
303  Sušnevo
304  Suxanovka
305  Svetloye
306  Syrokvašino
307  Šapčino
308  Ščerbino
309  Šekino
310  Šesto
311  Širino
312  Širnevo
313  Talakino
314  Talankino
315  Tatyrino
Telešovo
Telicy
Terpiolo
Teterkino
Teter'ki
Topory
Tret'jakovo
Trexaljovo
Turičino
Turki-Perevoz
Ukryto
Uročišče-Dubrovka
Usovo
Ustinovo
Ust'-Dolyssy
Ušakovo
Vasil'ki
Vasil'kovo
Vas'kovo
Vaulino
Velikoje Selo
Veršitno
Veselki
Vidusovo
Vil'no
Vlaskovo
Vodača
Vodača vtoraja
Volči Gory
Vologino
Vorob'jovo
Vysockije
Vysokoje
Xarince
Xarny
Xmelinets
Xolyavino
Xomčixa
Xotešino
Xudojarovo
Xvatynja
Zaborov'je
Zalavoč'je
Zalogi
Zalon'je
Zamošća-Kanovskaja
Zamošća-Kubetskaja
Zamoš'je
364 Zaprosy
365 Zareč'je
366 Zaručev'je
367 Zaverež'je
368 Zavruj
369 Zavznory
370 Zajcevo
371 Zelen'ki
372 Zeljonyje Lugi
373 Zmeino
374 Zubarjovo
375 Zuyi
376 Železnica
377 Želudy
378 Žerstivicy
379 Žitki
380 Žukovo A
381 Žukovo B
382 Žuljovo
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The order followed is that of the English alphabet. Thus Russian surnames beginning with <р> are towards the end of the alphabet. Titles or authors’ names are listed in alphabetical order in an English transliteration. Letters with haček are taken as following the same character without haček. The soft sign, transliterated <њ>, is taken as following <з> (which itself follows z).
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