

SAINT-PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY

Manuscript

Prohorenkov Igor Aleksandrovich

**POLISH-LITHUANIAN ANTI-RUSSIAN LITERARY PROPAGANDA DURING
THE TIME OF TROUBLES**

Scientific specialty 5.6.2. General History

THESIS

Of the applicant for the degree of
Candidate of Sciences in History

Translation from Russian

Academic supervisor:
Doctor of historical science, professor
Alexander Ilyich Filushkin

Saint Petersburg

2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Chapter I. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the way to intervention in Russia.. | 31 |
| § 1. Relations with Moscow in the Polish-Lithuanian literature on the eve of the Time of Troubles..... | 31 |
| § 2. Literary propaganda of the period of the first “Dimitriades”..... | 47 |
| § 3. Death and resurrection of the false tsarevich: propaganda in search of new meanings in 1606–1609..... | 58 |
| Chapter II. Transformation of the military and political doctrine of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first decade of the XVIIth century in the context of anti-Moscow propaganda..... | 65 |
| § 1. Ideas of “just war” in Polish journalism of the XV–XVIth centuries..... | 65 |
| § 2. The “Home War” in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the invasion of Russia in the context of the beginning of centralized pro-war propaganda..... | 69 |
| § 3. Plans of subjugation and colonization of Russia in the writings of Paweł Palczowski..... | 77 |
| § 4. The genesis of colonization discourse in the work of Martin Paszkowski..... | 91 |
| Chapter III. The Siege and Capture of Smolensk as a Catalyst for the Spread of anti-Russian Literary Propaganda..... | 102 |
| § 1. Intensification of the creation of anti-Russian writings during the military campaign of 1609–1611..... | 102 |
| § 2. The Vilna Triumph in the context of propaganda of Sigismund III’s successes in the war against Russia..... | 125 |
| § 3. The main discourses of anti-Russian literary propaganda in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the capture of Smolensk on June 13, 1611..... | 136 |
| § 4. The Warsaw Sejm of 1611 and its decisions in the context of anti-Russian propaganda of the royal camp..... | 154 |
| Conclusion..... | 166 |
| References and Sources..... | 169 |

Introduction

The relevance of the chosen topic could be highly rated due to the special significance of the main plots of the Time of Troubles for Russian history and culture. The events and personalities of this period are reflected in all spheres of Russian spiritual life: in literature, sculpture, painting, theater, cinema, folk art etc. Russian public repeatedly turned in the crisis moments of own history to the images of heroes, who defended the independence of their own state in the first two decades of the XVIIth century. The example of K. Minin and D. Pozharsky, who liberated Moscow from foreign invaders, inspired the soldiers of the Red Army during the Great Patriotic War¹.

The importance of the subjects of the Time of Troubles for the development of national self-consciousness and all-Russian identity is also confirmed by the events of Russia's recent history. In particular, attention should be focused on the introduction of the "National Unity Day" celebrated annually on November 4 (since 2005). The holiday is officially regarded as a reconstruction of the commemorative date, established by Alexei Mikhailovich in 1649: the day of the Kazan Icon of the Mother of God. In modern commemorative practices, the date of November 4 is associated with the triumph of the Second People's Militia and the surrender of the Polish garrison in the Kremlin.

It should be noted that historical science does not have an absolute monopoly on relaying the plots of the Time of Troubles, as the importance of this period for Russian culture is extremely high. For this reason, not only professional researchers are the keepers of the history of the Time of Troubles, but also the memory of those events is the property of the entire Russian society. This circumstance allows us to refer the Time of Troubles to the category of "places of memory" in the terms of P. Nora. The French historian's reasoning about the phenomenon of "places of memory" ontologically correlates with the research direction we have chosen: «memory is life, the bearers of which are always living social groups, and in this sense it is in the process of constant

¹ Burova O., Ivanov V. S. "There is no such force that would enslave us" (Kozma Minin). Moscow, 1942; Burova O., Ivanov V. S. "Our truth. Fight to the death!" (Dmitry Pozharsky). Moscow, 1942.

evolution, it is open to the dialectics of remembering and amnesia»². Turning to the events of the Time of Troubles in our thesis, we are acting in line with the current social demand for the study of our own national roots, without which it is difficult to imagine modern Russian society.

The historical community is unanimous in its assessment of the Time of Troubles as one of the most tragic periods of Russian history, which became a significant boundary in chronology. Economical devastation, socio-political decline, spiritual and moral crisis caused by the horrors of the civil war – there is no aspect of Russian life in the first quarter of the XVIIth century that was not affected by the Time of Troubles. In addition to the totality of internal political causes, the genesis of such a complex phenomenon as the Time of Troubles cannot be considered without external factors, the most important of which is labeled in historiography by the phrase “foreign intervention”.

Interference of neighbors in the affairs of the Moscow tsardom began long before the official declaration of war in 1609. The Polish trace in the escalation of turmoil was evident from the first days of False Dmitry I’s entry into the Russian state. Despite the fact that by the time of the solemn entry into Moscow³, no more than 600–700 Polish horsemen remained in the impostor’s army, and victories in decisive battles were brought to the applicant not by Polish-Lithuanian weapons, but by the forces of militia of southern Russia⁴, it is impossible to imagine the success of the False Dmitry’s enterprise at the initial stage without the support of the Polish-Lithuanian political elite.

The motives that prompted the noble families of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to interfere in Russian affairs and support the impostor were comprehensively reflected in the “conditions” that were set by Sigismund III before False Dmitry I⁵. The false prince was expected to make territorial concessions in favor of the Polish-Lithuanian state, the admission of the Jesuits to Moscow, military assistance

² Nora P. Problematics of places of memory // France-memory. St. Petersburg, 1999. P. 20.

³ Skrynnikov R. G. Socio-political struggle in the Russian state at the beginning of the XVII century. Leningrad, 1985. P. 265.

⁴ Florya B. N. The Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia and Russian society. Moscow, 2005. P. 60.

⁵ See details: Alexandrenko V. N. Materials on the Time of Troubles in Russia of the XVII century // Antiquity and novelty. Book 14. 1911. P. 443–444.

against Sweden, as well as loyalty to the project of the “eternal union” of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Moscow tsardom.

It should be remembered that such ambitious goals, which were not publicized under the conditions of the secretive nature of the intervention in Russia, were understandable mainly to the representatives of the magnaneria, which was directly involved in the formation of the internal and foreign policy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The following question is actualized on this account: what motivated the ordinary nobility, small Polish and Lithuanian knighthood, and even representatives of the bourgeoisie to gather under the flags of False Dmitry? Chronologically, this problem goes beyond the enterprise of the first false tsarevitch, as Polish-Lithuanian volunteers continued to play an important role in the adventures of subsequent impostors. It should be noted that their independent actions in the Moscow lands did not stop even after the official declaration of war by King Sigismund III to Vasily Shuisky.

The mass participation of outlanders in the tragic events of the Time of Troubles causes the interest of modern foreign scientists in the period we are studying. The data presented in the dissertation on the material of little-studied sources on the perception of the Polish-Lithuanian reading public of the circumstances of the participation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the war against Russia are able to contribute to world historiography due to their novelty.

The **object of the** study is the public ways of describing the relations between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia during the Time of Troubles. The perceptions of Polish and Lithuanian contemporaries of the nature and expected consequences of the crisis phenomena that engulfed the Moscow Tsardom changed under the influence of actual military and political events⁶. The presented thesis is devoted to the study of the reasons, principles and mechanisms of creating informational and propaganda texts about the Time of Troubles, as well as to the identification of the main meaning-forming discourses in them.

⁶ Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian literary propaganda of the Time of Troubles: to the issue of periodization // The Slavic World: Community and Diversity. Theses of the conference of young scientists in the framework of the Days of Slavic Script and Culture. May 24–25, 2022 / Edited by E. S. Uzenyova, O. V. Khavanova. Moscow, 2022. P. 43–47.

As the main **subject of the** study, we have chosen sources of “small literary forms”⁷ of the Time of Troubles, which have been little studied in historical science. Flying sheets, occasional poetry, funeral texts, political polemics and journalism, collections of epigrams, panegyrics, fraszki and kolyads have not been previously considered as integral literary phenomenon. Despite the fact that all mentioned genre trends seem to be extremely heterogeneous in relation to each other, we cannot ignore their utilitarian unity. The works of these genres filled the information space of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with topical socio-political subjects, which is why we studied chosen sources from the historiosophic position of holism.

The aim of the thesis is to identify the propaganda potential of literary monuments of “small literary forms” published in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Time of Troubles and devoted to Russian themes.

In order to achieve the aim of our study, we had to complete a number of **tasks**:

1) To analyze the influence of current socio-political events on the plot content of printed publications published during the Time of Troubles in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

2) To conduct a comparative-textual analysis in order to find out how texts influenced each other.

3) To identify the main meaning-making discourses used in the anti-Russian information campaign.

4) To study the symbols and plots constructed by different authors and used in the ideological struggle against Moscow.

5) To trace the dynamics of the growth of anti-Russian sentiment, which gradually increased as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was drawn deeper into the events of the Russian Troubles.

6) To study the degree of personal interest of individual authors of propaganda works in the events of turmoil in those cases, where the sources provide such an

⁷ See details about the terminology: Shamin S. M. Foreign "pamphlets" and "curiosities" in Russia of the XVI – early XVIII century. Moscow, 2020. P. 12–15.

opportunity (whether the authors were eyewitnesses of the events, whether their patrons participated in the intervention, etc.).

The chronological framework of the thesis are the following: from the second half of the XVIth century to 1612. The vagueness of the lower boundary could be explained by the need to consider the genesis of anti-Russian polemics in the preceding Time of Troubles period of Russian history. Polish-Russian relations before the adventure of False Dmitry I had their own rich history and many turning points in it. Without reference to a number of literary sources, created during the Livonian War, our analysis of Polish-Lithuanian political rhetoric during the turmoil in Russia could hardly be called exhaustive.

The upper frame of our study is strictly defined: we were prompted to finish the study of historical sources on 1612 because of the political defeat of King Sigismund at the ordinary Sejm, held from September to November of 1611 in Warsaw. This event demonstrated that propaganda texts distributed with the support of the royal entourage could not influence the sentiments of oppositional szlachta ambassadors, which is why the monarch did not receive the financial sources, necessary to continue the war against Russia.

After the Warsaw Sejm the texts of “small literary forms” gradually lost their significance as a leading element of anti-Russian propaganda campaign and filled with completely new discourses. In particular, in the literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, published after the expulsion of the Polish garrison from the Kremlin, the opinion gradually formed that the exaggeration of military and political successes in Russia by the royal court did not allow the Sejm to take a sober look at the course of the war with a neighboring state and to vote for the levies necessary for the successful completion of the campaign. The literary reinterpretation of the reasons for the loss of Moscow for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth goes beyond the chosen topic of our thesis, since it no longer falls under the category of aggressive military agitation against Russia.

The geographical scope of thesis is mainly limited by the frontiers of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the context of studying the influence of certain socio-

political events on the dissemination of news in Europe through printed media, we touched upon several regions remote from the Polish-Lithuanian lands. For example, we noted how the death of False Dmitry I was announced in London by means of flyers, or how after the capture of Smolensk by Sigismund III Rome was filled with congratulatory panegyrics. This kind of outreach beyond the geographical boundaries of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is limited and used purely as a supplement to the main study.

Methodology and methods of research. The complex of the set tasks determined the use of an interdisciplinary methodological approach. In addition to the traditional for historical science textual method, we applied the method of discourse analysis to the sources we studied. Previously mentioned heterogeneity of used in the thesis sources caused the use of genology.

The degree of consistency and effectiveness of propaganda as a cultural and informational phenomenon is usually measured in connection with the level of development of mass media in the society. Due to this, the phenomenon of propaganda received the most attention in scientific works in the XXth century, where it was considered as a controlled and guided process. Nevertheless, it is impossible to ignore the inherent features of propaganda in the polemical discourses of previous historical periods. According to F. Taylor, a prominent researcher of propaganda theory, the essential feature of propaganda is to make people think and act in ways they would not have acted without its influence⁸.

In the presented thesis will be shown that the call to leave the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and to enter the Moscow lands with arms in hand was inherent in many multi-genre works of the Time of Troubles period (it was most clearly manifested in “exhorts”, “posilki” and “pobudki”). The fundamental method of propaganda is to create symbols to which society should react with the “right” (favorable to the propaganda goals) spectrum of emotions⁹. The image of a pitiful tsarevitch in need of help from the Polish and Lithuanian peoples, the symbol of Muscovite barbarians ready to descend

⁸ Taylor P. M. *Munitions of the mind. A history of propaganda from the ancient world to the present day.* Manchester; New York, 1995. P. 1.

⁹ Lasswell G. D. *Propaganda Technique in the World War.* New York, 1938. P. 9.

upon the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at any moment, the idea of Nemesis, which was to be embodied by the chivalry avenging the “bloody wedding” and other offenses – these and similar ideological stamps were (re)constructed everywhere in Polish-Lithuanian literature of the Time of Troubles.

Any society is particularly vulnerable to propaganda at difficult moments in its history¹⁰. The situation in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the early XVIIth century falls under this definition in many respects. The combination of internal (Zebrzydowski’s *rokosz*) and external (the long conflict with Sweden) turmoil created anxious moods in Polish-Lithuanian society. This was subtly felt by the writers of that time: from the miniature verses of K. Miaskowski¹¹ to the historical and didactic epic of M. Paszkowski¹² – the motive of lamenting about “house ruin” became widely popular in Polish literature of the first two decades of the XVIIth century. In view of all of the above, we give the toolkit of propaganda theory a prominent place in the methodology of this thesis.

Due to the fact that the source base of the thesis is a multilayered complex of Old Polish written sources, it is impossible to fulfill all the set tasks without applying the methods of literary studies.

In 1931, S. Skwarczyńska formulated the concept of “literatura stosowana”¹³. According to the researcher, old printed literary works could be divided into two wings: “literatura piękna” (beautiful literature) and “literatura stosowana” (applied literature). “Beautiful literature” generalizes genres and works in which aesthetics, expressive means and artistic forms play the main role (which is close to the concept of “l’art pour l’art”). “Applied literature” also strives to conform to the artistic and aesthetic canons of the style of the era, but was still willing to sacrifice them in favor of the informative component of the work. This type of literature includes polemical, journalistic, chronographic and topical (*okolicznościowy*) texts.

¹⁰ Lasswell G. D. *Propaganda Technique in the World War*. New York, 1938. P. 190–191.

¹¹ Miaskowski K. *Zbiór rytmów*. Kraków, 1612.

¹² Paszkowski M. *Wizerunek wiecznej sławy Sauromatów starych*. Kraków, 1613.

¹³ Skwarczyńska S. O pojęcie literatury stosowanej // *Pamiętnik Literacki: czasopismo kwartalne poświęcone historii i krytyce literatury polskiej*. 1931. T. 28. № 1/4. S. 1–24.

The genres used in this thesis fall under the category of “applied” literary works¹⁴, which allows us to interpret them as a historical source and to consider the artistic means used in texts as one of the ways of transmitting information from the author to the reader. It should be noted that Skwarczyńska’s concept has been criticized over time, because more and more sources appeared, that do not fall under the proposed classification. Such criticism has grounds and should be taken into account, but in our opinion, the concept of “literatura stosowana” is relevant to the literature of the Time of Troubles.

The Baroque era is characterized by a wide involvement of amateur authors in literature. Literary pursuits looked even more tempting for second-rate authors in the context of the reading public’s increased demand for descriptions of current socio-political events. In view of all the above, the Polish-Lithuanian literature of the Troubles era has high quantitative and low qualitative indicators, and for the most part will be considered through the prism of the concept of “applied literature”.

The need to solve the problem of studying the dynamics of the development of propaganda plots and the typology of anti-Moscow discourses during the Troubles is the reason why we used the genological methodology. Baroque literature is characterized by the rapid development of genres that could appear and disappear in a few years. Under certain conditions, the dominant discourse in society is capable of generating a new genre. Discursive filling of a certain genre form and modifications of discourse can lead to the fact that a certain type of statement can disappear from communication, being replaced by a genre adopted arbitrarily according to new communicative or cultural conventions¹⁵. Thus, for example, anti-Turkish sentiments in Polish-Lithuanian society gave rise to the genre of “turciks”.

Within the framework of genology, genre is understood as a set of intersubjectively functioning rules, framed historically and culturally, lived within certain discourses¹⁶. In Polish-Lithuanian literature of the Time of Troubles period actual discursive conventions had a noticeable impact on small genres. The “Dimitriada” did not become a new genre,

¹⁴ Skwarczyńska S. *Teoria listu*. Warszawa, 1937. S. 17–19.

¹⁵ Voytak M. *Genology of everyday texts // Genres of speech*. 1(11), 2015. P. 40–41.

¹⁶ Żydek-Bednarczuk U. *Typy, odmiany, klasy... tekstów. W poszukiwaniu kryteriów // Stylistyka a pragmatyka / Red. B. Witosz*. Katowice, 2001. S. 114–121.

as, for example, the *Turciki*, but it united thematically and subordinated a large number of other genres to its plot component. The use of the genealogical method in analyzing the works of dimitriads helps to reveal new meanings in the texts.

During the work on the research topic, sources in Polish, Latin, German, French, English and Italian were involved. All translations given in the text of the thesis were made by the author. The fragments of sources adapted by us are accompanied by the original text in footnotes, which allows to control the degree of relevance of translations.

Used poetic works have their own distinctive structure, conditioned by the literary and artistic norms of the XVI–XVIIth centuries. We tried to preserve the original organization of the text of the cited texts: the original line-by-line division of rhymed works in our work is indicated by the sign “/”. When referring to poetic texts, we used the abbreviation “ln.” to indicate the individual lines quoted in them. If the text used is a small work in a literary compilation, then together with the indication of the page and the quoted lines, we additionally designated the monument itself (“Song XI, ln. 1–4”, “On the same [Dmitry epigram], ln. 1–2”, etc.). The titles of the cited sources in the thesis are given in the original language and highlighted in italics, each literary monument mentioned for the first time in the text has its own bibliographic footnote.

Quotes from sources are arranged according to the following rules:

The quoted rhyming fragments in our translation are reproduced in the center of the page and separated from the main text by additional empty lines in cases where they are independently able to illustrate/argue the content of one or more logically related paragraphs of the study.

The cited fragments of sources in our translation are integrated directly into the text of the work in cases where they are consistently cited together with other quotations and only collectively reveal any research plot we have highlighted.

The cited fragments are given in the original language in cases where the use of certain words and phrases by the authors of the sources is fundamentally important for our research. For example, working with the original text is necessary as part of a textual analysis. Such fragments are provided with footnotes, which provide a translation of the text into Russian.

The main source base of the study was made up of Polish-language texts, which prompts us to specify in advance the mechanisms of work on their translation. The syntax of the Polish language is quite close to Russian, which is why, with rare exceptions, we were able to reproduce the structure of the original texts verbatim without rearranging words in places. Nevertheless, the language of the sources of the XVI–XVIIth centuries lexically differs significantly from the modern one. This circumstance led to the appeal to the “Dictionary of the Polish language of the XVIth century”¹⁷ The first volume of this edition was published in 1966 and work on it continues to this day (the estimated release time of the last volume is scheduled for 2035¹⁸). The dictionary is developed by a team of Polish philologists and historians according to the following principle: each word was given in all known interpretations with numerous examples of its use in real historical sources. The use of such fundamental reference literature allowed us to cope with the translation of the sources necessary for the disclosure of the topic of the thesis at a level relevant to the tasks set.

In addition to mentioned above methodological features of the work in the process of writing the thesis such general scientific methods as description, analysis, synthesis and systematization were used.

The source base of the study. The presented thesis is based on a large number of multi-genre sources of “small literary forms”. For the disclosure of the chosen topic we used both republished and well-studied in historical science texts along with practically unknown monuments from the funds of domestic and foreign archives and library collections. Since the heterogeneity of the studied texts does not allow us to make a unified overview of the source base. We have described the used historical monuments and their peculiarities directly in the chapters of our study. Nevertheless, in the introduction to the presented thesis we consider it necessary to point out the common features inherent in the literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the period we have chosen for study.

¹⁷ Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku / red. Mayenowa M. R., Peplowski F. (t. 1–34), Mrowcewicz K., Potoniec P. (t. 35–37), K. Wilczewska, L. Woronczakowa i in. (t. 27–37). Wrocław, 1966–1994; Warszawa, 1995–

¹⁸ See details: Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku [Electronic resource] / Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku [Electronic resource] / Internetowy przewodnik edukacyjny; red. Bańko M., Majdak M., Czeszewski M. URL : <http://www.leksykografia.uw.edu.pl/slowniki/28/slownik-polszczyzny-xvi-wieku-wroclaw-1966> (date of visit: 20.11.2023).

Throughout the entire Renaissance period, the development of literary traditions in Poland proceeded entirely in line with general European cultural trends¹⁹. With rare exceptions²⁰, the Polish-Lithuanian lands in the XVth and first half of the XVIth centuries did not reveal any genre peculiarities not peculiar to Western European literature. Polish authors took as a model the works of Italian humanists together with various grammars and verse textbooks published in Europe²¹. In the Western Slavic lands such works were known in the pre-publication book period. For example, the Jagiellonian Library held a fourteenth-century manuscript of Aristotle's *Poetics*²². However, this phenomenon falls more under the category of special cases than general rules. The first work devoted to the art of diction published directly in Poland itself appeared in 1505 in Krakow²³. The success of the book was a signal for publishers, and similar works began to be printed on a regular basis in the Polish-Lithuanian state.

In his work *De scholis*²⁴ (1551), Professor Szymon Maricjusz of Pilsno, a professor at the Kraków Academy, left a vivid sketch of how literature was studied in higher educational institutions in sixteenth-century Poland, and what an exceptional role ancient epic literature played in this process. The author himself taught students ancient literature and recommended following the canons of Homer, Aratus of Sol, Pythagoras, Cato, Fokilides and, of course, Virgil²⁵.

Publius Virgil Maron had a special status in European written culture. In the Middle Ages, according to the ideas of Christian thinkers, the poet's texts (especially his famous "Bucolics") considered to contain a prediction of the appearance of the "miraculous child" – Jesus Christ. Therefore, largely thanks to the Church, Virgil's creative legacy was not lost in the centuries. Also, the "Aeneid" was a source of borrowed plots for many medieval chivalric novels. The use of Virgil's figure by Dante Alighieri in his *Divine*

¹⁹ Pelc J. *Renesans w literaturze polskiej. Początki i rozwój // Problemy literatury staropolskiej. Seria pierwsza / pod red. J. Pelca. Wrocław, 1972. S. 30–32.*

²⁰ See details: Woronczak J. *Polskość i europejskość literatury naszego Średniowiecza // Problemy literatury staropolskiej. Seria pierwsza / pod red. J. Pelca. Wrocław, 1972. S. 7–28.*

²¹ Gansiniec R. „Metrificale” Marka z Opatowca i traktaty gramatyczne XIV i XV wieku. Wrocław, 1960. S. 12–15.

²² Tatkiewicz W. *Historia estetyki. T. 3: Estetyka nowożytna. Wrocław–Warszawa, 1967. S. 206.*

²³ See details: Horatius Flaccus. *Poetarum institutiones ad pisonem. Q. Horatij flaccij Carmen seculare. G. L. Cracovie, 1505.*

²⁴ *De scholis seu academiis libri duo. Kraków, 1551.*

²⁵ Szymon Marycjusz z Pilzna. *O szkolach, czyli akademiach ksiąg dwoje / Prz. A. Danysz, wstęp H. Barycz. Wrocław, 1955. S. 112–114.*

Comedy further cemented the Roman poet's fame as a major pre-Christian literary authority.

The figure and work of Virgil at the turn of the Renaissance and Baroque gained special popularity in the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. "Aeneid" was regarded as a benchmark of the genre of "epic", which was very highly valued by Polish litterateurs, as it alone could afford to touch upon countless themes at once²⁶. While in the Renaissance era, the "Aeneid" attracted readers and imitators primarily by its stylistics, Baroque authors were more interested in the didacticism and "historicity" of the narrative²⁷. Virgil's epic presented readers with a coherent cosmographic picture that appealed to the intellectuals of the turn of the XVI/XVIIth century. The gods and various mystical forces, full participants in Virgil's epic, were metaphorically and allusively reinterpreted in Baroque literature. The pagan Mars and Venus, the Furies and Moiras lost their personalization, turning under the influence of the Counter-Reformation into metaphorical figures (war, love, fate, etc.).

By imitating the "historical" part of the "Aeneid", Polish-Lithuanian writers pursued two goals: either they created an opus playing the role of an *origo gentis* saga (Palemoniad, Lehiad), or the work became a panegyric in the stylistic canon of the epic, serving the purpose of glorifying the addressee (Jagielloniada, Radziwilliada, Batoriada). Within the framework of our research, it is important to emphasize once again the "historical" beginning of the ancient epic, adopted and adapted by Polish-Lithuanian authors in the early Baroque era. It can be stated that in practice the role of the historian and the poet was spliced together. Poetry could reveal the described events from a new angle. Thanks to it, it was possible to give the facts a certain meaning, to emphasize or diminish their significance, to fill them with emotional coloring, etc. In our opinion, this symbiosis between the roles of historian and poet is best illustrated by the figure of M. Strykowski. The mentioned author is known to posterity in two roles at once: as a major historiographer of the GDL²⁸, who compiled a chronicle in the national language²⁹, and

²⁶ Nieznanowski S. *Staropolska epepeja historczna. Kształtowanie się pojęcia, drogi rozwoju*. Wrocław, 1972. S. 394.

²⁷ *Ibid.* S. 395–396.

²⁸ Rogov. A. I. *Russian-Polish cultural ties in the Renaissance (Strykowski and his chronicle)*. Moscow, 1966. P. 7–9.

²⁹ Strykowski M. *Kronika polska, litewska, zmodzka i wszystkiej Rusi*. Krolewiec, 1582.

as the most prominent poet of the XVIth century³⁰, able to compete with Virgil in the poetic field³¹.

A distinctive and very important feature of the literature of the initial stage of the Baroque period is that in the period under study the number of authors grew at the expense of people from social strata that had not previously been characterized by creative activity. Bourgeois poetry flourished: representatives of the urban upper classes (doctors, merchants, artisans, etc.) began to devote their leisure time to literary creation. New authors made themselves known, and their work was not at all limited to small phrases. For example, M. Bielski, a brilliant self-taught writer³², who had no university education, created a fundamental *Kronika wszystkiego świata*³³ in Polish, which was as informative as the works of professional European chronographers³⁴.

There were people for whom studying literature was not just a hobby, but a real profession. During this period the number of “home poets” – authors who passed from one patron to another and engaged in glorification of their patrons – multiplied rapidly. For example, M. Paszkowski, who lost his land holdings during the Polish-Swedish conflicts in the Baltics, is known to us as a very poor poet³⁵, who took up literature for mercenary purposes, as he “hoped to improve his fate with rhymes”³⁶. Authors, who connected their life with this kind of literary activity, were in constant search of patrons. They tried in every possible way to please their patrons with their work, and the participation of representatives of Polish noble families in the events of the Troubles just gave a wide scope for the singing of new heroes and denunciation of hostile Muscovites.

³⁰ Golenishchev-Kutuzov I. N. The Italian Renaissance and Slavic literature of the XV-XVI centuries. Moscow, 1963. P. 309.

³¹ The original manuscript of Strykowski's epic poem “About the Beginnings...” dates back to 1577. The work was published only in the 20th century: Strykowski M. O początkach, wywodach, dzielnościach, sprawach rycerskich i domowych sławnego narodu litewskiego, żemojdzkiego i ruskiego / oprac. J. Radziszewska. Warszawa, 1978.

³² Bibliografia Literatury Polskiej – Nowy Korbut. T. 2: Piśmiennictwo Staropolskie. Warszawa, 1964. S. 27–30.

³³ Bielski M. Kronika wszystkiego świata na sześć wieków, monarchie cztery rozdzielona, z kosmografią i z rozmaitemi królestwy, tak pogańskimi, żydowskimi, jako i krześcijańskimi, z Sybillami i prorocctwy ich, po polsku pisana, z figurami, w której też żywoty cesarskie, papieskie i tych królów z ich królestwy, asyryjskich, egipskich, żydowskich, greckich, perskich, tureckich, węgierskich, czeskich i inych królów, książąt, jako inych przelożonych, od początku świata aż do tego roku, który się pisze 1551, są wypisane, między któremi też nasza Polska na ostatku z osobna jest wypisana. Kraków, [1551].

³⁴ Karnaukhov D. V. The Polish-language historical book in the intellectual culture of the Renaissance // Humanities in Siberia. 2008. No. 3. P. 34–35.

³⁵ Juszyński H. Dykcjonarz poetow polskich. T.2. Kraków, 1820. S. 47.

³⁶ Siarczyński F. Obraz wieku panowania Zygmunta III, króla polskiego i szwedzkiego, zawierający opis osób żyjących pod jego panowaniem. T. 2. Lwów, 1828. S. 62.

The abundance of new mediocre poets, whose work marked the Polish-Lithuanian literature of the Time of Troubles, allowed A. Oszczyda to conclude that the anti-Moscow literary cycle stands out for the quantity, but not for the quality of literary material³⁷.

Genres, in which the informative and news aspect was initially a priority, deserve special mention. The circulation of so-called fly-sheets in the Polish-Lithuanian lands intensified in the second half of the XVIth century. The events of the Livonian War and the Union of Lublin, the succession of interregnums in Poland and the subsequent election of new monarchs – such events inevitably became the main topic of numerous ephemerides. The literary field was filled with various news, and in the 1570s, for example, dozens of different news publications were published annually³⁸.

The information boom reached its next round of development in the first two decades of the 17th century. At that time, news about the Polish-Swedish confrontation in the Baltics was actively printed, and several information brochures on the subject were published every year. Not a single major success was missed – for example, in Polish, German, Italian and Latin, immediately in 1605, the victory of J. Chodkiewicz over the troops of Charles IX at Kirchholm was celebrated in fly sheets³⁹.

Further, starting from the same year 1605, a new topic emerges in the Polish-Lithuanian news space, which attracted the close attention of the reading audience: the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was filled with urgent news about the beginning of the “Dimitriades”. Supported by the Polish-Lithuanian nobility, the enterprise of an impostor tsarevich aiming for the Moscow throne stirred the minds of contemporaries. With the death of Boris Godunov and the entry of False Dmitry I into the capital it seemed to be one step away from the union with Moscow and the transformation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth into a republic of not two, but three nations. Nevertheless,

³⁷ Oszczyda A. *Mała Iliada – Nemezis kraju północnego Jakuba Duszy Podhoreckiego* // *Napis*. 2001. Seria VII. S. 135.

³⁸ For example, 21 editions in 1574 and 27 in 1577. Statistics from: Electronic Library of the Polish Language and news brochures related to Poland [Electronic resource] / Electronic Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences. URL : <http://cbdu.ijp.pan.pl/view/year/> (date of visit: 20.11.2023).

³⁹ *Avviso della gran vittoria ottenuta da Sigismondo III, re di Polonia, appresso Riga, il 27 settembre 1605, contro il duca Carlo di Sudermania*. Roma, 1605; *Ein neues Lied von der Belagerung der Stadt Riga und Schlacht bei Kirchholm zwischen dem Feldobersten von Polen Johann Karl Chodkiewicz und Herzog Karl aus Schweden am 27. September 1605*. [s.l.], 1605; *Mercurius Sauromaticus sive rerum in septentrionalibus regnis in decursu 1605 anni gestarum relation*. Mainz, 1606; *Nowiny z Inflant o porażce, która się stała nad Karolem, księciem Sudermańskim przez Jana Karola Chodkiewicza dnia 27 września 1605*. Kraków, 1605; *Wahrhaftige Neue Zeitung und Beschreibung der sieghaften Schlacht Sigismundi III., Königs von Polen, durch Carolum Chodkiewicz mit Carolo Fürsten von Sudermanland*. [s.l.], 1605.

this was not destined to come true due to the uprising of May 27, 1606, as a result of which both the tsarevich himself was killed and many wedding guests from Poland and Lithuania suffered.

The turmoil in Russia attracted the attention of the inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: interest in the events in the neighboring state was fueled by the fact that the crisis phenomena within both powers showed certain similarities. Ideas that the Time of Troubles were not “Russian” proper, but had a larger, regional character, are often expressed in modern historical science⁴⁰. In Polish polemics, contemporaries found Polish analogies to many Russian events of that time. For example, the similarity of the fates of Sigismund III and Tsarevich Dmitry Ivanovich was emphasized – just as the Swedish king was deposed from his rightful throne by Charles IX, so the usurper Boris Godunov deprived Dmitry of his royal crown. In view of this, a number of leaflets even proclaimed the Polish king and the Moscow tsarevich “brothers” in fate⁴¹. The internal turmoil in both states was not exempt from comparison – this is how, in its senselessness and bloodiness, the Zebrzydowski’s rebellion was compared by polemicists with the armed popular unrest in the Moscow state⁴².

The flying sheets of the time period we are interested in were able to capture such nuances. First of all, the specificity of this type of literary sources requires us to clarify the terminology used. The flying press of that epoch, more often than not, hid under the titles: *Listy / Gazety Ulotny, Nowiny, Opisy, Efemerydy, Relacji, Doniesienia, Pisma* in the Polish tradition, *Zeitungen, Neue Zeitungen, Flugblätter, Nachrichtenblätter, Einblattdrucke, Flugblattdrucke* in German, *Feuilles d'actualité, Feuilles d'information, Feuilles volantes, Occasionnels, Canards* in French, and *Avvisi, Lettere, Relazioni* in Italian. The origins of the very word combination “flying newspaper” are usually sought in the Mediterranean region. The etymology of the word “newspaper”, according to

⁴⁰ For example, see: Pensky V. V. Russian Distemper of the early XVII century - a local phenomenon or part of the global process? // *Time of Troubles in Russia: conflict and dialog of cultures*. St. Petersburg, 2012. P. 234–239.

⁴¹ Grochowski S. *Piesni na fest ucieszny wielkim dwiema narodom polskiemu y moskiewskiemu, przemoznego monarchy Dymitra Iwanowica cara moskiewskiego [...]* od autora powtore wydane, z przyczynieniem niektorych rytymow, do slawy tegoz wielkiego cara sluzacych. Kraków, 1606. A4v–B1r.

⁴² Paszkowski M. *Wizerunk wiecznej slawy Saurmatow starych, pobudzający młódz rycerską ku naśladowaniu spraw ich. Od szlachetnej Pallady, z Gniazda cnót ich, w ojczyстым Parnasie wbudowany. A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego, z przykłady mężów rzymskich, onych wielkich miłośników Ojczyzny, opisany i wydany. Hic sibi delegit sedem pulcherrina virtus, Hinc sua Sauromatas, fors super astra vehit*. Kraków, 1613. A4v–B2r.

experts, is derived from the Italian “gazzetta” – a bargaining chip for which the first news sheets were bought⁴³. In the XVIth century, the term is fixed as a name for the category of news leaflets, usually of topical content, and goes beyond the Italian lands.

For the first time historians turned to the subject of flying newspapers in Polish bibliography in the first quarter of the XIXth century. The pioneer here is the researcher F. Bentkowski, who in 1814 in his work “History of Polish Literature” noted that under King Wladyslaw IV newsprint was widely spread, but since these publications were not periodical in nature, they could not be classified as regular newspapers⁴⁴. It was necessary to introduce into scientific circulation a new category to classify such publications – “fly-sheets”.

A. T. Chlendorowski in 1816 in research essay “On the First Periodicals in Polish” also touched upon the topic of flying newspapers. An important step in understanding the phenomenon of the flying press was the statement of the frequent use of verse forms in ephemerides, which distinguishes them from the first periodical news publications that appeared later⁴⁵. In article “Brief Notices of Polish Newspapers” (1819) J.S. Bandtke mentioned, that already in XVIth century news avisas were often published after major battles. The researcher noted the multilingualism of fly-sheets⁴⁶: one and the same news text could be issued in several different languages at once. The flysheets targeted not only the readers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also sought to reach audiences in other European countries.

In bibliography the dispute about the status of such flyers ran throughout the first half of the XIXth century. For example, K. Majeranowski did not consider the flying press to be a separate phenomenon, and called printed after battles text “the first periodicals”⁴⁷. F. Siarczyński opposed this opinion. In his monograph “A picture of the time of Sigismund III’s reign” the author gave a special status to volatile publications and

⁴³ Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti. T. 16. Roma, 1949. S. 470.

⁴⁴ Bentkowski F. Historia Literatury polskiej. T. 2. Warszawa, 1814. S. 671.

⁴⁵ Chlendorowski A. T. O początkowych pismach periodycznych w języku polskim. „Pamiętnik Lwowski”. T. 1. Lwow, 1816. S. 122–133.

⁴⁶ Bandtke J. S. Wiadomość krótka o Gazetach Polskich, czytana na posiedzeniu Towarz. 15 Maia 1817 // Rocznik Towarzystwa Naukowego z Uniwersytetem Krakowskim Połączonego. T. 4. Kraków, 1819. S. 205.

⁴⁷ Majeranowski K. Wiadomość historyczno-krytyczna o pismach periodycznych najdawniejszych czasów aż do roku 1826 alfabetycznie zebrane // Flora Polska. T. 5. Kraków, 1826. S. 35.

separated them from regular periodicals⁴⁸. According to Siarczyński, flyers were characterized by irregularity, could be entirely devoted to news from other countries, were of a topical nature, reported, as a rule, no more than one major news item, the information could be presented in verse, and the flyers themselves could be printed in marching conditions.

Further study of flysheets went in the direction of search and accumulation of new titles of news ephemerides for the XVI–XVIIth century. The bibliography was significantly enriched thanks to the works of M. Wiśniewski⁴⁹ and W. A. Maciejowski⁵⁰ – both researchers compiled parallel works of catalog type, which attempted to introduce a classification of flyleaf publications. The newspapers were divided according to formal, external characteristics: signed or anonymous, written in verse or prose, leaf or brochure forms of publication, etc.

F. M. Sobieszcański's research essay "Polish Newspapers"⁵¹ expressed other ideas on classification. Instead of artificial rubrication, the author suggested a more detailed study of the terminology of flyleaf titles. Sobieszcański searched for the distinguishing features of "letters", "noviny", "relacja", "descriptions", "notices", etc. This can be called the main direction for the study of flysheets in the second half of the XIXth century: the emphasis was no longer on the study of the external attributes of the publication in the context of scientific bibliography, but on the analysis of the text itself. Flysheets received more attention from historical science than in the previous period. The approach to the flysheet newspaper as a special type of historical source can be found in the works of K. Bąkowski⁵², S. Gorski⁵³ and W. Czajewski⁵⁴.

The subject of the flying press reached a new stage of development in Poland only in the post-war years. In historical science the topic of propaganda studies was actualized on a worldwide level and the flying press of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries fell into this

⁴⁸ Siarczyński F. *Obraz wieku panowania Zygmunta III, króla polskiego i szwedzkiego*. T. 1. Poznań, 1843. S. 178–182.

⁴⁹ Wiśniewski M. *Historia literatury polskiej*. T. VIII. Kraków, 1851. S. 44–55.

⁵⁰ Maciejowski W. A. *Piśmiennictwo polskie od czasów najdawniejszych aż do roku 1830*. T. II. Warszawa, 1852. S. 675–677.

⁵¹ Sobieszcański F. M. *Czasopisma polskie // Encyklopedia Powszechna Orgelbranda*. T. IV. Warszawa, 1861. S. 304–306.

⁵² Bąkowski K. *Dziennikarstwo krakowskie do roku 1848 // Rocznik Krakowski*. Kraków, 1906. S. 129–138.

⁵³ Gorski S. *Dziennikarstwo polskie*. Warszawa, 1905.

⁵⁴ Czajewski W. *Warszawa ilustrowana*. T. VII. *Czasopiśmiennictwo*. Warszawa, 1896.

stream⁵⁵. Researchers have responded differently to the question of whether the dominant motive in the flying press was news or propaganda, since moral evaluations of events are given in an overwhelming number of news ephemerides. A. Kersten urged the researchers not to go to extremes and proved that in the sources under study the two origins coexisted quite harmoniously⁵⁶.

In recent decades, the study of the subject of the flying press in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has been dominated by the tendency to publish not generalized works, but highly specialized studies. The study of the early stage of the existence of flying newspapers in the Polish lands was carried out by J. Pirożyński⁵⁷. J. A. Drob devoted a separate study to the phenomenon of the change of flying news publications to regularly published newspapers in the era of the “Swedish Deluge”⁵⁸.

Special mention should be made about the works of K. Zawadzki, who compiled the most complete to date three-volume catalog of flying newspapers⁵⁹, either printed in Poland or thematically related to it. Zawadzki summarized his research on flysheets in his monograph “Beginnings of the Polish Press”⁶⁰. The researcher suggested that the word combination “gazeta ulotna”⁶¹ summarized the totality of news ephemerides. The bibliographer contrasted “fugacity” with the “regularity” of the first newspapers that appeared later⁶². Zawadzki also tried to give a scientific definition of the concept of “flying publication”. According to him, a flying newspaper is “a verse or prose publication, mostly of small volume, containing one or more topical news from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth or abroad. In terms of content, flysheets were usually of a political, religious or sensational nature, issued on the occasion of important or extraordinary events that could widely attract public interest”⁶³.

⁵⁵ Zawadzki K. *Początki prasy polskiej: gazety ulotne i seryjne XVI-XVIII wieku*. Warszawa, 2002. S.18–19.

⁵⁶ Kersten A. W sprawie badań nad początkami prasy polskiej // *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1963. Z. 1. S. 69–83.

⁵⁷ Pirożyński J. *Z dziejów obiegu informacji w Europie XVI wieku. Nowiny z Polski w kolekcji Jana Jakuba Wicka w Zurychu z lat 1560–1587*. Kraków, 1995.

⁵⁸ Drob. J. A. *Obieg informacji w Europie w połowie XVII wieku*. Lublin, 1993.

⁵⁹ Zawadzki K. *Gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące XVI–XVIII wieku*. Bibliografia. T. 1. 1514–1661. Wrocław, 1977; T. 2. 1662–1728. Wrocław, 1984; T.3. 1501–1725. Wrocław, 1990.

⁶⁰ Zawadzki K. *Początki prasy polskiej: Gazety ulotne i seryjne XVI-XVIII wieku*. Warszawa, 2002.

⁶¹ Zawadzki K. *Szesnastowieczne gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące. Terminologia. Definicja. Charakterystyka. Zagadnienia edytorskie i topograficzne // Rocznik Historii Czasopiśmiennictwa Polskiego*. T. XI/1. S. 6.

⁶² *Ibid.* S. 9.

⁶³ Zawadzki K. *Szesnastowieczne gazety ulotne polskie...* S. 12.

Prior studies of the issue. “«Smutology» is a very young science”⁶⁴ – with these words A. Y. Dvornichenko began his reflections in a recently published article about the state of modern specialized researches, devoted to the dramatic events of Russian history of the turn of the XVI–XVIIth centuries. It should be noted that the mentioned branch of historical knowledge seems to be not only young, but also actively developing. A little more than ten years have passed since the release of A. A. Selin’s article about the primary directions in modern “Smutology”⁶⁵, but the main research trends have already changed significantly.

From the point of view of source studies, we can see a rapid growth of historians’ interest in texts, that previously traditionally belonged to the sphere of scientific interests of linguists and philologists. Polish scholars with the support of the Warsaw scientific publishing house Neriton have launched a process of reprinting and scholarly commentary on texts of “small literary forms” from the Time of Troubles period. A. Oszczyda’s anthology “Moskiewski Mars”⁶⁶ reproduces under one binding a multitude of little-studied multi-genre monuments that shed light on the socio-political realities of Russia and Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Time of Troubles. This work can be considered a kind of manifesto of this trend.

The republishing and scientific commentary of little-known literary monuments of the Troubles period seems to be the main trend in contemporary Polish “Smutology”. In addition, the intermediate results of the research of Polish specialists dealing with the above-mentioned layer of sources are actively published by the journal of the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences “Napis”. This periodical supplemented and substantially refined S. Skwarczyńska’s methodological concept. The central idea of the journal is the revision of the Polish-Lithuanian literary heritage through the prism of the latest methodological schools, which is fully in line with the idea of our thesis. In different years, the following authors have published articles close to the topic

⁶⁴ Dvornichenko A. Y. Smuta as a factor of Russian history // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. History. 2018. Vol. 63. Issue. 3. P. 677.

⁶⁵ Selin A. A. The Time of Troubles in the historiography of recent years // The time of Troubles in Russia: conflict and dialogue of cultures. Materials of the scientific conference. St. Petersburg, October 12-14, 2012. St. Petersburg, 2012. P. 223–227.

⁶⁶ Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / oprac. A. Oszczyda. Warszawa, 2016.

of this dissertation: A. Budzyńska-Daca⁶⁷, M. Kuran⁶⁸, M. Jarczykova⁶⁹, M. Krzysztofik⁷⁰, P. Borek⁷¹, R. Krzywy⁷², J. Niedźwiedź⁷³ and other authors whose works have been taken into account in our research and mentioned in the relevant chapters.

In Russian historiography of recent years, the topic of our research has received much less attention from specialists, which determines the brevity of the essay about the prior studies of the issue. We intentionally do not take out the fundamental research on the history of the Time of Troubles, which were used separately in the preparation of the work, since we developed precisely a narrowly focused plot for “Smutology”: the dynamics of anti-Russian propaganda during the Time of Troubles, based on the material of specific sources of “small literary forms”. Among the authors, whose works thematically close to the theme of our thesis, we can highlight such names as D. I. Antonov⁷⁴, L. M. Arzhakova⁷⁵, D. V. Karnaukhov⁷⁶, A. I. Tsepkov⁷⁷ and N. V. Eilbart⁷⁸. The achievements of other Russian researchers will be mentioned directly

⁶⁷ Budzyńska-Daca A. O cudownym rozmnożeniu Dymitrów, czyli retoryka wielkiej mistyfikacji // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 157–169.

⁶⁸ Kuran M. Pamięć o heroicznym czynach i cnotach rycerskich sławnych obrońców ojczyzny utrwalaona w kazaniach funeralnych Fabiana Birkowskiego OP // *Napis*. 2019, Seria XXV. S. 37–63; Kuran M. Moskiewska trylogia Jana Żabczyca // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 109–126.

⁶⁹ Jarczykova M. Sponsorowana pochwała. Funeralia Radziwiłłowskie z XVII wieku napisane na zamówieni // *Napis*. 2019. Seria XXV. S. 19–36.

⁷⁰ Krzysztofik M. Siedemnastowieczne kalendarzowe poglądy na temat problemów zewnętrznych i wewnętrznych Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 7–20.

⁷¹ Borek P. Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski w poezji rokoszowej z lat 1606-1608 // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 49–63.

⁷² Krzywy R. Adama Władysławiusza lamenty „moskiewskie” w imieniu kobiet pisane // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 197–207.

⁷³ Niedźwiedź J. Polska i szwedzka epika propagandowa w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 319–330.

⁷⁴ Antonov D. I. Smuta in the culture of medieval Russia: the evolution of ancient Russian mythologies in the bookishness of the early XVII century. Moscow, 2009; Antonov D. I. The amusing hell of False Dmitry, or the monster on the Moskva River // In *Umbra: Demonology as a semiotic system. The Almanac. Issue 2 / Rev. ed. and comp.* D. I. Antonov, O. B. Khristoforova. M., 2013. P. 45–56

⁷⁵ Arzhakova L. M. The Turkish theme in Peter Skarga's "Sejm sermons" // *Problems of social history and culture of the Middle Ages and early Modern times. Issue 5.* St. Petersburg, 2005. P. 75–86.

⁷⁶ Karnaukhov D. V. The historical image of Muscovy in the Polish chronography of the Renaissance // *Bulletin of the Russian State University for the Humanities*. 2008. № 10. P. 101–114; Karnaukhov D. V. Concepts of the history of medieval Russia in the Polish chronography of the Renaissance. Novosibirsk, 2010; Karnaukhov D. V. The Polish-language historical book in the intellectual culture of the Renaissance // *Humanities in Siberia*. 2008. No. 3. P. 34–37; Karnaukhov D. V. The problem of Russian chronicle sources by Jan Długosz and Maciej Strykowski in Russian and foreign historiography // *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*. 2011. No. 346. P. 69–73.

⁷⁷ Notes of Stanisław Nemojewski (1606–1608). Zholkevsky's manuscript / Prepared for publication by Tsepkov A. I. Ryazan, 2006.

⁷⁸ Eilbart N. V. "Horace for Marina Mnishek": heroes of the Time of Troubles in the poetry of Sebastian Petritsi // *Scientific dialogue*. 2017. No. 2. P. 216–233; Eilbart N. V. The moral aspect of the Polish nobility's support of Russian impostors of the early XVII century: according to sources of Polish-Lithuanian origin // *Scientific Dialogue*. 2017. No. 1. P. 204–214.

in the text of our research in the context of the degree of study of the sources we have used.

Academik novelty. As mentioned above, today in Poland there is an active process of republishing and scientific commenting on new literary sources on the history of the Time of Troubles. Against this background, the fundamental innovation of our work is the view of the multi-genre monuments of “small literary forms” as a single layer of sources, cemented by utilitarian unity. The simultaneous study of a large number of genre-heterogeneous texts in the context of their impact on the information space of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth allows us to obtain new data on the socio-political situation in the state, which directly influenced the development of crisis phenomena in Russia.

The proposed attempt to generalize the studied sources not only helps to overcome the emerging gap in the source space between Russian and Polish colleagues, but also anticipates future research aimed at interpreting the phenomenon of the existence of anti-Russian sources of “small literary forms” on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the years of Smuta. The presented thesis is considered by us as a necessary step in the process of introducing new sources into scientific circulation (first of all, the translation of texts of “small literary forms” and commentary on it) on the history of the Time of Troubles.

Structure of the thesis. The work consists of an introduction, three chapters, conclusion, as well as a list of sources and literature used.

Chapter I is devoted to the study of multi-genre texts from which the common people of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth could learn news about the socio-political crisis in Russia before the official declaration of war by Sigismund III in 1609. The first paragraph of the chapter summarizes the image of Polish-Russian relations in the literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the eve of the Time of Troubles. The second paragraph studied the historical sources that emerged under the influence of False Dmitry I's campaign to Moscow. The authors agitated the nobility to support “Tsarevich Dmitry”, as it could bring many benefits for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The third paragraph analyzes the situation in Polish-Lithuanian literature after the death of the false tsarevitch in 1606. Literary writers tried to realize the meaning

of the tragedy, and the texts of this period broadcast completely polar views: some writers feared the consequences of interference in the internal affairs of the Moscow tsardom, while others insisted on the need for a new war against the neighboring state.

Chapter II analyzes the path of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to a direct declaration of war against Russia through the prism of historical sources of “small literary forms”. The first paragraph of the second chapter is devoted to the established views in Polish-Lithuanian society on the permissibility of offensive war, which is an important topic for the study in the context of the siege of Smolensk in 1609–1611. The second paragraph describes the influence of actual socio-political events that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth faced before and during the Time of Troubles on the growth of anti-Russian writings published. The third and fourth paragraphs are devoted to the work of individual authors whose activities stood out in the history of the dissemination of anti-Russian propaganda: P. Palczowski and M. Paszkowski.

Chapter III, which is also divided into four paragraphs, attempted to interpret the growth of anti-Russian sentiment in the literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in connection with the purposeful activities of Sigismund III and his entourage. In the first paragraph we showed how the king’s military campaign against Smolensk led to a significant increase in anti-Russian propaganda. The second paragraph is devoted to the royal triumph in Vilna and its role in Sigismund III’s information campaign. The third paragraph analyzes the main meaning-making discourses of propaganda literature, which were used to explain the war with Russia and the necessity of its continuation. The last paragraph of Chapter III demonstrates, how, propaganda failed to really influence its addressees. This circumstance led to the failure of the Warsaw Sejm of 1611 for the royal plans to seize the throne of Moscow.

Main scientific results:

1. A concept has been created justifying the possibility of using multi-genre monuments of "small literary forms" of Polish-Lithuanian origin in the study of public

attitudes, expectations and fears in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that arose due to the participation of magnates and the king in the events of the Troubles in Russia⁷⁹.

2. The model of functioning of anti-Russian propaganda has been reconstructed and studied, highlighting the main actors, which provides new knowledge in the field of social and cultural history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia during the Time of Troubles⁸⁰.

3. The hypothesis is put forward and substantiated that the growth of anti-Russian propaganda in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first decades of the XVII century was directly related to the activities of the royal court of Sigismund III. Other political forces in the state – magnate and gentry groups – played a secondary role in this process against the background of the activities of the royal chancellery⁸¹.

4. The periodization of the development of anti-Russian propaganda of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the beginning of the XVII century is proposed. The main chronological stages that the Polish-Lithuanian reading public went through on the way from fears about the consequences of the war to accepting confrontation with Russia are revealed⁸².

The main scientific results of the dissertation research are also presented in the following scientific publications:

1. Prohorenkov I. A. Pavel Vlodkovits. The conflict between Poland and the German Order at the Constance Cathedral [Electronic resource] // Problems of history and culture of medieval society. Materials of the XXXIII All-Russian conference of students, postgraduates and young scientists "Kurbatov readings" (November 26–29, 2013) / Edited by A. Y. Prokopiev. St. Petersburg, 2013. P. 103–110. (RINC).

⁷⁹ Prohorenkov I. A. The project of the Polish-Russian Union and the embassy of Lev Ivanovich Sapieha in 1600 on the pages of the rhymed diariush Geliash Pielgrzymowski // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. History. 2018. No. 3. P. 708–709; Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian political propaganda and its figurative series (on the example of rare editions of panegyric poetry of the era of the first Demetriades in the collections of the National Library of the Russian Federation) // Book Antiquity. Issue 4. 2018. P. 42–43.

⁸⁰ Prohorenkov I. A. Returning to the original borders: the problems of relations and borders between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Moscow Kingdom in the poetry of Marcin Paszkowski // History. Historians. Sources. 2016. № 4. P. 54–56.

⁸¹ Prohorenkov I. A. Military and Political Printed Propaganda of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Late XVI – Early XVII Century: Printers in the Royal Service // Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana. 2021. № 2. P. 58–61.

⁸² Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian literary propaganda of the Time of Troubles: to the issue of periodization // The Slavic World: Community and Diversity. Theses of the conference of young scientists in the framework of the Days of Slavic Script and Culture. May 24–25, 2022 / Edited by E. S. Uzenyova, O. V. Khavanova. Moscow, 2022. P. 43–47.

2. Prohorenkov I. A. «Our people came to the walls with bombs in the crimson twilight...». Storming Smolensk through the eyes of a Polish poet // *Rodina*. 2013. No. 9. P. 29–30. (SAC).

3. Prohorenkov I. A. Riddle of the co-author of The “Chronicle of European Sarmatia” by Alexander Guagnini (about the book by Michal Kuran “Marcin Paszkowski-Poeta okolicznościowy i moralista z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku”) // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana*. 2014. No. 1. P. 193–205. (SAC, SCOPUS).

4. Prohorenkov I. A. Wars for the Baltics in the second half of the XVI century in the chronicle of Alexander Guagnini: «...and since those times the land of Inflation Poland and Lithuania has always belonged and belongs» // *History. Historians. Sources*. 2015. № 3. P. 43–55. (RINC).

5. Lisichenok E. A., Prohorenkov I. A. The Oriental discourse in the anti-Moscow *Posiłek Bellony Słowieńskiej* by Marcin Paszkowski // *Res Historica*. № 40. 2015. P. 115–125. (BazHum).

6. Prohorenkov I. A. Returning to the original borders: the problems of relations and borders between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Moscow Kingdom in the poetry of Marcin Paszkowski // *History. Historians. Sources*. 2016. № 4. P. 53–67. (RINC).

7. Prohorenkov I. A. Gathering the Old Russian heritage: discourses of history and geography of Russian lands in the chronographs of the 16th – first quarter of the 17th century and in the East European historical narrative // *Vestnik NNGU named after N.I. Lobachevsky*. 2017. № 2. P. 63–71. (SAC).

8. Prohorenkov I. A. The project of the Polish-Russian Union and the embassy of Lev Ivanovich Sapieha in 1600 on the pages of the rhymed diariush Geliash Pielgrzymowski // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. History*. 2018. No. 3. P. 702–717. (SAC, SCOPUS).

9. Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian political propaganda and its figurative series (on the example of rare editions of panegyric poetry of the era of the first Demetriades in the collections of the National Library of the Russian Federation) // *Book Antiquity*. Issue 4. 2018. P. 41–56. (RINC).

10. Prohorenkov I. A. Military and Political Printed Propaganda of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Late XVI – Early XVII Century: Printers in the Royal Service // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*. 2021. № 2. P. 53–63. (SAC, SCOPUS).

11. Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian literary propaganda of the Time of Troubles: to the issue of periodization // *The Slavic World: Community and Diversity*. Theses of the conference of young scientists in the framework of the Days of Slavic Script and Culture. May 24–25, 2022 / Edited by E. S. Uzenyova, O. V. Khavanova. Moscow, 2022. P. 43–47. (SAC).

12. Prohorenkov I. A. Death and Resurrection of False Dmitry I. "Life" of the tsarevich and the fate of Moscow after the uprising on May 27, 1606 through the eyes of Polish contemporaries // *Polza zelo velikaja: a collection of scientific articles for the 60th anniversary of Andrei Vladimirovich Voznesensky* / Edited. Ed. Nikolaev N. V. St. Petersburg, 2022. P. 61–65.

13. Prohorenkov I. A., Eilbart N. V. Military and political agitation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth against Ivan the Terrible: based on the materials of various literary monuments of the Livonian War era // *Scientific Dialogue*. 2023. Vol. 12. No. 6. P. 432–448. (SCOPUS).

As part of the work on the dissertation, the author participated in a grant related to the topic of his research: The International competition of the RGNF – Belarusian Republican Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) in 2015. Project: 15-21-01003 a(m). "Friends" and "strangers": the phenomenon of the frontier in the Middle Ages and early Modern Times in Eastern Europe as a factor in the formation of socio- and ethnocultural identity of the population of the regions. Time of participation in the project: 2015–2016.

The results of the work were also presented in 8 reports at international and All-Russian conferences in leading scientific institutions:

1. Prohorenkov I. A. Marcin Pashkovsky – new facts from biography // *Historical portraits of figures of the common history of Russia and Poland*. International Scientific Conference. St. Petersburg (Russia), St. Petersburg State University, May 21–23, 2015.

2. Prohorenkov I. A. Description of the past as a description of another: comparison of the description of the history of Ancient Russia as part of world history in Russian chronographs of the XVI-XVII centuries and the Eastern European cosmographic narrative // Ancient Russia after Ancient Russia: the discourse of East Slavic (non) unity within the framework of the project "Eastern Slavs in search of new supra-regional identities in the XVI- ser. XVIII centuries. in the context of the emergence of modern nations in Europe." Minsk (Republic of Belarus), Republican Institute of Higher Education, November 4–6, 2015

3. Prohorenkov I. A. Reflection of borderland problems in narrative monuments // Belarusian-Russian International Seminar: Problems of studying the borderlands of the Russian Federation, Russia and other Eastern European states in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. Mogilev (Republic of Belarus), Mogilev State University named after A. A. Kuleshov, August 16, 2016

4. Prohorenkov I. A. Collecting the ancient Russian heritage: discourses of the history and geography of Russian lands in chronographs of the XVI – first quarter of the XVII centuries and in the Eastern European historical narrative // International scientific and practical conference "XVI and XVII centuries in the history of Russia: Gathering of Peoples, Lands and Times (Minin Readings–2016)" Nizhny Novgorod (Russia), Lobachevsky Nizhny Novgorod State University, September 29 – October 1, 2016

5. Prohorenkov I. A. The Polish Flying Seal and the struggle for the Baltic States in the first quarter of the XVII century: morphology of narrative strategies // The first St. Petersburg International Historical Forum. Saint Petersburg (Russia), Saint Petersburg State University, October 29 – November 3, 2019.

6. Prohorenkov I. A. Printing houses in the Royal service of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the last quarter of the XVI century // XXX scientific readings "Book rarities of the Russian National Library". St. Petersburg (Russia). Russian National Library, November 18, 2020.

7. Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian anti-Russian propaganda of the Time of Troubles // Scientific and practical conference of young specialists on the 225th

anniversary of the founding of the Russian National Library "Traditions and Innovations" St. Petersburg (Russia), Russian National Library. November 26–27, 2020.

8. Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian literary propaganda of the Time of Troubles: on the issue of periodization // *Slavic World: Community and diversity*. A conference of young scientists within the framework of the Days of Slavic Writing and Culture. Moscow (Russia), Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, May 24–25, 2022.

The main findings to be defended:

1. During the Time of Troubles in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, many multi-genre monuments of "small literary forms" were published, which highlighted various circumstances of the socio-political crisis in Russia. Traditionally, they were studied separately from each other and were little involved in the history of the Troubles. The presented dissertation research shows that a one-time analysis of a large number of such sources is possible due to their utilitarian integrity. This approach helps to identify the main narrative strategies by which the central government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth explained the need for war against a neighboring state.

2. From the point of view of the genesis of Polish-Lithuanian anti-Russian propaganda during the Time of Troubles, we can distinguish three periods in the history of devoted to Russian themes texts. From 1604 to 1606, Polish and Lithuanian writers assumed a peaceful resolution of the dynastic crisis in Russia, which would lead to the strengthening of relations between neighboring states. After 1606 the authors were divided in their views on the situation in Moscow: some suggested distancing themselves from Russian socio-political problems, while others called for resolving the conflict by force. After 1609 propaganda became purposeful and organized, which was connected with the official declaration of war against Russia by King Sigismund III.

3. The intensification of anti-Russian literary propaganda during the Smolensk siege and during the celebrations organized in the cities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the occasion of the capture of the impregnable fortress led to two results. On the one hand, anti-Russian texts failed to influence the mood of the deputies of the embassy hut during the Warsaw Diet of 1611, since new taxes to finance the war

with the Muscovite Kingdom were not accepted. On the other hand, the persistent promotion of the annexation of Smolensk as a resounding triumph helped to soften the blow to the prestige of the central government after the Russian capital slipped out of royal hands in 1612, and Prince Vladislav remained the Russian tsar only on paper. For the authority of the crown, the defeat had to be presented as a grandiose victory, which is why the "Smolensk Triumph" of Sigismund III was spread in propaganda.

These provisions are copyrighted, original and are offered for the first time.

Chapter I. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the way to intervention in Russia

§ 1. Relations with Moscow in the Polish-Lithuanian literature on the eve of the Time of Troubles⁸³

The origins of poetic propaganda, which became a mass phenomenon during the Time of Troubles, could be founded in the literary experiences of the Livonian War period⁸⁴. There are two points of view on the time of formation of the corpus of anti-Moscow poetic works during the wars for the redistribution of the Baltic in the second half of the 16th century.

Since the mid-60s J. V. Nekrasevich-Korotkaya has been counting the appearance of the "Livonian" cycle⁸⁵. Chronologically the earliest reflection in poetry on the confrontation between Poland and Lithuania on the one hand, and Moscow on the other, the researcher calls J. Mülius of Liebenrode's work *Divina gratia*⁸⁶ (1564) and the poem *Conflictus ad Nevelam Polonorum cum Moschis*⁸⁷ (1564) by J. S. Semuszewski⁸⁸. Mülius extolled the victory of G. Chodkiewicz over P. Shuisky at Ula, initiating the literary glorification of the heroes of the Livonian War. Presumably at the same time an unpublished poem by M. Strykowski was written, also dedicated to the triumph at Czaszniki⁸⁹. Jan Semuszewski, in his turn, did not dwell in detail on personalities when described the battle of August 19, 1562 near Nevel, but through the disclosure of a

⁸³ This paragraph is a revised and supplemented version of the article: Prohorenkov I. A. The project of the Polish-Russian Union and the embassy of Lev Ivanovich Sapielha in 1600 on the pages of the rhymed diariush Elias Pielgrzymowski // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. History. 2018. No. 3. P. 702–717.

⁸⁴ See details: Prohorenkov I. A., Eilbart N. V. Military and political agitation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth against Ivan the Terrible: based on the materials of various literary monuments of the Livonian War era // Scientific Dialogue. 2023. Vol. 12. No. 6. P. 432–448.

⁸⁵ Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Latin-speaking poets of the XVI—XVII centuries - enlighteners of Belarus and Novolatinsk poetry as a phenomenon of Belarusian book culture // The role of enlighteners in Belarus and Turkey: materials of the international scientific and practical conference (Minsk, April 19, 2011). Minsk, 2011. P. 84–89.

⁸⁶ Libenrodensi I. M. *Divina gratia imperante Sigismundo Augusto Polonorum rege potentissimo, Magno Lithuaniae Duce etc. Victoria de Moschis reportata a Magnifico Domino Gregorio Chodcieutio Castellano Vilenensi, Capitaneo Grodnensi, stipendiarii militis supremo gubernatore*. Vienna, 1564.

⁸⁷ Semusouio I. S. *Conflictus ad Nevelam Polonorum cum Moschis*. Bononiae, 1568.

⁸⁸ Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Belarusian Latin-language poem: late Renaissance and early Baroque. Minsk, 2011. P. 91–92.

⁸⁹ See details: Dzarnovich O. I. Matey Strykovsky's poem "The Battle of Ula" (1564): A figurative series and event specifics // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana*. 2010. No. 2(8). P. 127–134.

separate military episode brought out the general idea of Polish-Lithuanian and Moscow irreconcilable confrontation.

Belarusian scholar S. V. Kovalev noted, that it is appropriate to speak about the formation of an integral corpus of anti-Moscow works in the Rzeczpospolita only from the late 70s – early 80s of the 16th century⁹⁰. Despite the fact that the works of subsequent authors did not differ much from the texts of Mülius and Semuszewski in their subject matter, Kovalev explained his chronology by the geography of the editions and the ethnic origin of the authors. The works mentioned by Nekrashevich-Korotkaya were published in foreign printing houses by scribes who did not always have a direct connection with the Polish-Lithuanian lands. S. V. Kovalev emphasized the authors originating from the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which discussed the peculiarities of their works. The cultural involvement of the authors in the subject of their descriptions distinguishes the "Livonian" corpus of sources from other anti-Moscow works.

The poem *Panegyricus in excidium Polocense*⁹¹, published in 1580 in Padua, can be called a peculiar bridge that connected European bookishness with the literary traditions of the Rzeczpospolita. According to S. V. Kovalev, this work "summarizes the development of Latin poetry of Belarus and Lithuania in the 50–70s of the 16th century, and at the same time it is a kind of prologue of its blossoming in the 80–90s"⁹².

Panegyricus in excidium Polocense was devoted to a topic, that can be called the main one for Polish-Lithuanian poetry of the 1580s: the struggle of the peoples of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth against the “Moscow aggression” during the Livonian War. The poem by B. Hyacinth can be considered a vivid example of the transformation of occasional poetry into a heroic epic⁹³, which in turn became the leading genre in late Renaissance rhymed literature in the Polish-Lithuanian lands⁹⁴. *Panegyricus*

⁹⁰ Kovalev S. Heroic and epic poetry of Belarus and Lithuania at the end of the XVI century. Minsk, 1993. P. 40-41.

⁹¹ Hyacinthius B. *Panegyricus In Excidium Polocense atq[ue] in memorabilem Victoriam Stephani invictissimi Poloniarum Regis magniq[ue] Ducis Lituaniae ex potentissimo Moschorum Principe III. Cal. Septemb. MDLXXIX. Reportatam. Patavii, 1580.*

⁹² Kovalev S. Multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Renaissance. Minsk, 2010. P. 215.

⁹³ It should be noted that the author himself admitted in the preface that he does not pretend to the epic genre, as he does not consider himself such a master, "qualis Homerus erat" - Hyacinthius B. *Panegyricus In Excidium Polocense...* Patavii, 1580. P. 2.

⁹⁴ Kovalev S. Multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Renaissance. Minsk, 2010. P. 216.

significantly influenced the genre orientation of subsequent authors who took up anti-Moscow subjects.

As for the historical basis of B. Hyacinth's poem, it is completely overshadowed by its artistic features. For example, although the poem was written on the occasion of the return of Polotsk, the storming of the city itself was practically not reflected in it⁹⁵. In praising the feat of the Polish-Lithuanian army, the author preferred to make do with general narrative constructions. Thus, for example, it can be noted that the anti-Moscow orientation of the text of the *Panegyricus* is revealed not through the description of the vices and failure of the hostile people, but through the denigration of the image of the Moscow tsar. A red line through the whole work runs the opposition of the figures of “King” and “Tyrant”, behind which the reader can easily see Stefan Bathory and Ivan the Terrible. In the person of these two persons, the poet contrasts the republican order of the Polish-Lithuanian state and the “eastern barbarism” of Moscow. For this confrontation B. Hyacinth sees only one outcome, predicting the fall of “Tyrant”:

«The just glory has already been received, our victory is inevitable:
the King will rise, the current Tyrant will fall»⁹⁶.

A much more extensive historical basis was provided by the Latin-language poem *Hodoeporicon Moschicum*⁹⁷ by F. Gradovski published in Vilna in 1582, which is the first of many works about Radziwill's raid on the rear of the Moscow troops in the fall of 1581.

Hodoeporicon Moschicum opens with the coverage of the exploits of Nicholas Radziwill, the father of the poem's protagonist. Gradovsky writes about the victory of the Hetman of the Great Lithuanian over Peter Shuisky at Ula in 1564, after which he immediately proceeds to the description of the campaign of Christopher Radziwill in

⁹⁵ For more details see: Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Belarusian Latin-language poem: late Renaissance and early Baroque. Minsk, 2011. P. 92–100.

⁹⁶ Latin: «Legitimus sit honos, velut est, victoria certe / Nostra manet, stabit Rex, corruet ille Tyrannus». Цит. по: Hyacinthius B. *Panegyricus In Excidium Polocense...* Patavii, 1580. P 13.

⁹⁷ Gradovio F. *Hodoeporicon Moschicum illustrissimi principis ac domini, domini Christophori Radiwilonis*. Vilnae, 1582.

1581. Thus, the author emphasizes the continuity of military traditions between the two generations of the Radziwill family.

The author describes the Radziwill raid in detail, but the anti-Moscow component of his work pales against the main motive of the work – the exaltation of the Radziwill family. The author created the image of wise and just defenders of his fatherland, and therefore Christopher's campaign is presented not as a sudden attack deep into Moscow's territories, but as a defense of his own borders: “so the Muscovites, pursued with indescribable horror, flee from their positions **back to their native fortifications** (emphasis mine – I. P.)”⁹⁸.

The theme of the defensive war with Moscow and the special role of the Radziwills in military actions was continued and developed in the work of A. Rymsha. As noted by S. V. Kovalev, the story of the Radziwill raid became extremely popular in epic poetry of the late 16th century, because «the semi-legendary, fantastic in its audacity campaign of Christopher Radziwill deep into the Moscow lands, certainly stood out among other episodes of the last period of the Livonian War, reminiscent of the glorious campaigns of ancient Russian princes and medieval knights. The names of towns, villages, rivers, and lakes of the mysterious “barbarian” Muscovy sounded exotic and mysterious to readers from the Rzeczpospolita, as if they were talking about distant and completely unknown lands»⁹⁹.

Rymsha's poem *Deketeros akroama, to jest Dziesięćcrocna powieść wojennych spraw*¹⁰⁰ occupies 2184 rhymed lines, which is almost three times the volume of Gradowski's work. The Polish language chosen by the poet for his text shows the intended recipients of the poem: it was intended not only for the educated upper classes of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also for ordinary readers. This also explains the features of the allusive series in the Rymsha's text – the characters of the poem are matched not only among the heroes of Antiquity, but also prototypes from their own

⁹⁸ Gradovio F. *Hodoeponicon Moschicum*. Vilnae, 1582. D1r.

⁹⁹ Kovalev S. *Multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Renaissance*. Minsk, 2010. P. 224.

¹⁰⁰ Rymsha A. *Deketeros Akroama to jest dziesięćcrocna powieść wojennych spraw oświeconego księżęcia i pana, pana Krzysztofa Radziwiła, księżęcia na Birzach i Dubinek, pana trockiego, podkanclerzego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i hetmana polnego, borysowskiego, soleckiego etc. starosty. Ku temu posługi niektórych rotmistrzów i ludzi rycerskich pod sprawą jego mości będących są przypomniane i imiona napisane, która się poczyna od roku po narodzeniu Pana Chrystusowym 1572 aż do roku, który pisano 1582. Wilno, 1585.*

history are found. For example, H. Radziwill appeared in the poem as a new Vitaut, around whom the entire Lithuanian people should rally¹⁰¹. The Livonian war and the Radziwill raid, in turn, were presented as a defensive war: «So that Moscow [tsar] would no longer harm Lithuania, Voivode Troksky in Lithuania ordered people to gather, so that Moscow would not allow the campaign to Lithuania»¹⁰².

When dealing with the discourse of defensive warfare and the glorification of the house of Radziwill in the poetry of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the late 16th century, it is impossible to avoid the work of J. Radwan. Not much is known about the creator of *Radivilias*¹⁰³. The poet received his primary education in Vilna, after which he continued his studies at the University of Padua¹⁰⁴. Upon its completion, Radwan returned and settled at the court of the Radziwills of the Bierzha line, where he created his famous work¹⁰⁵.

Occupying 3302 rhyming lines, the poem is divided into four parts: the first of them tells about the annexation of the Teutonic Order lands to Poland in 1561, the second – about the war with Moscow up to the triumph at Ula, the third reveals the chronology of the Livonian War up to the “Great Campaign” of Stefan Bathory (1579–1582) to the Moscow lands, and, finally, the fourth part tells about the final chords of the Livonian War.

In the text of Radwan's poem, the imitation of ancient works acquires a new meaning. The mythical continuity between the Roman Empire and Lithuania through the legend of Palemon comes to the fore¹⁰⁶. Thus, in the author's opinion, if Lithuanians are epigones of the Romans, epic is the most suitable genre for narrative poetry. Emphasizing the ancient roots, the author turns the Moscow-Lithuanian antagonism not into a local

¹⁰¹ Niedźwiedz J. How did Virgil help forge Lithuanian identity in the sixteenth century? // *Litinitos in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: its Impact on the Development of Identities*. Ed. Giovanna Siedina. Firenze, 2014. S. 40–41.

¹⁰² Polish.: «Aby Litwie Moskiewski już więcej nie wadził. / Panu Trockiemu w Litwie kazał ludzie zbierać, / Moskwie by nie dopuszczał do Litwy sie wrywać». Rymsza A. Deketeros akroama, to jest Dziesięćroczna powieść wojennych spraw // *Archiwum Literackie*. T. XVI. Wrocław, 1972. S. 159.

¹⁰³ [Radvanus I.] *Radivilias, sive, De vita, et rebus praeclarissime gestis, immortalis memoriae, il- lustrissimi principis Nicolai Radivili Georgii filii, ducis in Dubinki ac Bierze [...] libri quatuor, Ioannis Radvani Lit[uanii]; iussu ac auctoritate mag. d. Ioannis Abramowicz, in Worniany [...] Addita est oratio funebris, generosi d. Andreae Volani, secretarii sacrae regiae magestatis, et quorundam auctorum epigrammata, vilnae metropoli lituanorum: ex officina Ioannis Kartzani. Vilna, [1592].*

¹⁰⁴ Doroshkevich V. I. *New latin poetry of Belarus and Lithuania: the first half of the XVI century*. Minsk, 1979. P. 45.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* P. 245.

¹⁰⁶ Kulicka E. *Legenda o rzymskim pochodzeniu Litwinów i jej stosunek do mitu sarmackiego* // *Przegląd Historyczny*. 1980. T. 71. N. 2. S. 1–21.

military confrontation, but into a confrontation between the bearers of Roman culture and Eastern barbarians.

Summarizing the development of anti-Moscow themes in the poetry of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Livonian War, we can conclude the following:

1. The poetry was filled with ideas of war for the fatherland: the confrontation of the Polish-Lithuanian state with Moscow was presented only in a defensive way. The texts do not reveal motives of conquest of the neighboring state. The more so, the literature is alien to the discourses of colonization of Russian lands, which would be destined to fill the poetry of the Time of Troubles.

2. The vast majority of poetic works were published in the lands of the GDL. As a rule, the mentioned epic poems were created by authors close to the Radziwill family, which is why the theme of glorification of the defenders of the Lithuanian lands plays a major role.

After the end of the Livonian War, interest in Russia in Polish-Lithuanian society did not decline, and new stories gained popularity in literature related to Moscow affairs. Despite the irreconcilable rivalry over the Baltics, relations between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Moscow Tsardom were never reduced to mere military confrontation¹⁰⁷: the other side of the coin of continuous confrontation on the battlefields was a subtle diplomatic game that unfolded around the development of various plans of alliance and unification¹⁰⁸. The succession of Polish “uncrownings”, the Election of 1587 and the peace negotiations of 1590-1591 were the conditions within which the continual birth of the alliance and unification plans was constantly taking place. Literary conceptualizations of the political prospects of concluding a union with Russia aroused keen interest among Polish-Lithuanian contemporaries.

According to the circle of the highest political figures of the Rzeczpospolita, the next favorable situation for the conclusion of the “eternal union” was formed in 1599–1600. The mission to establish the union fell to the Moscow embassy of the chancellor of

¹⁰⁷ Florya B. N. *The Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia and Russian society*. Moscow, 2005. P. 54.

¹⁰⁸ Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa. 1603-1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa, 1968. S. 83–87.

the GDL L. I. Sapieha, a well-known supporter of the union of the two powers¹⁰⁹. The initiative this time came entirely from the Polish-Lithuanian side, which can be explained by a number of the following circumstances.

First of all, it should be noted that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was on the threshold of significant foreign policy trials. A serious conflict with Sweden was looming: dethroned after the defeat at Stengebro (September 25, 1598) Sigismund III entered into an open confrontation with his uncle Charles IX of Södermanland. Although contemporaries could hardly imagine that the war would drag on for 30 years (the clashes practically did not stop from 1600 to 1629), the coming battle for the redistribution of the Baltic could not but cause certain fears among the Polish-Lithuanian political elite.

At the same time, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had to face difficulties on its southern borders: in May 1600, the voivode Mihai the Brave (1558–1601), who had united Wallachia and Transylvania under his scepter, opposed the Moldavian governor Jeremiah Mogila, who was a vassal of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Mihai's military successes, which were at odds with Polish interests in the Carpathian region, as well as the Swedish threat in the Baltic, put before the Republic of Both Nations real prospects of a war on two fronts at once.

However, it was not only his own foreign policy difficulties that prompted Sigismund III to send a great embassy to his eastern neighbor. Among the dignitaries of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth there was an opinion, that Russia was experiencing no less problems and that the benefits of the forthcoming union could incline Moscow towards the conclusion of the union¹¹⁰.

At the turn of the XVI-XVIIth centuries there were serious adjustments in the Baltic policy of the Moscow kingdom, which until then had been strongly influenced by Sweden: the divergence between the foreign policy program of the new Swedish government and Russian interests in the Baltic became increasingly clear¹¹¹. The Swedes

¹⁰⁹ Czwołek A. Lew Sapieha, dyplomata w służbie Zygmunta III // Lev Sapieha (1557–1633) and his time. Grodno, 2007. S. 124–127.

¹¹⁰ Siarczyński F. Obraz wieku panowania Zygmunta III, króla polskiego i szwedzkiego, zawierający opis osób żyjących pod jego panowaniem. T. 2. Lwów, 1828. S. 9.

¹¹¹ Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the Baltic question at the end of the XVI – beginning of the XVII century. Moscow, 1973. P. 124.

insistently demanded confirmation of the Treaty of Tiavzin and jealously guarded their control over Russian foreign trade in the Baltic Sea. The severity of the Swedish tutelage led to the fact that sometimes Russian merchants had to completely bypass Swedish possessions on their way to European cities¹¹². The cooling between Moscow and Stockholm did not go unnoticed by Polish diplomats. Thus, L. I. Sapega himself, on the eve of his departure to Moscow, repeatedly mentioned in his personal correspondence that these circumstances opened up extremely favorable opportunities for improving relations with the eastern neighbor¹¹³.

The internal situation in the Moscow state also gave optimism to the supporters of the union. The death of the childless Fyodor Ivanovich in 1598 and the inevitable redistribution of power by boyar families gave the diplomats of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth new levers of pressure¹¹⁴. Even in the very run-up to the negotiations in Moscow was turbulent: in early November 1600 in the capital was arrested accused of attempted coup F. N. Romanov – one of the first people in the state. Internal tensions in the Moscow kingdom gave the ambassadors hope that the promise of support from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would make Boris Godunov a sufficiently accommodating political partner¹¹⁵.

After the settlement of all formal issues, the great embassy headed by L. Sapieha, S. Warszywicki and G. Pielgrzymowski moved from Orsha to Moscow on September 27, 1600. The minimum program for the diplomatic mission was to solve the issue of prolonging the truce with the Moscow tsardom, and if not assistance from its side, at least benevolent neutrality in the coming Polish-Swedish conflict. The maximum program was the conclusion of the long-discussed "eternal union"¹¹⁶. This attempt to establish the union attracts research interest at least because of the fact that the embassy of L. I. Sapieha in 1600–1601 was the last **peaceful** attempt to unite the two states through diplomacy¹¹⁷.

¹¹² Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the Baltic question. P. 127.

¹¹³ Archiwum domu Sapiehów, t.1. Lwów, 1892, Nr. 256 (S. 214–215).

¹¹⁴ Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the political development of Eastern Europe in the second half of the XVI – early XVII centuries. Moscow, 1978. P. 245.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. P. 143–144.

¹¹⁶ Zamoyski A. Polska. Opowieść o dziejach niezwykłego narodu. Warszawa, 2011. S. 187.

¹¹⁷ Gajda M. Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehy w Moskwie w latach 1600-1601 w świetle polskich relacji dyplomatycznych oraz relacji Izaaka Massy i Jacques'a Margereta // Piotrkowskie Zeszyty Historyczne. 2001. № 12/1. S. 124.

The authors of the unification project seriously overestimated the precariousness of Boris Godunov's position, which should have pushed him to conclude a union treaty. As a result, despite all the optimism of the envoys, the union received firm rejection from Moscow. One of the ambassadors, G. Pielgrzymowski, wrote down the chronology of the negotiations, his vision of the reasons for their failure and reflections on the idea of the absolute impossibility of peaceful existence with Moscow following the results of the diplomatic mission.

Upon his return from Moscow, Pielgrzymowski engaged in a poetic revision of the diariush he had composed. By the time he was working on the rhymed diary, its author was already widely known in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as the writer¹¹⁸. S. V. Kovalev called him "one of the most famous poets of Belarus and Lithuania of the Renaissance"¹¹⁹.

The rhymed diariush of G. Pielgrzymowski was named *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwy*¹²⁰. A thorough study of the real chronology and reliance on a documentary basis in the text of the work allow us to characterize Pielgrzymowski's poem as a first-class historical source¹²¹. The author reproduced in detail in the poem the documents available to him – the draft of the union, the ambassadorial speeches, the answers of the Boyar Duma, lists of gifts, provisions, etc. Due to these features, in Belarusian historiography, the work in question is commonly called “diariush in verse form” or “an epic poem in the form of diariush”¹²².

Anti-Moscow propaganda is the central theme of the rhymed diatribe, and the author does not miss a single opportunity to cast Moscow life in a bad light¹²³. Although such themes were widespread in the poetry of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the last third of the XVIth century, nevertheless, *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z*

¹¹⁸ Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Glory and the lament of a patriot and a prophet: the poem "Philopatris" (1597) // Acta Albaruthenica. 2003. No. 3. P. 8; Markowska W. Literatura Polska epoki Odrodzenia. Warszawa, 1956. S. 113.

¹¹⁹ Kovalev S. multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Renaissance. Minsk, 2010. P. 268.

¹²⁰ Pielgrzymowski E. *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta Trzeciego* / wyd. i oprac. R. Krzywy. Warszawa, 2010.

¹²¹ See details: Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the Baltic question at the end of the XVI – beginning of the XVII century. Moscow, 1973. P. 144–145; Tyszkowski K. *Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehi w Moskwie 1600 r.* Lwow, 1927. S. 5; Pielgrzymowski E. *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta Trzeciego* / wydał i opracował Roman Krzywy. Warszawa, 2010 S. 18.

¹²² Kovalev S. multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Renaissance. Minsk, 2010. P. 281.

¹²³ Pielgrzymowski E. *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą*. S. 21.

Moskwy can be considered a truly exceptional case: unlike other authors, G. Pielgrzymowski had the experience of a personal stay in Moscow, which reinforces his work with the authority of an eyewitness.

The poem opens with a dedication to L. I. Sapieha: from the first paragraphs Pielgrzymowski turns to the theme of his own misadventures together with the chancellor of the GDL in Moscow's borders («how we spent five and twenty weeks in captivity together»¹²⁴), weaving the discourse about personally experienced difficult days into a general picture of the offenses inflicted by the Muscovites on the Republic¹²⁵. After presenting the difficulties experienced together as a pretext for seeking patronage, the author proceeds to a direct description of the embassy.

The road to Moscow passed without incident, and on arrival the ambassadors were satisfied with the reception they received and the conditions of their detention. Despite the diplomats' early arrival, they did not receive their first audience until November 26. This delay was due to two reasons: firstly, the Moscow messengers refused to accept the register of gifts of the embassy, as it did not contain the royal title of the sovereign, and secondly, Boris Godunov himself was suffering from attacks of gout at this time¹²⁶. During his forced inactivity, Pielgrzymowski was engaged in describing the life of the capital and began to reveal the theme of the viciousness of the Moscow population.

The author's attention was drawn to the following incident, which took place on October 20: the bailiff who arrived to the ambassadors begins to share news with the Poles, gradually moving on to a description of Moscow's wealth and power. Pielgrzymowski paints the archetype of a liar, common for the description of a Muscovite. He cannot stop lying: Moscow's natural riches are innumerable, its riverbanks are dotted with rubies and gold, the entire Islamic world trembles before its army, and the capital itself has long surpassed in its splendor all the ancient wonders of the world. In the end, even the bailiff's comrade cannot stand the sounding boast and interrupts him:

¹²⁴ Polish: «jako więzieniu jednym w zaparciu przez pięć a dwadzieścia niedziel». Ibid. S. 30–31.

¹²⁵ Pielgrzymowski lists the territorial grievances of the Rzeczpospolita: "Nie bez wielkiego żalu serce cnotliwe, widząc nie mał na dwieście mil państw od Wielkiego Księstwa oderwanych, wspominać musi. Nieprzyjacieli cieszy się z tego. Jemu Nowogród Wielki, Łuki Wielkie, Psków, Księstwo Siewierskie, Możejask, Wiaźma, Dorohobuż, Smoleńsk, zdradą wszytki wzięte, hołdują. Nam się serce pada, co to wiemy, widzimy i z przodków naszych prawa na to mamy". Ibid. S. 30.

¹²⁶ Tyszkowski K. Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehi w Moskwie 1600 r. Lwow, 1927. S. 52.

«And when he told about such unprecedented things,
 The second bailiff said to him: “Brother, do not sin!
 You talk about something that doesn't exist, and you don't know it yourself,
 Which of these [ambassadors] everyone knows well, where and what happens.
 Stop cheating – for us it's rude,
 When you talk about something that doesn't exist on our earth”»
 (ln. 335–340)¹²⁷.

As a result, there is a quarrel between the bailiffs and they remove themselves, and Pielgrzymowski raises to the reader's laughter all that Muscovite has said (ln. 340–455).

It was only on November 26 that the ambassadors were presented to Boris Godunov, during which letters and gifts were given to the Tsar. The audience ended with a feast, which received a particularly detailed analysis by the poet: Pielgrzymowski returns to the theme of Moscow's barbarism through his description of the dishes and the ways in which they were served. Despite the abundant food, the poet negatively evaluates the feast, as the Muscovites are completely unable to dispose of their wealth with dignity:

«It is true that they have a lot of things in their lands,
 But they do not have the understanding how and what to use»
 (ln. 777–778)¹²⁸.

At the same time, the author argues that if the Polish-Lithuanian people had the same resources, they would have been able to benefit from them much more, and the Muscovites themselves would have benefited (ln. 779–780). The colonizing discourse that would become widespread in Polish-Lithuanian poetry after the Rzeczpospolita

¹²⁷ Polish: ««I gdy tak niesłychane napowiadał rzeczy, / Drugi Posnik rzecze mu: „Bracie, to nie grzeczny! / Powiadasz to, co nie jest, aza nie wiesz tego, / Że z tych każdy wie dobrze, gdzie co jest takiego. / Poprzestań płutany – nieuczciwość nasza, / Gdy o tym mówisz, czego nie ma ziemia nasza”» Here and further the line numbers are given according to the edition: Pielgrzymowski E. Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta Trzeciego / wydał i opracował Roman Krzywy. Warszawa, 2010.

¹²⁸ Polish: «Dobrze mówią, że wszego mnogo w ziemi mają, / Lecz jako czego zażyć, rozumu nie mają».

began to actively intervene in Muscovite affairs during the Time of Troubles is easily identified here. Pelgrimowski argues that the wise tutelage of more developed neighboring nations over Moscow territories could be an undoubted boon for the local population¹²⁹.

The first full-fledged meeting of ambassadors with the boyar Duma clearly showed the fundamental impossibility of concluding any alliance in view of the serious conflict of foreign policy ambitions of the two states. The audience on December 9 heated up the situation, when the "return" of the Inflationary lands to Moscow turned into the main condition of the union. Pielgrzymowski notes that the Muscovites did not shy away from direct blackmail, hinting that they themselves could side with Sweden: what Sigismund III refused to give to Moscow, Duke Charles IX (ln. 1215–1244) could easily give.

After December 9, 1600, the attitude towards the ambassadors changed significantly, in view of which Pielgrzymowski began to call his stay in Moscow nothing but "captivity". Realizing the failure of the ambassadorial mission, L. Sapieha asks the Moscow government for leave from the capital. The chancellor receives a refusal, argued by attacks of illness of the tsar, who personally wanted to deal with the diplomatic mission. The ambassadors themselves at this time are restricted in their foreign relations, falling under a real "house arrest". Under these conditions, the work of the embassy continues, and the boyars make many attempts to break the diplomats.

Thus, at the session held on December 14, 1600, A. Vlasyev gives the ambassadors blatant misinformation about the defeat of Zamoyski's troops against Mihai the Brave:

«I will also tell you the second news:

Zamoyski is defeated, your hetman, along with the knighthood,

Mikhail at that time, since he (Hetman Zamoyski – I. P.) did not support him

The governor of Kiev, what did he contribute to (the defeat of Zamoyski – I. P.)»

(ln. 1821–1824)¹³⁰.

¹²⁹ For an example of a poem based entirely on the colonizing discourse see: Lisichenok E.A., Prohorenkov I.A. The Oriental discourse in the anti-Moscow Posiłek Bellony Słowieńskiej by Marcin Paszkowski // Res Historica. № 40. 2015. P. 115–125.

¹³⁰ Polish: «Powiedam wam i drugą nowinę do tego: / Zamoyski zbit, hetman wasz, i rycerstwo jego / Od Michała w tych czasach, że go nie ratował / Wojewoda kijowski, tamtemu folgował».

The ambassadorial mission turns into a real test of the diplomats' determination: sessions are either held under the dictate of Moscow's demands or completely disrupted ("Then both sides parted in anger"¹³¹), and even the personal safety of the embassy members was jeopardized: the boyars repeatedly remark to the chancellor L. Sapieha that for his pride and contempt for Moscow's proposals he may pay a heavy price (ln. 2371–2374).

In this part of the poem, Pielgrzymowski no longer restrains himself and directs all his literary talent to scourge Moscow mores. Once again on the pages of the poem were used a lot of common for the literature of this period stereotypes about the essence of "Moscow barbarism". The author could not ignore, for example, such a widespread stamp as the Muscovite addiction to alcohol, linking it to the complete lack of intellectual culture in this people. As the poet writes, a Muscovite would rather take a goblet of vodka in his hands than a pen:

«They are not interested in science, they read and write little,
[this art] only affected their priests to the smallest extent.
Theophrastus is said to have written three hundred books,
Others wrote up to a thousand books cleanly.
But the Muscovite is not so adept at handling the letter,
Rather, his hands got used to the cup with the vodka»
(ln. 2817–2822)¹³².

Pielgrzymowski in his poem presented the material in line with the propaganda topos, which was often used in the European literature of the period we are studying to denigrate the Russian people: we are talking about the "Asiaticity" of the Muscovites, because of which, according to Western authors, they have long strayed from European

¹³¹ Pielgrzymowski E. Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. S. 137.

¹³² Polish: «Nie zabawia nauką, czytać, pisać mało, / Samym trochę władcykom ledwo się dostało. / Teofrastes, tak pisał, napisał książkę trzysta, / Drudzy książkę do tysiąca pisali do czysta. / Ale tu nie tak rychło Moskal w pismo zajdzie, / Rychle kufel gorzałki w rękę jego najdzie».

civilization and Christianity, which is why they now occupy their rightful place among the Tatar and pagan peoples (ln. 2839-2840). Of course, speaking about the Asian nature of the Moscow people, the author also touched on the topic of slavery. Thus, captivity is depicted by the poet as the natural state of Muscovites:

«The camel prefers muddy water instead of clean water,
so they prefer to be in captivity [more than] in freedom»
(ln. 2927–2928)¹³³.

Developing the above-mentioned theme of "Asiaticity", Pielgrzymowski deliberately negatively assessed the ability of Muscovites to build a state in which all classes would coexist in harmony. In his opinion, the tendency to tyranny is a natural feature of the Russian people. The poet notes that although dynasties have changed, nothing has changed at all in the very essence of power:

«After one tyrant, another now rules
Cleomedes the Cruel, for faithful service
He exterminates thousands of innocent people with the sword and hooves,
He would rather starve than repay with affection»
(ln. 2985–2988)¹³⁴.

In such pessimistic arguments and constant bickering with the Moscow boyars at the embassy sessions, diplomats survived the winter of 1600/1601. This time became the most stressful stage in the work of the embassy.

The situation turned around when on the way to the next embassy session diplomats received news from the bailiffs about the cancellation of the scheduled meeting due to the fact that a messenger will soon arrive in Moscow with new letters from Sigismund III (ln. 3031–3038). The meeting with the royal courier J. Poradovsky took place at the

¹³³ Polish: «Bywielbład, coniz jasną woli mętną wodę, / Tak oni być w niewoli wołą niż swobodę».

¹³⁴ Polish: «Że po jednym tyranie dziś panuje drugi / Kleomedus okrutny, za wierne posługi / Co tysiącmi niewinnych mieczem, turmą traci, / Głodem rychlej umorzy niż łaską zapłaci».

ambassadors on February 11. The news he brought about the victories of Hetman J. Zamoyski in Moldova (ln. 3145–3152) and other news from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth inspired the ambassadors and significantly strengthened their positions.

Under these conditions, the last attempt by the Moscow authorities to direct negotiations to their advantage was made during the work of the Sapieha embassy. The Swedish ambassadors arrived in Moscow on February 18, after which the arriving delegation was specially solemnly held in front of the Polish-Lithuanian diplomats (ln. 3683–3690). The newly arrived ambassadors were also accommodated in direct sight of L. Sapieha's court. However, this attempt to "put pressure" on Polish-Lithuanian diplomats was destined to fail, since the Boyar Duma failed to receive any concrete benefits from the Swedes due to the limitations of their authority¹³⁵.

Realizing the impasse of the current diplomatic situation and fearing a final rupture of relations with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Moscow side finally decided to meet the Polish Embassy halfway. The result of the tests carried out by diplomats was the signing of a 20-year truce¹³⁶ between the Moscow Tsardom and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (ln. 4104–4105), and on March 11, after the final 20th session of negotiations, the ambassadors were able to leave Moscow.

According to Pielgrzymowski, in such conditions, in which the embassy of L. Sapieha worked, it was impossible to dream of better results. The author returned from Moscow with a deep conviction, which he tried to convey to his readers: despite the apparent proximity of the Muscovites, it will never be possible to conclude any stable peace with this people due to its deep depravity. This idea is the leitmotif of Pielgrzymowski's anti-Russian creativity. The author uses a biblical metaphor and likens it to a bad tree, from which, no matter how hard you try, you will not get good fruits:

¹³⁵ Tyszkowski K. Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehi w Moskwie 1600 r. Lwow, 1927. S. 64–65.

¹³⁶ In the text of the poem, special attention is paid to discussing the duration of the agreement: both sides demonstrated their disinterest in this truce, giving the opponent the opportunity to choose its duration himself. As a result, the 20-year term is called by the Moscow side. Pielgrzymowski sees a certain symbolism in this: during the 20 most difficult ambassadorial sessions, the Polish-Lithuanian and Moscow peoples received 20 years of peace. See details: Pielgrzymowski E. Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwy. S. 192–194.

«How an evil tree [fake] gives out a beautiful color,
 [so] all the Moscow customs were against us»
 (ln. 4645–4646)¹³⁷.

In the context of the dominance of the works of the Livonian cycle in Polish-Lithuanian poetry at the end of the XVIth century, Pielgrzymowski poem represents a radical revision of the foundations of anti-Moscow propaganda. In a rhymed diary, Moscow is not a formidable invader against whom a defensive war must be waged. G. Pelgrzhimovsky on the pages of his work promoted the idea of war with Russia, for which he described the Russians as a barbaric and despotic people with whom Poles and Lithuanians will never be able to live in peace, but who can and should be pacified by the power of chivalry of Speech The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

¹³⁷ Polish: «Awa jako drzewo złe kwiat piękny wydaje, / Moskiewskie przeciwko nam były obyczaj». ».

§ 2. Literary propaganda of the period of the first “Dimitriades”¹³⁸

The failure of L. Sapieha’s promising diplomatic mission should have put an end to any unification projects between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Moscow, but the appearance in 1603 of an impostor in the Polish-Lithuanian lands, claiming to be the miraculously rescued Tsarevich Dmitry Ivanovich, brought the question of relations with Moscow to the forefront again. Now that Poland had a “legitimate heir” to the throne of Moscow, the question of the troubled eastern neighbor could be finally resolved.

The motives that prompted the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to interfere in Russian affairs and support False Dmitry received a fairly wide coverage in historiography. At the same time, it is worth noting that the attention of researchers to the object of study was not quite evenly distributed. For example, we have a good idea of the interests of the Polish-Lithuanian ruling elites, which were comprehensively reflected in the conditions set by Sigismund III before False Dmitry¹³⁹. “Eternal connection” of the two states, on a par with territorial concessions in favor of the Polish-Lithuanian state and the admission of Jesuits to Moscow, was the *conditio sine qua non* of the political elite’s arrangements with the False Tsarevich.

In turn, the motives of the ordinary szlachta, willingly participating in the eastern campaign, are far from being so obvious. Nevertheless, it was spontaneously formed Polish-Lithuanian voluntary detachments that supported the impostors in their claims to the Russian throne, served as the most important catalyst for the tragic events of the Russian Turmoil¹⁴⁰. A certain intellectual climate within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth could have encouraged the nobility to participate in False Dmitry’s adventure. The demographic boom in Poland and Lithuania at the turn of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries led to a crisis of szlachta landlessness. The upper szlachta was interested in a military campaign to the east, thanks to which their financial situation could be

¹³⁸ This paragraph is a revised and supplemented version of the article: Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian political propaganda and its figurative series (on the example of rare editions of panegyric poetry of the era of the first Demetriades in the collections of the National Library of the Russian Federation) // *Book Antiquity*. Issue 4. 2018. P. 41–56.

¹³⁹ See details: Alexandrenko V. N. Materials on the Time of Troubles in Russia of the XVII century // *Antiquity and novelty*. Book 14. 1911. P. 443–444.

¹⁴⁰ Florya B. N. The Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia and Russian society. Moscow, 2005. P. 65–71.

improved. Only a substantial reason could morally authorize such a campaign, and the figure of the exiled Tsarevich Dmitry provided just such a reason.

Literary campaign in support of False Dmitry I fits into the concept of F. Taylor, who noted in his works that the main function of propaganda – to make people think and act in a way that he would not have done without its influence¹⁴¹. In the specific case, it was necessary to attract as many followers as possible to False Dmitry's military campaign. The underlying mechanics of propaganda is the creation of symbols to which the public learns to respond with the “right” spectrum of emotions¹⁴². Beginning in 1605, Polish-Lithuanian writers and polemicists were successfully engaged in the construction of such symbols, the most important of which was the image of Dmitry Ivanovich himself – the unfortunate heir to the throne of Moscow, forced into exile because of the treachery of the usurper Boris Godunov.

The image of Tsarevich Dmitry in the Polish propaganda of the Time of Troubles can serve as a kind of litmus test for the researcher, reflecting changes in the public mood in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth regarding interference in Moscow affairs. The image of the tsarevitch-exile was subject to significant adjustments depending on the development of events. Thus, the “new Odysseus”, the noble Moscow tsarevitch, who had been praised during the first Dimitriada (1604–1606) and who tried his best to regain his rightful throne, became more and more often the target of ridicule and epigrams by the end of the Time of Troubles. K. Miaskowski captured in his epigrams this turn to the negative perception of Dmitry most vividly, reacting in the following words to another “miraculous rescue”¹⁴³ of the Moscow tsarevich:

«Dmitry, if you are dead, then lie quietly in the coffin,
And let your shadow no longer remind us of you»
(Na tegoż [Dymitra epigramma], ln. 1–2)¹⁴⁴.

¹⁴¹ Taylor P. M. *Munitions of the mind. A history of propaganda from the ancient world to the present day*. Manchester; New York, 1995. P. 1.

¹⁴² Lasswell G. D. *Propaganda Technique in the World War*. P. 9.

¹⁴³ This refers to the escape from the massacre on May 17 (27) in Moscow, which happened during the popular uprising of 1606.

¹⁴⁴ Polish: «Dymitrze, jeśliś umarł, leż spokojnie w grobie, / A nam cień twój niech więcej nie baje o tobie». The line numbering is given by: Miaskowski K. *Zbiór rytmów // Biblioteka pisarzy staropolskich*. Warszawa, 1995. T. 3. S. 228.

Many authors have worked on creating a favorable literary image of the Moscow tsarevitch Dmitry Ivanovich. For the purposes of this dissertation research, we will analyze in detail the works of three prominent writers: J. Żabczyc, S. Grochowski and J. Jurkowski. Such a selection is justified by the fact that these writers were at the very origin of the propaganda campaign aimed at supporting False Dmitry.

Extremely scant information has been preserved about J. Żabczyc, the creator of the first rhymed biography of False Dmitry, which allowed S. I. Nikolaev to call Żabczyc “a semi-mythical person” in his article on Russian translations of this poet’s works in the XVIIth century¹⁴⁵. Even the origin of the poet is unclear: he came from a peasant or a bourgeois family; it is only known that thanks to his talents he managed to get an education at the Krakow Academy. The literary career of Żabczyc can be judged by the dedications in his works: the poet’s talent was revealed at the courts of the Lesser Poland’s magnatery, and the Mniszech family played a special role in his support¹⁴⁶. Through the efforts of J. Żabczyc, a cycle of works dedicated to False Dmitry’s Moscow campaign was created, which historiography has called the “Moscow Trilogy”¹⁴⁷. This cycle includes the following works: *Mars Moskiewski krwawy*¹⁴⁸, *Posel moskiewski*¹⁴⁹ and *Żegnanie ojczyzny możnej cesarzowej moskiewskiej*¹⁵⁰.

Of particular interest in the Żabczyc trilogy is the panegyric poem *Mars Moskiewski*, which differs in the detail of the historical material presented. Thus, T. Wierzbowski, who studied this poem, noted with sadness: «...it is a pity that he (Żabczyc – I. P.) chose not the prose form and did not set out everything in the form of a diary, but he wanted to praise Dmitry in verse»¹⁵¹.

J. Żabczyc began his rhyming work with a description of the final chords of the Livonian War. It should be noted that extensive excursions into history are a key feature

¹⁴⁵ Nikolaev S. I. The works of Jan Żabczyc in Russian translations of the XVII century. // TODRL. T. 36. L., 1981. S. 163.

¹⁴⁶ Kuran M. Moskiewska trylogia Jana Żabczycyca // Napis (Warszawa). 2006, Seria XII. S. 109–110.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. S. 109.

¹⁴⁸ Żabczyc J. *Mars moskiewski krwawy*. Kraków, 1605.

¹⁴⁹ Żabczyc J. *Posel moskiewski*. Kraków, 1605.

¹⁵⁰ Żabczyc J. *Żegnanie ojczyzny możnej cesarzowej moskiewskiej*. Kraków, 1606.

¹⁵¹ Verzhbovsky F. F. Materials on the history of the Moscow state in the XVI and XVII centuries. Issue 3: The Time of Troubles in contemporary Polish literature. Part 1: 1605–1607. Warsaw, 1900. C. X.

of many panegyric poems of the “dimitriad” era. The abundance of historical material, accompanied by its specific interpretation, was intended to facilitate the readers’ understanding of the drama unfolding in the Moscow lands. In his historical sketch Żabczyc contrasted Ivan the Terrible, depicted as a cruel tyrant, with his three sons, endowed with all possible virtues. In the poet’s opinion, the accession of Ivan IV’s children could have brought great happiness to all Eastern European nations, but each of the tyrant’s sons suffered misfortune. Thus, J. Żabczyc presents an extremely curious version of the death of Tsarevich Ivan Ivanovich: after the capture of Polotsk by Stefan Bathory (1579), Ivan the Terrible held a council of war, at which his eldest son strongly condemned all of his father’s actions against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and suggested the earliest possible conclusion of peace with the neighbors. The Moscow monarch was infuriated by the tsarevich’s soft-heartedness, and the enraged father raised his hand against his son:

«He hit his son hard with a staff and out of it
He shed blood, and sent him to the next world»
(ln. 60–61)¹⁵².

Żabczyc makes a clear distinction between Ivan the Terrible, the implacable enemy of the Republic, and his descendants. The plot about Tsarevich Ivan Ivanovich, who suffered for his sympathies, was meant to convince readers that with the change of generations on the Moscow throne, relations between the Polish-Lithuanian and Russian peoples could change completely.

The brothers of the murdered tsarevich, Fyodor and Dmitry, possessed no less dignity. Alas, but the hopes placed on them could not be fulfilled, as both brothers became victims of the new usurper of the throne – Boris Godunov. Godunov is directly called the culprit of the death of the descendants of Ivan IV. Thus, by order of the head of the government in Uglich was killed the youngest son of Ivan the Terrible – Dmitry (ln. 89–

¹⁵² Polish: «Mocno syna uderzył kościeniem i z niego / Krew wypuścił, i posłał do świata wiecznego».

90), and soon Shuisky got rid of Fedor Ivanovich, personally presenting him at the feast a goblet of poison (ln. 237–239).

However, the tyrant's plans were not completely successful, because an "Italian doctor" (ln. 102) managed to substitute Tsarevich Dmitry with another boy, thus keeping alive the real heir to the throne. The narrative of Dmitri Ivanovich's life before the outbreak of the military campaign of 1604 sprawls over four hundred rime lines. Wandering through monasteries, fleeing from the Moscow kingdom, revealing himself to Lithuanian magnates, an audience with King Sigismund III and an assassination attempt by assassins sent by Boris Godunov (ln. 448–485) – the author reveals to the reader in detail the dramatic pages of the life of "the heir" to the Moscow throne who miraculously escaped death.

Turning to the history of the military campaign, Żabczyc describes the Tsarevich's troops in detail, paying close attention to the commanders and individual detachments (ln. 528–598). These rhymed military lists are distinguished by a high degree of detail: they were repeatedly reproduced with a change in the poetic structure, but with the preservation of the factual part, in subsequent poetic works dedicated to False Dmitry¹⁵³.

It should be noted that despite the openly propagandistic nature of his work, Żabczyc does not hide some of the failures that befell False Dmitry's troops. In particular, the poem does not ignore the critical situation in False Dmitry's military camp near Novgorod Seversky¹⁵⁴. The unsuccessful siege of the city and the depletion of the impostor's campaign treasury led to the threat of a split in the Polish-Lithuanian army. Thus, the author describes, without any softening, the quarrel between False Dmitry and his entourage: «...There, the angry Tsar Dmitry began to reproach the knights» (ln. 675–676)¹⁵⁵.

Such insertions were intended to elicit empathy from the readers, since defeats as well as trumpets are an invariable part of any dramatic work. Despite all the hardships, "Tsarevich" Dmitry and his troops reached Moscow, where the final victory was granted

¹⁵³ See details: Kuran M. M. Moskiewska trylogia Jana Żabczyca // Napis (Warszawa). 2006. Seria XII. S. 112–116.

¹⁵⁴ Skrynnikov R. G. Russia at the beginning of the XVII century. Smuta. Moscow, 1988. P. 147–150.

¹⁵⁵ Polish: «...tamże rozgniewany Car Dymitr począł wołać na rycerskie pany».

to the applicant by the Lord himself: on hearing of Dmitry's approach to the capital, Boris Godunov's «blood spurted from his ears, from his mouth, from his nostrils, from his eyes» (ln. 898) and the usurper of Moscow fell dead.

J. Zabczyk's poem ends with the jubilation of both the Moscow and Polish-Lithuanian peoples on the enthronement of "the legitimate tsarevitch" Dmitry Ivanovich. The author was filled with optimism about the prospects of cooperation between the Moscow Tsardom and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, since the work was published during the life of the False Dmitry. The poem, with its rich historical material, laid the foundation for all subsequent propaganda poetry of the Time of Troubles.

Information about the next poet who responded vividly to contemporary events and continued the work of J. Żabczyk – S. Grochowski – has reached us in a fuller volume than about his little-known colleague. Deriving his family name from the village of Grochy (Podlasie), the future poet was born into a poor noble family. In 1571, Grochowski began his studies at the Jesuit College in Pułtusk and soon received a priestly ordination. In 1584, the poet became the royal secretary. Grochowski's career was successfully going uphill, but in 1600 the situation changed dramatically – the author gained many enemies after it became known about his anticlerical work¹⁵⁶. The poet was forced to move to Krakow, where from 1600 to 1607 he devoted himself fully to writing under the auspices of his main patron, Bishop B. Maciejewski¹⁵⁷. Works written during this period in Latin and Polish gained wide popularity among the reading public¹⁵⁸. The high artistic merits of Grochowski's Polish-language poetry are also noted by T. Wierzbowski, who explicitly characterized his works as the most outstanding¹⁵⁹ among the poetic sources he collected from the first two years of the Time of Troubles.

The events, public sentiments and expectations of the first "dimitriada" were comprehensively reflected in Grochowski's poetry collection *Piesni na fest ućieszny*¹⁶⁰.

¹⁵⁶ Trzej poetycy świadkowie pierwszej dymitriady. Wójcicki J. [oprac.], Kraków, 2008. S. 11–12.

¹⁵⁷ Oszeżdża A. Poeta Wazów: studia o okolicznościowej poezji Stanisława Grochowskiego (1542–1612). Wrocław, 1999. S. 4–9.

¹⁵⁸ The encyclopedic dictionary of F. A. Brockhaus and I. A. Efron. Volume IXa. St. Petersburg, 1893. P. 778.

¹⁵⁹ Verzhbovsky F. F. Materials on the history of the Moscow state in the XVI and XVII centuries. P. XI.

¹⁶⁰ Grochowski S. *Piesni na fest ućieszny wielkim dwiema narodom polskiemu y moskiewskiemu, przemożnego monarchy Dymitra Iwanowica cara moskiewskiego* [...] od autora powtore wydane, z przyczynieniem niektórych rytmow, do slawy tegoz wielkiego cara sluzacych. Kraków, 1606.

This verse pamphlet was published in Kraków in 1606 in two editions: the first (the printing house of the Siebenecher's widow) consisted of 16 songs, while the second (the printing house of J. Szeliga) was significantly expanded¹⁶¹. The second edition included 23 songs, two new verses dedicated to Dmitri's struggle for the Moscow throne, as well as 5 portraits (and verse dedications to them) of the main characters of the first Dimitriada: "the tsarevich" Dmitri Ivanovich, the Moscow ambassador A. Vlasev, the Krakow bishop B. Maciejewski, the magnate Y. Mnishech and his daughter Marina.

Grochowski's revised edition was strongly influenced by the works of J. Kohanowski (in artistic terms) and J. Żabczyk (from whose works the author drew historical material), which has been repeatedly noted in historiography¹⁶². In turn, S. Grochowski discovered several original topics that became the backbone for subsequent pro-Dmitry propaganda.

In particular, when Dmitri's accession to the Moscow throne became a fait accompli, the author talked about possible future changes on the map of Europe. Now that the figure of Dmitri and his military campaign "sealed with blood" («Moscow will flourish with Poland, fraternized, united by blood» (Song II, ln. 7–8)¹⁶³), in the poet's opinion no one could oppose the allies any longer.

Grochowski brings the theme of "gratitude" from the Moscow side to the forefront. The Polish-Lithuanian people had lent a helping hand to their eastern neighbors and rid them of the usurper by returning the rightful tsar – now it was time to repay this boon. In Grochowski's opinion, Sigismund III was, in a sense, in a similar position to Tsarevich Dmitri: just as Boris Godunov betrayed the rightful heir and took the throne of Moscow, so the rebel Charles of Södermanland occupied the Swedish throne, which rightfully belonged to Sigismund. Having finished with one traitor, the author suggests that we immediately switch to dealing with the other:

¹⁶¹ Verzhbovsky F. F. Materials on the history of the Moscow state in the XVI and XVII centuries. P. XI.

¹⁶² Estreicher K. Bibliografia Polska. Tom XVII. Kraków, 1899. P. 371–372; Trzej poetyccy świadkowie pierwszej dymitriady. Wójcicki J. [oprac.], Kraków, 2008. S. 16–17.

¹⁶³ Polish: «Moskwa zakwitnie z Polską pobracona, / Krwią zjednoczona». Here and further, the line numbering is given by: Grochowski S. Piesni na fest ucieszny wielkim dwiema narodom polskiemu y moskiewskiemu, przemoznego monarchy Dymitra Iwanowica cara moskiewskiego [...] od autora powtore wydane, z przyczynieniem niektórych rytmow, do slawy tegoz wielkiego cara sluzacych. Wyd. 2. Kraków, 1606.

«Io, triumph! Glorious Sigismund the Third,
 Tsar Dmitry sat on his father's land!
 Therefore, the opponent Carl is getting weaker,
 He does not expect to receive any help from Moscow»
 (Song XI, ln. 1–4)¹⁶⁴.

Another direction in which the “united nations” should make joint efforts, according to the author, is the formation of the anti-Turkish league. Grochowski noted that the joint war against the expansion of Islam was completely identical to the political proclamation of the False Dmitry after his accession to the throne¹⁶⁵:

«Shake off the sleep from your eyes, glorious Pole,
 It's time [for those] who [want to serve] The Fatherland is successful,
 Which is already safe from the Muscovite,
 Beat the Tatar!»
 (Song XIV, ln. 17–20)¹⁶⁶.

Grochowski's *Piesni na fest ućieszny* also stand out because of their visual component. As already noted, the poet's pamphlet was illustrated with lifetime images of the heroes of the Dimitriada. The skillfully executed portrait engravings were intended to make the literary image of the tsarevich and his associates more memorable for the reader. The combination of all the above reasons makes it possible to put the poet's work on the same level with the creative legacy of J. Żabczyc in terms of intellectual contribution to the formation of a positive image of “Tsarevich” Dmitry in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

¹⁶⁴ Polish: «Ijo tryumfie, cny Trzeci Zygmuncie, / Car Dymitr usiadł na ojczystym gruncie! / Zaczym przeciwnik Karolus słabieje, / Z Moskwy pomocy nie mając nadzieje».

¹⁶⁵ See more: Kozlyakov V. N. *False Dmitry I*. Moscow, 2009. P. 155–163.

¹⁶⁶ Polish: «Zetrzy sen z oczu, Polaku cnotliwy, / Masz czas, ktokolwiek Ojczyźnie chętniwy, / Bezpieczny będąc już od Moskwicina, / Bij Tatarzyna!».

The optimistic view of the marriage of False Dmitry and M. Mniszech, which was to lead to a breakthrough in Polish-Russian relations, was characteristic of the work of another poet of that era, the Kraków physician J. Jurkowski¹⁶⁷.

The poet, whose date of birth is unknown to us, was born in Pilzno. Jurkowski was educated at the University of Kraków, but student lists know many “Jan of Pilsno”¹⁶⁸. Biographers generally believe that the poet was listed under the name Joannes Martini Georgides Pilsnesis, who entered the academy in 1596. In this regard, the date of birth of the poet is attributed to the early 1580s¹⁶⁹. Modern researchers consider the author’s work to be among the pearls of Baroque poetry¹⁷⁰.

The peak of literary activity of the poet fell on 1604–1607 years. As in the case of Grochowski and Żabczyc, Jurkowski was associated with the political elites who actively participated in the events of the first Dimitriada. In particular, the circle of the poet’s benefactors included B. Maciejewski and J. Mniszech, who were the addressees of the poet’s dedications.

J. Jurkowski’s poem *Hymenaeus*¹⁷¹ composed and published in 1605 in honor of False Dmitry’s wedding. Unlike Grochowski’s small and thematically isolated *Songs*, Jurkowski’s work is a whole and extensive work. Its title is due to the Renaissance fashion of appealing to antique models. It is important to note that the work in question strongly influenced the subsequent antikization of the dimitrian plot in the topical literature of that epoch. In the pages of Jurkowski’s poem, the military campaign of the exiled tsarevich was for the first time seen as a real “dimitriada”. Conceptually, the poem represents the confrontation between Mars, who wants eternal bloodshed between the

¹⁶⁷ Gipich V. V. The Moscow state of the first half of the XVII century and the “Time of Troubles” in the writings of Polish burghers // *Time of Troubles in Russia: conflict and dialogue of cultures*. St. Petersburg, 2012. P. 56–57.

¹⁶⁸ *Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis*. T.4 / wyd. A. Chmiel. Kraków, 1904. S. 198.

¹⁶⁹ Jurkowski J. *Tragedya o polskim Scylurusie y o trzech synach koronnych Oyczyzny polskiej* / [oprac.S. Pigoń]. Kraków, 1949. S. 3–4.

¹⁷⁰ Niewolak-Krzywda A. *Moralista, wizjoner czy towarzysz „frantowskiego cechu”?* – Jan Jurkowski // *Pisarze staropolscy*. Sylwetki. T. 2. Warszawa, 1997. S. 609.

¹⁷¹ Jurkowski J. *Hymenaeus niaśnieysze[go] monarchy Dymitra Iwanowica, z łaski Bożey wielkiego cara moskiewskiego, wołodimirskie[go], rezańskie[go], nowogrodzkiego, etc. etc., wielkieg[o] hospodara iugurskieg[o], lapskiego, obdorskiego, etc. etc., cara rzańskiego, astrahańskiego, sibirskiego, inowłayce y dziedzica ruskiego, y niaśnieyszey paniey, iey mości paniey Marynie, carowey moskiewskiej etc. etc., iaśnie wielmożne[go] pana, p[ana] Ierze[go] Mniszka [sic] z Wielkich Kończyc, woiewody sędomierskiego, lwowskiego, samborskiego, medeńskiego etc. starosty, córki; przez Iana Jurkowskiego wydany. Kraków, 1605.*

Moscow tsardom and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and Venus, who seeks to reconcile the two nations:

«...Who will be found [powerful enough]
to unite Moscow and Poland with love?

When Mars severely quarreled with them, Polotsk remembers, Ulla,
Starodub, Pskov, Orsha...»¹⁷².

Boris Godunov's murder of the infant Tsarevich Dmitry Ivanovich and the subsequent plans of the usurper of the Moscow throne to conclude an alliance with Sweden against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth are the crown of Mars' plans. However, Venus intervenes in the course of events, putting into the Tsarevich's hands «...a thread that led him as if out of the Labyrinth»¹⁷³ from the Moscow lands. Thus began the wanderings of the «new Odysseus»¹⁷⁴, who escaped from the «Polyphemus» devouring his subjects¹⁷⁵.

In addition to rewards in the form of land, riches and glory, the poet several times refers to the Swedish factor as an incentive to participate in Dmitry's campaign. According to the author, the very question of the existence of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was at stake, which was threatened by a war on two fronts at once, since Godunov was looking for Swedish support¹⁷⁶. After the successful completion of the Polish-Lithuanian campaign against Moscow and Dmitry's wedding with M. Mniszech, Jurkowski, like S. Grochowski, urged to fight back Sweden as soon as possible. The poet expected the following from the grateful "tsarevich":

«And the treacherous Swedes will be mightily tamed,
And he will willingly return their possessions to the Poles»¹⁷⁷.

¹⁷² Polish: «... zaś kto będzie taki? / Co zjednoczy miłością Moskwę y z Polaki? / Gdyż ich Mars srogo zwadził pomnie Połock, Ula, / Starodub, Pskow, Orsza...». Hymenaeus... A2v.

¹⁷³ Ibid. A3r.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. A3v.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. A3r.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. A4v.

¹⁷⁷ Polish: «Ze Szwedy wiarołomne potężnie ukroci / A Polakom ich włości chętlwie przywroci». Hymenaeus... A3v.

Published before the uprising in Moscow and the death of the false tsarevich, the poem was imbued with optimism, and the unification of the Polish-Lithuanian-Russian people was perceived in it as an almost accomplished fact.

Thus, a poetic corpus of works was formed in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first years of Polish-Lithuanian interference in the events of the Russian Troubles – from the beginning of False Dmitry’s military campaign until his death on May 27, 1606. These poems agitated their readers in favor of comprehensive support for the cause of the “miraculously saved” heir to the Moscow throne. The leading role in the creation of this panegyric poetry was played by authors close to the magnate families that supported the impostor’s enterprise.

Polish-Lithuanian pro-dimitrian poetry at the early stage of the Time of Troubles appears to be a very bright and short-lived phenomenon. The distinctive feature of this intellectual stratum is that at a certain point in the literature Moscow becomes the most genuine ally of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. However, the situation in the region completely changed after the uprising in Moscow in May 1606 and the subsequent violence against the wedding guests of False Dmitry and M. Mnishech. These events led to a change in the vector of development of relations between the two states, which was reflected in the literature of subsequent years.

§ 3. Death and resurrection of the false tsarevich: propaganda in search of new meanings in 1606–1609

The foreign guests who arrived in 1605 for the Moscow wedding of “Tsarevich” Dmitry and M. Mnishech could hardly have imagined that they would witness events that were destined not to unite the two peoples as expected, but to ignite irreconcilable enmity between them for decades. During the celebration of the royal wedding, an uprising inspired by the boyars began, as a result of which False Dmitry was killed and Vasily Shuisky was proclaimed the new tsar. The Krakow nobleman S. Niemojewski, who was in the capital at that time, kept a detailed diary of the dramatic events that took place. In his notes he reproduced a detailed list of dead guests – so, according to his data, the rebels killed 524 people in Moscow¹⁷⁸.

Polish researcher A. Budzyńska-Daca described the situation in relations between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Moscow Tsardom immediately after the “bloody wedding” as follows: «soon after those events, a propaganda war began»¹⁷⁹. The Moscow government revived and began to spread the story of the fugitive monk Grigory Otrepiev, an impostor who wanted to give the state to foreigners. In Polish-Lithuanian literature, after lamentations about compatriots killed and captured in Moscow, the main place was occupied by calls for revenge for past and current grievances.

In the context of the Polish perception of Dmitry as a bridge capable of uniting the two states, the events of May were seen as a real disaster. Now that the tsarevich was dead, any unification was out of the question. Not so long ago it seemed that the triumph of the union was within reach but the intrigues of the Moscow boyars upset all plans. Polish intellectuals were not ready to come to terms with this fact so easily, therefore, despite the death of the real impostor, the literary image of Tsarevich Dmitry after the Moscow uprising on May 17, 1606 underwent a certain revision and found a new life. The authors addressed two fundamental questions:

¹⁷⁸ See details: The Zholkevsky manuscript // The Notes of Stanislav Nemoevsky (1606-1608). The Zholkevsky manuscript / comp. A. I. Tsepkov. Ryazan, 2006. P. 122–125.

¹⁷⁹ Budzyńska-Daca A. O cudownym rozmnożeniu Dymitrów, czyli retoryka wielkiej mistyfikacji // Napis. 2006. Seria XII. S. 158.

1. **Was Dmitry the real heir to the throne after all?** Ultimately, the Muscovites justified the revolt by the Tsarevich's imposture. Polish propaganda could not ignore this important question, so it had to be firmly determined: whether Dmitry's "imposture" really provoked the revolt, or whether the Moscow events were just another boyar plot against its rightful ruler.

2. **Did Dmitry survive the uprising?** Rumors that the tsarevich had been saved began to spread rapidly immediately after his assassination on May 17, 1606. Whether Dmitry died, or whether there was another "miraculous rescue" – a problem that could not remain without due attention on the part of propagandists.

The answers to these questions were addressed everywhere in Polish-Lithuanian literature of 1606–1609. The works of the participants of the May events themselves deserve special attention here: backed by the authority of eyewitnesses, the opinions of the wedding guests who survived the Moscow uprising were of great value to the reading circles of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Right on the spot – in the Moscow confinement – a pleiad of talented authors engaged in literary reflection on the events that took place¹⁸⁰.

S. Liffel, a Protestant burgher from Kraków, whose father held a prominent position in the city's furrier's guild, took a leading position in prodimitrian propaganda after May 1606. Having discovered his poetic talent early on, through which he was able to establish contacts with the magnate families of Lesser Poland, the poet came to the wedding of Tsarevich Dmitry and M. Mniszech as part of the entourage of M. Oleśnicki¹⁸¹. Liffel described the story of the "bloody wedding" and his imprisonment in Moscow in the work *Gody moskiewskie tamże na Moskwi opisane*¹⁸². The poet's work was finished on December 20, 1606.

S. Liffel, who participated in the Moscow celebrations, did not doubt for a second the authenticity of the Tsarevich¹⁸³, in this connection, the poet characterizes the uprising

¹⁸⁰ Budzyńska-Daca A. O cudownym rozmnożeniu Dymitrów, czyli retoryka wielkiej mistyfikacji // Napis. 2006. Seria XII. S. 160.

¹⁸¹ Polski słownik biograficzny. T. 17 (Lewiński Franciszek Ksawery - Linde Adrian von der). Wrocław, 1972. S. 313–314.

¹⁸² Liffel S. *Gody moskiewskie tamże na Moskwi opisane*. Kraków, 1607.

¹⁸³ Budzyńska-Daca A. O cudownym rozmnożeniu Dymitrów, czyli retoryka wielkiej mistyfikacji // Napis, Seria XII. 2006. S. 160.

several times in the text as a boyar intrigue against the legitimate ruler (ln. 61–62)¹⁸⁴. The author is also absolutely sure that Dmitry is alive, and instead of the tsarevich was killed by his double. In Liffel's opinion, the tsarevich managed to escape in the turmoil of the uprising, so that together with P. Basmanov it was not Dmitry himself who suffered, but “someone else”:

«And then the faithful Basmanov turned his neck to [the conspirators],
And someone else with him, and both their bodies at once,
Shamefully naked, they dragged him to the square,
Where did they leave them for further abuse»
(ln. 419–422)¹⁸⁵.

In conclusion, the author urges the Poles to fight Moscow. The previous offenses and the current perfidy of the Muscovites, who ruined the wedding guests, are not the main reasons for the war for Liffel. The author first blames the Muscovite people for the sin of attempting to murder their own rightful ruler:

«O inglorious people, O offspring of the evil one
Geryon, O tribe of the treacherous Eryx!
You have enough dishonor that on your own
The king's hand was raised...»
(ln. 501–504)¹⁸⁶.

The version of the second “miraculous rescue” of the false tsarevich received additional details in the anonymous song *O Dymitrze*¹⁸⁷. In the text of the poem, the history of the uprising is presented as follows. In the early morning of May 17, Vasily

¹⁸⁴ Here and further, the line numbers are given by: Liffel S. *Gody moskiewskie tamże na Moskwi opisane*. Kraków, 1607.

¹⁸⁵ Polish: «Atoli darski Bosman dał tam gardło swoje, / I ktoś z nim drugi, a wnet ciała ich oboje, / Sromotnie obnażywszy, na plac wywleczono, / Gdzie je na hańbę większą zostawiono».

¹⁸⁶ Polish: «O narodzie bezecny, o potomstwo złego / Geryona, o plemię Eryksa zdraednego! / Dosyć hańby stąd macie, żeście na własnego / Pana ręce podnieśli...».

¹⁸⁷ Anonim. *O Dymitrze // Pamiętnik sandomierski* / wyd T. Ujazdowski. T. 2. Poszyt 7. Warszawa: [s.l.], 1830. S. 410–413. Researchers have not yet been able to attribute the work accurately; it is assumed that it was created no later than 1607.

Shuisky personally with an armed retinue came to Dmitry's quarters and began to break in the door of the royal bedchamber. The Tsarevich «...called the lackey, got up himself from his couch. And he told him (the lackey – I. P.) to be at the bed, and he went to Shuisky to open it» (ln. 57–60)¹⁸⁸. The crowd crumpled Dmitry who had opened the door and rushed to the lackey who had flocked to the bedside, while in the turmoil the tsarevich himself «hid behind a curtain, behind which he found his protection» (ln. 63–64)¹⁸⁹. Following Liffel, the anonymous author repeats that the body on display on Red Square together with the corpse of P. Basmanov did not belong to the tsarevich, but to his lackey, who was «...tortured and ignominiously wrecked» (ln. 67–68)¹⁹⁰. Dmitry Ivanovich himself, in the poet's opinion, has managed to leave Moscow and is waiting for a new moment and allies to reclaim his father's throne.

An important step in the process of departure of Polish-Lithuanian poets, who created during the Time of Troubles, from using the symbolic meaning of Tsarevich Dmitry as the main banner of the entire eastern military campaign are the works of S. Petrycy of Pilzno (1554–1626). A famous physician, philosopher and poet, Petrycy arrived in Moscow in 1606 as part of M. Mnishech's retinue, as he enjoyed the special favor of her family¹⁹¹.

S. Petrycy arrived for the tsar's wedding, intending to stay in Moscow and enrich himself in the new place under the patronage of the future Russian queen¹⁹², as well as to continue his translations of ancient authors (in particular, at this time the author was engaged in the translation of Aristotle's *Ethics*). The Moscow uprising wiped out all Petrycy's creative plans, and instead of material benefits the author himself received only captivity in a foreign land, which lasted until September 1607¹⁹³.

¹⁸⁸ Polish: «...zawołał odźwiernego, / powstawszy sam z łoża swego. / I kazał mu przy łożu być, / sam Szujskiemu szedł otworzyć». Here and further, the line numbers are given by: Anonim. O Dymitrze // Pamiętnik sandomierski / wyd T. Ujazdowski. T. 2. Poszyt 7. Warszawa, 1830. S. 410–413.

¹⁸⁹ Polish: «schronił się za oponę, / z której tam miał swą obronę».

¹⁹⁰ Polish: «...zapytowali / i haniebnie mordowali».

¹⁹¹ Eilbart N. V. "Horace for Marina Mnishek": heroes of the Time of Troubles in the poetry of Sebastian Petrtsi // Scientific dialogue. 2017. No. 2. P. 217.

¹⁹² Petrycy S. Horatius flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego. Warszawa, 2006. S. 38.

¹⁹³ Trościński G. "Wiek naprawdę stracony". Poezja Sebastiana Petrycego jako świadectwo klęski wyprawy moskiewskiej // Napis. Seria XII. 2006. S. 139.

Petrycy wasted no time during his forced stay in Moscow from 1606 to 1607, as a new creative idea was being fulfilled under his pen. Putting aside Aristotle, the author began to translate Horace's work, which he interspersed with his own reflections on the conflict that had played out between Russia and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

After returning from captivity, the author immediately began to revise the drafts he had composed in Moscow. As a result, at the beginning of 1609 in Krakow his *Horatius Flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego*¹⁹⁴ was published – a work considered to be the first complete translation of Horace into Polish¹⁹⁵. According to literary scholars, the choice made by Petrycy in favor of translating Horace's works is far from accidental. From the point of view of the current political situation, the poet, without attracting unnecessary suspicion, created an anti-Moscow work in an environment hostile to him, encrypting it in the Roman classics. From the artistic point of view, using the works of Horace the translator chose the road of paraphrase, with the help of which he could best achieve his literary goals¹⁹⁶. Under the pen of S. Petrycy, Horace Flaccus was adapted to modern intellectual needs, and often, reading about the period of civil wars in Rome, the reader could easily discern in them allusions to the realities of political life in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the turn of the XVI–XVII centuries¹⁹⁷.

Horatius Flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego is a comprehensive work from the point of view of the meanings embedded by the author, which has not exhausted the interest of researchers in itself to this day. If other poets clearly expressed their thoughts about the fate of "Tsarevich" Dmitry, the war with Moscow and other issues that agitated the public, then S. Petrycy's work required erudition on the part of the reader.

Like Liffel, Petrici does not doubt Dmitry's authenticity and does not focus on this problem. Much more important to the poet was the question of Dmitry's role in the events unfolding in the region. S. Petrycy's narrative of the fate of Dmitry Ivanovich in the

¹⁹⁴ Petrycy S. *Horatius Flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego na utulenie żalów... w liryckich pieśniach zawarty*. Kraków, 1609.

¹⁹⁵ Prior to Petrici, Horace was translated in fragments. For example, several odes were translated by Jan Kochanowski. For more details see: Budzyńska-Daca A. *O cudownym rozmnożeniu Dymitrów, czyli retoryka wielkiej mistyfikacji* // *Napis*, Seria XII. 2006. S. 162.

¹⁹⁶ Trościński G. "Wiek naprawdę stracony". *Poezja Sebastiana Petrycego jako świadectwo klęski wyprawy moskiewskiej* // *Napis*. Seria XII. 2006. S. 142.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.* S. 143.

context of the Moscow uprising is filled with contradictions of a dialectical nature: in one fragment we read that Dmitry was «killed», «executed» and «destroyed», while in other fragments we read that the tsarevich was «resurrected», «saved», and instead of him «a false one was killed»¹⁹⁸.

Thus, first of all, we find information that Dmitry is alive in Odes 15 and 36. In the first, the author mocks the powerlessness of the Muscovites, who had already tried twice to destroy their own ruler, but neither attempt was successful:

«Your Dmitry himself, who is not in the world,
To your just destruction, I heard he rose from the dead.
If he is twice unbroken from you [left]
Soon your strength may completely crumble»
(Book 1, Ode 15, ln. 25–28)¹⁹⁹.

In the following verse narrative, Petrycy again explains Dmitry's miraculous rescue through the rebels' killing of a double instead of the real tsarevitch:

«I sing praises to Dmitry's defender,
Who let the traitors ruin himself,
Instead of the prince, a substitute [servant] was killed»
(Book 1, Ode 36, ln. 1–3)²⁰⁰.

Nevertheless, while stating in some odes that the tsarevich was saved and alive, in the commentaries to others the poet directly points to Dmitry's death – «...when the

¹⁹⁸ Eilbart N. V. "Horace for Marina Mnishech": heroes of the Time of Troubles in the poetry of Sebastian Petrycy // *Scientific Dialogue*. 2017. № 2. P. 220.

¹⁹⁹ Polish: «Sam Dymitr wasz, którego na świecie nie staje, / Na waszą pewną zgubę, słyhać, z martwych wstaje. / Jeśli on dwakroć od was niebity / Prędko moc wasza musi puścić nity». Here and further numbers of lines given by: Petrycy S. *Horatius Flaccus in the trials of the Moscow prison on the utulenie zhalov...* in lyrical songs included. Kraków, 1609.

²⁰⁰ Polish: «Obrońcy chwałę Dmitrowemu dajmy, / Który dał ciągnąć zdrajcom jego kota / Że miasto niego ubili podmiota». These lines can be translated only when the sentence structure is changed. A separate interpretation is required by the phrase "Kota ciągnąć" (old polish) – a kind of shameful execution / punishment when a criminal was tied to horses and dragged along the ground in front of a gathering of the people.

boyars dishonorably destroyed by a secret conspiracy the tsar Dmitry, their lord, protected by the oath of service...»²⁰¹.

Such contradictory information can be explained as follows. It was difficult to convince eyewitnesses, who saw with their own eyes the corpse of False Dmitry on Red Square, in his next “miraculous salvation”. Therefore, the author deliberately introduces a mystical element into the poetry when he writes about God’s Providence and the resurrection of Dmitry²⁰². For the poet, the Tsarevich is like an actor who has already successfully performed his main role and can retire to a well-deserved rest. Each of the contradictory “states” of the tsarevitch are used by the author to reveal the main message of the work: if Dmitry is *killed*, then it is necessary to take revenge for him and for the wedding guests as soon as possible; if he is *saved* or *resurrected*, then in this case, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth must intervene in Moscow affairs and help the tsarevitch again.

S. Petrycy created his work purposefully and in different parts of the text addressed practically all strata interested in the conflict with the eastern neighbor: those who had been in captivity in Moscow and their relatives, the ordinary szlachta, the magnatery and the highest dignitaries, and personally King Sigismund and his son Wladyslaw.

The most explicit anti-Moscow and anti-Dimitrian position in the poetry of 1606–1610 was defended by another victim of the “blood wedding” – P. Palczowski. As a prisoner in Moscow, the author drew from his imprisonment many observations about the people he deeply hated. Palczowski’s anti-Russian work marked a qualitative change in the propaganda of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: a study of the circumstances of the creation of the pamphlet directed against Moscow clearly reveals its commissioned nature. The innovative discourses that the author brought to the picture of relations between Russia and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth will be discussed in the next chapter of our thesis.

²⁰¹ Polish: «...gdy bojarowie Dymitra cara, pana swego, przysięgą posłuszeństwa ubezpieczonego, przez cicho sprzysięgå zdradę haniebnie zamordowali...». Petrycy S. Horatius flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego. Warszawa, 2006. S. 33.

²⁰² Eilbart N. V. “Horace for Marina Mnishech”: heroes of the Time of Troubles in the poetry of Sebastian Petrycy // Scientific Dialogue. 2017. № 2. P. 223.

Chapter II. Transformation of the military and political doctrine of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first decade of the XVIIth century in the context of anti-Moscow propaganda

§ 1. Ideas of “just war” in Polish journalism of the XV–XVIth centuries

The moral and ethical aspect of waging wars was comprehensively analyzed in the works of ancient philosophers (from Aristotle to Augustine of Hippo)²⁰³. Further development of human thought in this direction led to the formation of the theory of “just”, i.e. morally permissible war in the Middle Ages. Within the framework of Christian philosophy, the concept of “just war” was developed in the works of such thinkers of the XIIIth century as Raymond of Penyafort, William of Rennes, Thomas Aquinas and Sinibaldo Fieschi. Although the principles of this concept were not always followed in practice, the theory of “just war” nevertheless served as a leitmotif in medieval Christian publicity devoted to military and political conflicts²⁰⁴.

In the XIVth century, European theories on morally permissible warfare were actively adopted by Western Slavic intellectuals. In the Kingdom of Poland the question of the “just” nature of wars with Christian neighbors became topical due to frequent clashes with the Teutonic Order²⁰⁵. In 1364, under the patronage of Casimir III, the Krakow Academy was founded, 8 of its 11 departments specializing in various aspects of jurisprudence. On the basis of the university (since 1400 it was called “Jagiellonian”), the Polish kingdom formed its own legal school, which gave the world a number of talented thinkers.

After the conclusion of the Union of Krewa, the fates of the Polish Kingdom and the GDL were closely intertwined. The complex confessional situation in Lithuania, where the followers of both Western and Eastern Churches lived, as well as the pagan element remained, unleashed the hands of the Teutonic Order in its conquest plans²⁰⁶. The

²⁰³ See details: Wielgus S. *Polska średniowieczna doktryna „ius gentium”*. Lublin, 1996. S. 32–40.

²⁰⁴ Ehrlich L. *Polski wykład prawa wojny XV wieku*. Kazanie Stanisława ze Skarbimierza „De bellis iustis”. Warszawa, 1955. S. 80.

²⁰⁵ Bockman H. *The German Order: Twelve chapters from its history*. Moscow, 2004. P. 127.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.* P. 144–145.

apogee of the military antagonism between the Polish-Lithuanian alliance and the Crusaders was the Battle of Grunwald (July 15, 1410).

Simultaneously with military conflicts, the confrontation also took place on the pages of polemical works²⁰⁷. In this field, in the first quarter of the XVth century, two Polish publicists became especially famous: Stanisław of Skarbimierz and P. Włodkowiec.

Stanisław of Skalbierz (1365–1431), who came from a peasant family, was educated at the University of Prague and became a doctor of law in 1396. After that, the lawyer returned to Poland and began teaching at the Kraków Academy, of which he twice became rector²⁰⁸. Presumably, in the first half of 1410, the polemicist composed the treatise *Sermo de bello iusto et iniusto*, directed against the Order²⁰⁹. In his work, the author defended the idea that in some circumstances “just war” can be waged even against Christians, and to win in such a war is quite acceptable to use pagans.

Polish and German polemicists were able to meet face to face and bring mutual accusations of violating Christian rules of warfare at the Council of Constance (held from November 16, 1414 to April 22, 1418). P. Włodkowiec (1370/1373 – c. 1435) defended the positions of the Polish-Lithuanian alliance at the council. From 1404 to 1408 Włodkowiec spent the year at the University of Padua under the mentorship of F. Zabarella²¹⁰, and in 1414–1415 he already held the position of rector of the Jagiellonian University, later becoming its protector (in 1418).

«...Włodkowiec laid the foundations of the “new” face of international law» – this is how J. Le Goff characterized the work of this Polish thinker²¹¹. At the Council of Constance, Włodkowiec made a fiery speech that “just wars” should not be reduced to a confrontation between Christians and non-Christians. The real reason for waging a “just war” can only be a violation of established borders, which the Order and committed in relation to the

²⁰⁷ Prohorenkov I. A. Pavel Wlodkovits. The conflict between Poland and the German Order at the Constance Cathedral [Electronic resource] // Problems of history and culture of medieval society. Materials of the XXXIII All-Russian conference of students, postgraduates and young scientists "Kurbatov readings" (November 26–29, 2013) / Edited by A. Y. Prokopiev. St. Petersburg, 2013. P. 103–104.

²⁰⁸ See details: Bardach J. Historia państwa i prawa Polski. T. 1: Do połowy XV wieku. Warszawa, 1964. S. 432–433.

²⁰⁹ Nowak T. M. Zagadnienie wojny sprawiedliwej w polskiej literaturze prawnej XV i XVI wieku // Napis, 2001, seria 7. S. 40.

²¹⁰ Gorski K. Z dziejów walki o pokój i sprawiedliwość międzynarodową. Ostatnie słowo Pawła Włodkowica o Zakonie krzyżackim. Toruń, 1964. S. 9.

²¹¹ Le Goff J. The Birth of Europe. St. Petersburg, 2008. P. 276–277.

Polish-Lithuanian alliance. The conquering policy of the German crusaders, according to Włodkowiec, only harmed the Christian cause, as it created a hostile image of the Western Church in the minds of the inhabitants of the GDL.

The concepts of Stanisław of Skalmierz and P. Włodkowiec proved to be fully in line with the foreign policy of the Polish-Lithuanian state, and the idea of “defensive war” (up to complete victory over the aggressor, as in the case of the Teutonic Order) became the basis of Polish medieval military doctrine²¹².

At the end of the XVIth century, the idea of a “just” war as the only permissible war was analyzed in detail in the work of the famous Polish humanist A. Frycz-Modrzewski (1503–1572). The third book of Frycz-Modrzewski’s *Commentariorum de Republica emendanda*²¹³ was devoted to reflections on war and violence. In 1577, this work was republished in Polish²¹⁴, making it more accessible to the reading circles of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

According to the thinker, defensive warfare is the only form of “just war”. It is the defensive ideas that should guide rulers in conducting foreign policy, because those sovereigns «...who do not for other reasons, only for the glory and expansion of the state [fight] – they do great evil to people and their property»²¹⁵. Glory and wealth, which traditionally justify the conduct of war in journalism or heroic poetry, cannot justify, in the author’s opinion, the moral and material costs that fall on the shoulders of civilians in wartime.

As for the prospects of acquiring new lands through wars, Frycz-Modrzewski set the example of King Sigismund the Old to his contemporary rulers, who, after the death of Louis II of Hungary in 1526, did not occupy the Czech and Hungarian thrones offered to him, as this would take him away from the affairs of the Polish kingdom²¹⁶. The rulers

²¹² Osterrieder M. *Das wehrhafte Friedensreich: Bilder von Krieg und Frieden in Polen-Litauen (1505–1595)*. Wiesbaden, 2005. P. 199–200.

²¹³ Modrzewski A. F. *Andreae Fricii Modrevii commentariorum de Republica emendanda libri quinque*. Basileae, 1551.

²¹⁴ Modrzewski A. F. *Andrzeia Fricza Modrzewskiego O poprawie Rzeczypospolitey księgi czwore*. Przez Cypriana Bazilika z łacińskiego na Polski przetłumaczone. Łosk, 1577.

²¹⁵ Polish: «...ktorzy nie dla inszej przyczyny wszczynają wojnę, jedno dla sławy albo dla rozszerzenia państwa: ci bardzo źle sprzyjają ludziom i ich rzeczom». Modrzewski A. F. *Andrzeia Fricza Modrzewskiego O poprawie Rzeczypospolitey*. K. 106r.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.* K. 106v–107r.

who had taken possession of many lands, and because of the vastness of their possessions were unable to see to their prosperity, were censured by the thinker²¹⁷.

Thus, from the first public speeches of the Kraków school lawyers against the Teutonic knights to the generalizing philosophical work of Frycz-Modrzewski, the idea of a “just”/”defensive” war occupied a central place in Polish military and political journalism for almost two centuries. At the height of the Polish-Lithuanian intervention in the Russian Troubles, this doctrine was radically revised to suit the political ambitions of the royal court. The slogan of defending their borders and regaining previously lost lands in literature was already only the second one: the call for an offensive war came to the fore, which was supposed to end with the complete defeat and subjugation of the enemy.

²¹⁷ Polish: «A ponieważ wiele dalekich krain trzymają, przeto wiele rzeczy nie wiedzą, co się tam dzieje...». Ibid. K. 107r.

§ 2. The “Home War” in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the invasion of Russia in the context of the beginning of centralized pro-war propaganda

The events of May 1606 shocked the public of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, arousing a wide range of emotions. On the one hand, the idea of a military solution to the conflict with Russia was gaining popularity. As B. N. Florya noted, «... in the person of relatives and friends of the nobles detained in Moscow, an extensive circle of quite influential people has formed who are ready to support hostile measures against the Russian state ...»²¹⁸. On the other hand, the possibility of a large-scale conflict with Moscow frightened cautious politicians²¹⁹: would the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth now have to bear responsibility for its tacit support of the Impostor?

The precariousness of the position of the new tsar Vasily Shuisky pushed the government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to war against Russia. As mentioned in the previous chapter of our study, shortly after the murder of False Dmitry, news began to spread about the second miraculous rescue of the tsarevich from the machinations of the boyars. The rumors that stirred minds everywhere received a particularly warm response from the population of the southern outskirts of the Moscow state, where people were ready to defend the benefits and privileges previously received from Tsarevich Dmitry with arms in their hands²²⁰.

Nevertheless, the situation of internal affairs in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth did not facilitate the rapid organization of a military expedition against Moscow. In 1606, the Sandomierz rebellion, led by M. Zebrzydowski, formed against Sigismund III. The apogee of the rokosz was the drawing up of the act of Sigismund's dethronization on June 24, 1607, but the victory of the royal troops over the rebels at Guzow allowed the monarch to subdue the rebellious szlachta²²¹. It is interesting to note that dissatisfaction with their king among certain representatives of the szlachta and

²¹⁸ Florya B. N. The Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia and Russian society. M., 2005. P. 65.

²¹⁹ Nazarov V. D., Florya B. N. The peasant uprising led by I. I. Bolotnikov and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth // Peasant wars in Russia in the XVII–XVIII centuries: problems, searches, solutions. M., 1974. P. 330.

²²⁰ Florya B. N. The Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia and Russian society. M., 2005. P. 65.

²²¹ Ibid. P. 66.

magnatery was felt even by the first False Dmitry during his stay in Poland. After his enthronement in Moscow, the False Tsarevich contacted the Polish-Lithuanian nobility through his envoys, hinting that he could lead the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as well, replacing King Sigismund, who had repeatedly violated the rights of the nobility²²².

Thus, Moscow and Warsaw, constrained by domestic political turmoil, were equally uninterested in the development of the conflict²²³. Contrary to this, events were spontaneously unfolding. After the death of False Dmitry I, new impostors claiming the royal throne began to appear on the outskirts of the Moscow state. The participation of Polish-Lithuanian volunteers in the detachments of adventurers inflamed the international situation. The distinctly Polish element was noticeable in the enterprise of False Dmitry II from its very beginning. The support of the second false tsarevich by a number of major dignitaries of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (J. P. Sapieha, R. Rużyński, etc.) once again aggravated relations between Moscow and Warsaw to the limit, and anti-Russian polemics and propaganda received a new round of development.

After the assassination of False Dmitry I, many representatives of noble Polish-Lithuanian families found themselves in Moscow captivity. The delay of the wedding guests, who actually became hostages, was explained by the need to conduct proceedings and clarify the circumstances of the appearance of the False Tsarevich and the folding of his military expedition. The case was different with the ambassadors of King Sigismund – M. Oleśnicki and A. Gąsiewski, whose arrest in Moscow significantly violated international diplomatic etiquette. Having received a long-awaited leave in 1608, the envoys returned to their native lands, becoming the heroes of many flysheets. For the purposes of propaganda, it was important to cite the arguments of eyewitnesses to Moscow affairs; and the testimony of the ambassadors, who were obliged by their duty to understand foreign affairs, was especially valuable for agitation.

The return of the ambassadors from captivity coincided with the distribution of the flysheet *Posel z Moskwy*²²⁴. The work takes the form of a dialog between a Polish

²²² Kostomarov N. I. The Time of Troubles. The Moscow state at the beginning of the XVII century. Historical monographs and research. M., 2008. P. 211–213.

²²³ Czekalska A. Drugi etap rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego (X 1606 – VI 1608) w świetle wybranych druków ulotnych // Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. 2016. Folia historica 96. S. 37–39.

²²⁴ Posel z Moskwy, który przez Litwę idąc, potkał go szlachcic polski i pytał o nowiny. [b.m.], 1608.

diplomat and a poor nobleman who met him on the way. The nobleman stops the envoy to get news from Russia and immediately asks him a question about Dmitry:

«Answer me as soon as possible what I want to ask you:

Is Dmitry really alive, as we have heard about it?»

(ln. 7–8)²²⁵.

The messenger replies that it is dangerous for him to have such conversations, since Shuisky, who has unjustly taken the throne, is forcibly suppressing any rumors about Dmitry (ln. 22–24). Nevertheless, according to the ambassador, everyone in Moscow believes that the true tsarevich has fled and is safe now. The idea of the tsarevich's recurrent rescue is repeated in the final verses of the flysheet:

«Oh Lord, comfort your Dmitry,

Who left his native state twice

Because of the betrayal of his subjects, which he did not give a reason for!»

(ln. 1–3)²²⁶.

The nobleman sympathizes with the Russian people and asks the messenger: «Ambassador, is there still hope for peace in Moscow, or is it forever destined to be a place of bloody battle?» (ln. 47–48). The author of the work puts into the mouth of the ambassador a rhetoric directed against Zebrzydowski rebellion. According to him, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would have easily brought order to its eastern neighbor if not for the fire of rebellion in its own lands. The ambassador notes that the entire state of Moscow could have been subdued by Polish knights and brought it peace, but «without benefit in the native land of the Fatherland now lie» (ln. 106).

²²⁵ Polish: «Powiedz mi tak naprędce, o co cię chcę spytać: / Jeśliże ten Dymitr żyw, iako u nas slychać?» Here and further, the line numbering is given by: *Posel z Moskwy, który przez Litwę idąc, potkał go szlacheć polski i pytał o nowiny*. [b.m.], 1608.

²²⁶ Polish: «Boże moj, pociesz kiedy Dymitra swojego, / Który dwakroć uchodzę z państwa ojczystego / Dla zdrady swych poddanych, nie dawszy przyczyny!».

Zebrzydowski large-scale rebellion, which became one of the main symbols of the opposition between royal authority and the arbitrariness of magnateria in historiography²²⁷, prompted his contemporaries to publish a large number of publicistic “laments” and other genre-similar didactic and moralizing works condemning the “house wars”²²⁸. A supra-regional view of the internal problems of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the turn of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries allows us to note that the crisis phenomena that struck the Polish-Lithuanian lands were not unique, as similar scenarios of internal political turmoil were played out in most European countries.

The demographic boom, which led to the gradual de-landing of the petty nobility and the fragmentation of the possessions of the more prosperous families, brought the issue of colonization of new lands to the fore. The leading motive in the publicistic “lamentations” of this period was the condemnation of the ruinous house wars, which the nobility waged on Polish-Lithuanian lands instead of extracting new territories for the benefit of the Republic. Contemporaries were outraged that the sons of the crown, deprived of sources of income in their own state, fought against each other, against the royal authority or as mercenaries in the armies of powers hostile to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth²²⁹.

The sparsely populated lands on the southern borders of this state were often mentioned in Polish journalism at the end of the XVI–XVII centuries as a promising direction for the territorial expansion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth²³⁰. However, the events of the Troubles in Russia caused changes in the orientation of Polish colonization plans, they were reoriented to the East, against the Russian state, which was facilitated by the instability of the central government in the neighboring state. The hypothetical anabasis to Moscow for the sake of expanding the living space looked especially advantageous in the context that the forthcoming campaign could be presented

²²⁷ Maciszewski J. *Wojna domowa w Polsce (1606–1609): studium z dziejów walki przeciw kontrreformacji. Część I. Steżycy do Janowca*. Wrocław, 1960. S. 1–2.

²²⁸ Nowak-Dłużewski J. *Okolicznościowa poezja polityczna w Polsce. T. 4: Zygmunt III*. Warszawa, 1971. S. 119.

²²⁹ Czapliński W. *O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy*. Warszawa, 1966. S. 178.

²³⁰ *Ibid.* S. 179.

both as another stage of the struggle against the expansion of Swedish influence and as a crusade to the East for the triumph of the Catholic faith²³¹.

In 1604, when the royal court was discussing the possibility of helping the first Impostor, a number of major dignitaries were strictly against interference in Russian affairs, even if it was covert. Such major political figures as Grand Chancellor of the Crown J. Zamoyski, Bishop of Vilna B. Wojna, Kastelan of Poznań J. Ostroróg, voivode of Brześć Kujawski A. Leszczyński and Great Lithuanian Marshal K. Dorohostajski refused to support the adventure²³².

By 1609, the mood in the royal council under the influence of current political events had changed and the Senate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was almost unanimously in favor of the idea of war with Moscow. The military enterprise received especially fervent support in the speeches of the Grand Lithuanian Chancellor L. Sapieha, and the kashtelan of Małogoszcz, M. Oleśnicki²³³. Only K. Dorohostajski spoke out strongly against the war again. It should also be noted that S. Żółkiewski, who did not support the idea of direct military intervention in Russia, tried to dissuade the king from the idea, appealing to the weakness of the army, its poor armament, weak artillery and bad finances²³⁴.

By 1609, a whole set of factors pushed Sigismund III to intervene in Russia: the prospects of strengthening his own power and expanding the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the need to counter the growing influence of Sweden in Russia weakened by internal political turmoil, the support of the king's intentions by his closest advisers and the clergy, and the approval of the expansion plans by the papal curia. In spite of all this, the Ordinary Sejm, held in Warsaw from January 15 to February 26, 1609, refused to agree to an open invasion of Russia and to votate any additional levies for the army's needs²³⁵. The representatives of the ambassadorial cabal feared that even if the military venture succeeded, it would, above all, significantly strengthen the king's

²³¹ Gralja H. "In der Tyrannen Hand": The Russian colonization of Livonia in the second half of the XVI century. Plans and results // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana*. No. 2 (16). 2014. P. 184–186.

²³² Czaplinski W. *O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy*. Warszawa, 1966. S. 185.

²³³ Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa 1603-1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa, 1968. S. 162–163.

²³⁴ *Ibid.* S. 164–165.

²³⁵ Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa 1603–1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa, 1968. S. 165.

position, thus upsetting the already shaky political balance in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth between the monarch and the political estates.

The prospect of acquiring new lands resonated among the Sejm deputies, but one should not forget the heterogeneity of the nobility as a whole. On the eve of the military invasion of Russia there was a clear split in the mood of the szlachta: while the fractional nobility was ready to support any expansionist policy in the hope of improving their own financial situation, the majority of the middle and large nobility were against the king's adventurous plans, fearing significant material losses and loss of their position²³⁶.

When the negative position of broad noble circles on the issue of war with Russia became obvious, the Vilna voivode M. K. Radziwill and the Grand Hetman of Lithuania J. K. Chodkiewicz joined the opinion of the Sejm deputies. They tried to transfer the king's attention to Baltic affairs, noting that the public of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would authorize a new campaign against the Swedes in the Inlanders and would willingly give money for it, while an open war with Russia caused serious fears²³⁷.

Despite the opposition of the nobility, the king did not give up his eastern plans and decided to start the war on his own. This seems to be a very curious phenomenon: although at the will of a small political upper class, but still the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth moved from defense to direct military aggression towards Russia²³⁸. The researcher J. Maciszewski, analyzing the situation that had developed by the beginning of the open intervention in Russia, noted: «...then there was nothing left for the king and his advisers but to strengthen military propaganda and put the majority of the szlachta before the fait accompli»²³⁹.

By taking such a risky step, the royal chancellery significantly increased the information pressure within the state. Since the Sejm rejected the idea of war with Russia and any additional funding for the army, it was decided to seek funds for the military campaign at local Sejmiks, which became the field of polemical struggle between

²³⁶ Maciszewski J. *Szlachta polska i jej Państwo*. Warszawa, 1986. S. 191–192.

²³⁷ Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa 1603–1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa, 1968. S. 168–169.

²³⁸ Florya B. N. *Russian-Polish relations and the political development of Eastern Europe in the second half of the XVI – early XVII centuries*. Moscow, 1978. P. 268.

²³⁹ Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa 1603–1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa, 1968. S. 165.

ideologues and opponents of the war. The outcome of this confrontation varied depending on the region and the number of magnantries loyal to the king in it. At some sejmiks, the king's emissaries actually managed to convince the nobility of the necessity of a military campaign, while accusing the opponents of the campaign of excessive cowardice, which weakens the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and jeopardizes its prestige²⁴⁰. Successfully for the king's plans, for example, the sejmiks of the Różan (ziemia różańska) and Łomża (ziemia łomżyńska) lands in Mazovia were held, where the szlachta agreed to a levy under pressure from the clergy loyal to Sigismund III. On the other hand, there were also local sejmiks, where deputies flatly refused to make concessions to the king, and supporters of intervention in Russia were declared royalists and opponents of the nobility's freedoms²⁴¹. An example of such a situation can be seen in the results of the sejmiks in Środa (ziemia średzka) and Wisznia (ziemia wiszeńska).

On behalf of the advisers close to the king, the Deputy Chancellor of the Crown F. Kryski was entrusted with justifying the necessity of war in the face of his compatriots. In the spirit of Machiavellianism²⁴² he promoted the idea of the prospect of reorienting the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's foreign policy towards Russia in his polemical pamphlet *Diskurs słusznej wojny z Moskwą, rationes pro et contra*²⁴³. Under the pen of the talented polemicist, the war turned into a political panacea for all the internal problems of the Republic. In his opinion, a campaign against Moscow could remove the former members of Sandomierz rebellion from the kingdom and stop conflicts within the state. The text again repeated the tantalizing pictures of the unprecedented expansion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's lands, the defeat of the Swedish element in Russia, and the acquisition of fabulous riches in the East. In other words, Krymsky proposed to solve the internal problems of his state through a successful campaign against Moscow, which is why a campaign to demonize the Russian people was gaining momentum in propaganda literature.

²⁴⁰ Czaplinski W. O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy. Warszawa, 1966. S. 195.

²⁴¹ Maciszewski J. Polska a Moskwa 1603–1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej. Warszawa, 1968. S. 182.

²⁴² Yusim M. A. Machiavelli. Morality, politics, fortune. The ethics of Machiavelli. Machiavelli in Russia. M., 2011. P. 260–261.

²⁴³ See details: Maciszewski J. Kryski Feliks vel Szczęsny z Drobnina (Drobina) h. Prawdzic // Polski słownik biograficzny. T. 15. Wrocław, 1970. S. 482–485.

All these ideas were most fully and consistently presented in the writings of P. Palczowski²⁴⁴, whose political pamphlet *Kołada Moskiewska*²⁴⁵ was even distributed with the support of the royal chancellery. In particular, the Sejm acts show that the Sejm deputies were familiar with Palczowski's texts and regularly quoted them, while the author himself, whose finances were upset by the long captivity in Moscow, received financial aid from the magnates who supported the idea of war²⁴⁶. The work of this polemicist needs to be examined in detail, as it demonstrates the rapid breakthrough of the colonization discourse into the established circle of anti-Moscow themes in Polish-Lithuanian literature, and can already be considered a product of centralized pro-war propaganda.

²⁴⁴ Maciszewski J. Polska a Moskwa 1603–1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej. Warszawa, 1968. S. 170–171.

²⁴⁵ Palczowski P. Kołada moskiewska. To iest, Woyny Moskiewskiej, Przyczyny Sluszne, Okazyja pozadana, Zwycięstwa nadzieia wielka, Państwa tam tego pożytki y bogactwa, nigdy nieoszacowane. Krótko opisane Przez Pawła Palczowskiego, z Palczowic, Szlachćica Polskiego. Kraków, 1609.

²⁴⁶ Czapliński W. O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy. Warszawa, 1966. S. 197.

§ 3. Plans of subjugation and colonization of Russia in the writings of Paweł Palczowski

P. Palczowski was born about the year 1570. Early deprived of a father, he was brought up in the Calvinist faith by his mother B. Lubomirska and uncle S. Palczowski of Palczowice. From 1589 to 1604, the future polemicist traveled through most of Europe: Germany, the Netherlands, England, France and Italy²⁴⁷. After returning to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Palczowski began to publish and gained the support of a number of magnate families. The Lubomirski family on his mother's side patronized the writer in particular: the work entitled *Status Venetorum sive Brevis tractatus de origine et vetustate Venetorum*²⁴⁸, which tells about the order of the Venetian Republic, was dedicated to S. Lubomirski.

Soon after his return to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the writer was included in the entourage of M. Oleśnicki and arrived with the dignitary at the wedding of M. Mniszech and Tsarevich Dmitry in 1606. As a result of the Moscow pogrom, Palczowski was taken into custody and could not leave for his homeland until 1608. In captivity the polemicist actively collected material for his future anti-Russian pamphlet and tried to keep in touch with other captive compatriots sent to various Russian cities.

The Poles and Lithuanians stranded in foreign lands received fragmentary information about Zebrzydowski's rebellion raging in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth²⁴⁹. Palczowski later expressed his rejection of the revolt on the pages of his polemical works: in his opinion, while the nobility was bogged down in a domestic war, the real enemy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the east was growing stronger and gaining strength. Such a fusion of pro-war and anti-rebellion polemics fit perfectly into the ideological concept of Sigismund III's military campaign against Russia. Therefore, it is not surprising that after his return to the Polish-Lithuanian

²⁴⁷ See details: Palczowski P. *Koleśda moskiewska* / wyd. i oprac. Grzegorz Franczak. Warszawa, 2010. S. 8–11.

²⁴⁸ Palczowski P. *Status Venetorum sive Brevis tractatus de origine et vetustate Venetorum*, traktat po łacinie o ustroju Republiki Weneckiej. Cracoviae, 1604.

²⁴⁹ Czaplński W. *O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy*. Warszawa, 1966. S. 188–189.

Commonwealth in 1608, P. Palczowski was noticed by the royal court, which was also facilitated by his influential relatives.

The researcher W. Czapliński assumed that the *Kolęda moskiewska*, dedicated to the Sejm ambassadors and senators, was printed with financial support from the royal chancellery²⁵⁰. The opportunistic nature of the polemicist's work was noted by B. N. Florya: «Palczowski's statements were not a reflection of his own views alone. The echoes of similar views are also found in the instructions of sejmiks and in the public speeches of senators and ambassadors»²⁵¹. The work *Kolęda moskiewska*, which was quickly circulated at the beginning of the Sejm and presented to the deputies, is the most detailed collection of the pro-war arguments presented in 1609. From the very first lines, P. Palczowski clearly stated the goals of his literary work in a small poetic text that opens his pamphlet:

«So, living with Moscow people for a long time,
With my ears and eyes I have known [them] exhaustively,
And therefore, I'd like to briefly collect [news] here; for myself, I would like to
My fatherland was aware of that weak,
Slow and powerless people; so that it would be known,
That there had never been such an opportunity before
Take away their vast lands, tame their pride,
To change their faith and evil customs into a better state»²⁵².

In order to induce the knighthood to fulfill the above tasks, the author gave a great number of arguments and promised the participants many benefits from the aggressive military expedition. The dissemination of a work of this nature was beneficial for the royal power in the context of the upcoming military campaign against Russia. Since

²⁵⁰ Czapliński W. O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy. Warszawa, 1966. S. 189–190.

²⁵¹ Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the political development of Eastern Europe in the second half of the XVI – early XVII centuries. M., 1978. P. 271.

²⁵² Polish: “Com, długi czas mieszkając z ludźmi moskiewskimi, / Uszyma i oczyma pilno czerpał swemi, / Tom krotko tu zebrać chciał, życząc sobie, aby / Ojczyźnie mej znajomy był ten naród słaby, / Marny i niepotężny; ażeby wiedziano, / Iż nigdy tak łącznego przystępu nie miano / Ziemię ich wziąć obfitą, hardość ich ukrocić, / Wiarę i złe zwyczaję w lepszy rząd obrocić”. Palczowski P. *Kolęda moskiewska* / wyd. i oprac. Grzegorz Franczak. Warszawa, 2010. S. 55.

Kolęda is a work of authorship by a talented publicist, the topics raised and arguments presented in it did not proceed sequentially as they would in a dryly written analytical work. Palczowski sought to elicit from the reader an emotional response favorable to the royal enterprise, so the artistic principle of material arrangement was favored over the utilitarian one. In order to analyze in detail the ideas of P. Palczowski's pamphlet, which run in a continuous stream in the text, are regularly repeated in modified forms and somewhat chaotically replace each other, within the framework of this dissertation research we have divided them into four major thematic blocks:

Justification of the necessity of war with Russia.

P. Palczowski began his justification of the coming war between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia with the motive of avenging offenses, which was customary for the anti-Moscow polemics of the period under consideration. But Palczowski expanded this thesis and appealed to a much lesser extent to the feelings of relatives and friends of the guests at the Tsar's wedding in Moscow in 1606. The author emphasized the reputational damage that was inflicted on the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth by the Muscovites, which, in turn, affected every citizen of the Republic.

Palczowski sought to convince his readers that what had happened in Moscow went beyond just Polish-Lithuanian-Russian relations and had already attracted the attention of many European states. It should be concluded that the polemicist in his essay turned the picture of the coming war in such a way that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth turned from an aggressor into a state "defending itself" from the "onslaught" from Russia. News of the violence committed by the Russians against the subjects of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had spread widely throughout the world, and it would have been disgraceful to the nobility's honor to put up with it: «I know for sure that for a long time in German and other lands, that tragedy has been transmitted through descriptions and illustrations through fairs and towns: here our troops are going to a wedding, Muscovites [are galloping] in front of them and behind them with triumph, and now a

Muscovite is chopping, beating a Pole, and he raises his hands and asks for mercy. They can write and draw things there that never existed»²⁵³.

Palczowski colorfully emphasized the injustice of the situation: the Polish-Lithuanian knighthood, which brought peace to the neighboring state and helped to restore order in its lands, was first subjected to a treacherous attack in Moscow, and then became an object of ridicule in European leaflets²⁵⁴. The author stated that he knew of no other example of one nation suffering as many insults from another as the Poles and Lithuanians had suffered from the Muscovites²⁵⁵.

The humiliation of such a situation was aggravated by the fact that, according to Palczowski, the inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth suffered atrocities «from such a [nation], which under the sun of the world there is no more worthless and dissolute»²⁵⁶. As we have shown in the preceding chapters of the dissertation research, the topos of dehumanization and demonization of Russians were quite typical motifs for the Polish-Lithuanian polemics of the turn of the XVI–XVIIth centuries. However, the *Kolęda moskiewska*, published on the eve of the Sejm, which was to decide the issue of the outbreak of war, and circulated with the support of the royal power, stands out strongly even against the general russophobic literary background.

Palczowski did not shy away from any artistic inflections in order to achieve his main goal – to portray the Russian people in such a way that they would evoke no other emotions in the readers than contempt and hatred. The following passage from *Kolęda*, which we have quoted, illustrates this thesis optimally. The polemicist noted that during his imprisonment he managed to establish contact with another Muscovite prisoner, the monk N. de Mello²⁵⁷. According to the author, this missionary wanted to tell the world the truth about the Muscovites, but was exposed by them and taken into custody: «Those people are not worthy of the Christian name and title, for under that name they commit such sins and abominations as no people in the world [allows themselves]. And I testify

²⁵³ Palczowski P. *Kolęda moskiewska* / wyd. i oprac. Grzegorz Franczak. Warszawa, 2010. S. 100.

²⁵⁴ Ibid. S. 96.

²⁵⁵ Ibid. S. 107.

²⁵⁶ Ibid. S. 107.

²⁵⁷ N. de Mello was a Portuguese Augustinian monk sent by the papacy as a missionary to India, Persia and Russia. During the reign of Boris Godunov he was captured and imprisoned in the Solovetsky monastery, where he died in 1611.

to this before the Lord Jesus Christ, that in all my long wanderings ... I have neither seen nor heard of such a nation, which would compare with the Muscovites in every kind of unrighteousness, sinfulness, treachery, which would be alien to any virtue and justice, laws human and divine, which would also be devoid of all love and mercy, fear of God and men, which would be filled with sins, injustice, indecency, licentiousness, bribery, sodom sin, madness; and such are not the individual men there, but all of them, from the least to the greatest, and the most persistent and quick to commit every sin among them are the priests, clerics, and nuns...»²⁵⁸. Palczowski summarizes that Muscovites are real anti-Christians, and in essence, they are even more destructive to real Christians than pagans, Muslims or Jews.

Continuing the theme of a “sinful nation” in which everyone from the smallest to the greatest is despised, the author did not forget to insult the Muscovite tsar himself. Referring to the diplomatic experience of Herberstein and Possevino, Palczowski recalled the Russian ruler’s custom of thoroughly washing his hands after receiving foreign ambassadors: «the Holy Father Pope [of Rome] does not do this. Christ himself did not do such a thing, that he immediately began to wash his hands after they looked at him, talked to him or touched him, even though he communicated with obvious sinners. And this ugly beast of Moscow (A ta brzydka bestyja moskiewska), who stinks with garlic, onions, vodka and sweat as if a dog had been dead for several days, and whose hands are habitually smeared with the blood of his subjects, whom he rules in a tyrannical way, what does he do?»²⁵⁹.

The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth’s neighborhood with Moscow, Palczowski concludes, is God’s test, and the Republic must pass it honorably, restore justice and take revenge on the eastern barbarians²⁶⁰. Thus, the polemicist comes to the main proven argument in his work, which corresponded to the ideology of the political elite of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: according to the magnate and the gentry, war with Moscow is inevitable. Any attempt to solve the conflict with Russia by diplomacy is

²⁵⁸ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 130–131.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.* S. 103.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.* S. 108.

doomed to failure: “indeed, it is necessary to fight with this people, not to conclude agreements! Not ambassadors to them, but trumpeters!”²⁶¹.

Proclamation of military superiority of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth over Russia.

The analysis of the arguments presented by P. Palczowski contributes to a better understanding of the public mood in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the eve of the invasion of Russia. In particular, the polemicist was well aware that the nobility was worried about the hardships and losses that the coming war would bring them, so he sought to reassure and inspire his readers. Having announced the inevitability of war, the author immediately proclaimed that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1609 risked nothing if the Sejm approved a military expedition against Moscow.

Describing all his experiences in captivity, Palczowski stated that it was simply impossible to lose in a military battle to such bad warriors as the Muscovites: «[In Muscovy] some beasts in the forest between the trees, others behind the ramparts in the cities, dwell and live among the walls. After all, are these people who have neither the decency at home, nor the courage and bravery in the camp, nor the strength sufficient for battle, nor a steadfast heart and the right advice? Only in the opinion of other nations they are good for something, but in essence they are nothing at home, they get everything only by cunning and deceit»²⁶².

As with the problem of justifying the necessity of the coming war, the polemicist appeals to his constructed negative traits of the neighboring nation when he writes about Russia’s military weakness. Palczowski regularly emphasized that he was describing what he had witnessed himself. For example, the writer claimed that he personally saw how during military exercises one rifleman from an arquebus tried to hit a straw scarecrow, but instead shot a random person – Russian shooters were so poorly trained and their weapons were of such poor quality that a bullet fired could fly anywhere.

²⁶¹ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 102.

²⁶² *Ibid.* S. 60.

Palczowski ends this short note with a rhetorical question: how many opponents can such a fighter shoot?²⁶³

Immediately the author hastens to note that if such is the training of the best soldiers in Moscow, then others do not know how to fight at all. Other soldiers seen by the polemicist at the sound of a shot immediately fell to the ground in fright, as they thought it was thunder²⁶⁴. The essay actively promoted the idea that the vast majority of Muscovites are reluctant to fight and take up arms for the first time in their lives only before an upcoming battle. Palczowski concluded that this was God's plan, so that he and his wedding guests would go into captivity, learn the whole truth about what Muscovites are like in military affairs and tell everyone back home about it as soon as possible²⁶⁵.

The pamphlet is filled with many such episodic stories, but the author did not limit himself to them and sought to give a large-scale analysis, which shows that Palczowski was actually quite well informed about Russia. In discussing the disorder in the Moscow state, the author correctly identified the factors that had sapped its strength:

1. The polemicist wrote about the bad harvest years and the epidemics provoked by them, which fell during the reign of Boris Godunov.
2. The suppression of the Rurikids dynasty and the troubles endured by the Russians under Godunov led to the fall of the authority of the central power. No one, in the writer's opinion, was able to restore order in Russia, so the local population would willingly accept natural sovereigns from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.
3. After the death of the false tsarevitch in May 1606, Russia found itself in the midst of a devastating "domestic war". Based on this, Palczowski concluded that the Russians could not have seriously resisted an invasion from outside²⁶⁶.

We would like to pay special attention to Palczowski's last conclusion. *Kołąda moskiewska* clearly stood out from other propaganda works both because of its commissioned nature and due to the artistic merits that the author, who sincerely hated Russia for personal reasons, managed to bring to the text. The work was noticed by

²⁶³ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 108–109.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.* S. 109.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.* S. 116–117.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.* S. 90–92.

contemporaries and actively quoted by them. As an illustration of this statement, we will demonstrate how a fragment of a text about the consequences of “domestic war” in Russia by Palczowski passed into the chronicle of A. Guagnini²⁶⁷, which was popular among readers of those times.

Table 1.

| | |
|---|--|
| P. Palczowski, <i>Kolęda moskiewska</i> ²⁶⁸ . | Alexander Guagnini, <i>A Description of Sarmatian Europe</i> ²⁶⁹ . |
| Za nastąpieniem potym, y za prędkim sie obraniem tego Suyskiego na to gospodarstwo, zaraz domowa woyna między nimi urosła. Dopieroż sie w te czasy krew ich hoynie lała, tak że do tych czasow wszytkich dusz z obu stron, więcej niż na dwa kroć sto tysięcy (jako nam to Moskwa, nawet samiż przystawowie powiedali) poległo. A tak w małym czasie, około piącikroć sto tysięcy ludzi tam poginęło: ktora liczba, ledwie za kilkaset lat w pokoju żyjąc, napelnić sie może ²⁷⁰ . | Po zamordowaniu Dymitra, zarazem sobie Szuyskiego za pana obrali, zaczym też zaraz y domowa woyna między nimi urosła: dopieroż sie w te czasy krew ich hoynie lała, tak że ich na ten czas wszytkich dusz z obu stron więcej niż na dwakroć stotysięcy poległo, ktora liczba ledwie za kilka setlat w pokoju żyjąc wypelnić może ²⁷¹ . |

²⁶⁷ During the author's lifetime, the chronicle was republished seven times. As part of our research, the most complete version of the text was used, published in Krakow in 1611.

²⁶⁸ Palczowski P. Kolęda moskiewska. To iest, Woyny Moskiewskiej, Przyczyny Sluszne, Okazya pozadana, Zwycięstwa nadzieia wielka, Państwa tam tego pożytki y bogactwa, nigdy nieoszacowane. Krotko opisane Przez Pawla Palczowskiego, z Palczowic, Szlachćica Polskiego. Kraków, 1609. S. D3v.

²⁶⁹ Kronika Sarmacyey Europejskiej: W Ktorey Sie Zamyka krolestwo Polskie [...] tudziez też Wielkie Xięstwo Lithew., Ruskie, Pruskie, Zmudzkie, Inflantskie, Moskiewskie y część Tatarow Przez Alexandra Gwagnina [...] Pierwey Roku 1578 po Lacinie wydana ; A teraz zas z przyczynieniem tych Krolow, ktorych w Lacińskiej niemaż, Tudziez krolestw [...] Przez tegoż Authora [...] Rozdziałami na X Ksiąg krociuchno zebrana, A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego za staraniem Authorowym z Lacińskiego na Polskie przełożona/ Kronika W.X. Moskiewskiego y Państw do niego należących. Kraków, 1611. S. 78.

²⁷⁰ Translated from Polish: «After that, and after the early election of that Shuiskey to the tsardom, immediately a domestic war broke out between them. At that time, their blood flowed abundantly, so that then the souls on both sides more than twice a hundred thousand (as the Moscow bailiffs themselves told us) died. And after a while, about five hundred thousand people have already disappeared there: a number that can only recover in a few hundred years of life in the world».

²⁷¹ Translated from Polish: «After the murder of Dmitry, Shuiskey was chosen as tsar, after which a domestic war broke out between them immediately. At that time, their blood flowed abundantly, so that then the souls on both sides died more than twice a hundred thousand; a number that can only recover in a few hundred years of life in the world».

Accumulating in his work the Russophobic ideas of his predecessors, such as A. Possevino and S. Herberstein, P. Palczowski managed to create a pamphlet that became an authoritative creative model for many subsequent polemicists who created works hostile to Russia.

Palczowski's reflections on Russia's military weakness can be summed up with the following quote from the author, which he wanted to encourage his contemporaries: «and so that Dmitry was brought to the reign and placed to the great admiration of all nations [that they] reasoned about those affairs in such a way that if one senator of the Polish kingdom could place Dmitry on the reign, how much greater [success] would His Grace the King and the whole Republic have achieved if he himself had taken up that state?»²⁷².

Justification of the benefits of the annexation of Russian lands for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

As we have shown above, P. Palczowski sought to instill in his readers the idea that war with Moscow was a necessity. However, by indoctrinating his readers with such an idea, the author immediately led them to the fact that from this necessity it was possible to derive substantial benefits for the Republic. The polemicist made a direct break with the defensive military-political views dominating in the polemical literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the XV–XVIth centuries, which we examined in the first paragraph of the present chapter of the dissertation. Mainly, Palczowski sought to challenge the Latin maxim *mole sua ruunt imperia*²⁷³ and to attract the nobility to the royal enterprise by describing the future benefits of the military expedition.

Palczowski chose the Spanish Empire as an ideal model to emulate: before the eyes of his contemporaries, it was rapidly acquiring vast new possessions in the New World, and no harm was done to the state. On the contrary, the glory of the conquistadors rumbled throughout Europe²⁷⁴. Palczowski proposed to resemble them: as small groups of Spanish conquerors conquered America, so a small army of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would be enough to conquer Moscow²⁷⁵.

²⁷² Palczowski P. Kolęda moskiewska. S. 91.

²⁷³ Translation from Latin: «Empires crumble under their own weight».

²⁷⁴ Palczowski P. Kolęda moskiewska. S. 122–123.

²⁷⁵ For more information about the genesis of such views on Russia, see: Tazbir J. Szlachta a konkwistadorzy. Opinia staropolska wobec podboju Ameryki przez Hiszpanie. Warszawa, 1969. S. 3–34.

It should be noted that within the framework of Polish-Lithuanian geographical ideas America occupied a separate place. Among all European states, the Polish kingdom was the most belatedly informed about the discovery of the New World, but it immediately caused a stir. Krakow has become a kind of center of “American studies” thanks to its urban academic environment, nurtured by the academy and a large number of free publishing houses²⁷⁶. In 1530, the first map of America was produced in this printing center²⁷⁷. Soon the curiosities of the New World received their first textual descriptions in M. Bielski’s chronicle²⁷⁸ and its subsequent reprints²⁷⁹.

Maps and descriptive texts inflamed the imagination of Polish intellectuals of the XVI–XVIIth centuries, attracted their attention to exotic countries and encouraged them to dream of unrealistic projects similar to the one outlined on the pages of *Kołąda* P. Palczowski regarding Russia. Continuing to cite the Spanish conquests as an example, the polemicist described the “Eastern” and “Western” Indies²⁸⁰ as incredibly rich lands full of gold, silver, pearls and gems. All the same, according to the author’s conviction, is in Muscovy, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth can reach these treasures much easier than European states can reach the riches of distant India²⁸¹.

Despite their appeal, in Palczowski’s descriptions of Russia, noble metals and precious stones took a back seat to the real value of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which was undergoing a demographic upsurge. The polemicist focused his readers’ attention on the vast fertile lands, the annexation of which would solve many internal problems and help to overcome the crisis of smallholdings. The author noted that Russian jailers often moved captive wedding guests to different cities, and in these wanderings he happened to visit even beyond the Volga. Palczowski compared the lands he saw with Hungarian lands in terms of fertility, and suggested that the Polish-Lithuanian

²⁷⁶ Tazbir J. Europa środkowoschodnia wobec "odkrycia Ameryki" // Kwartalnik Historyczny. 1991. N. 4. S. 21–24.

²⁷⁷ Rudimenta cosmographica. Kraków, 1530.

²⁷⁸ Miakiszew W. They found wonderful and terrible animals... The World of Bizarre Animals in the Russian translation of the Chronicles of the Whole World by Marcin Bielski // Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. No 3792, Slavica Wratislaviensia CLXV. Wrocław, 2017. S. 287–288.

²⁷⁹ The most detailed description of America can be found in the publication: Bielski M. Kronika tho iest historia swiata na sześć wieków. Kraków, 1564. S. 440v.

²⁸⁰ The East Indies in Age of Discovery were Indonesia, parts of New Guinea and the Malay Archipelago, and the West Indies were the American lands.

²⁸¹ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 56.

Commonwealth would be significantly strengthened if these territories were endowed to the Polish-Lithuanian nobility²⁸².

Palczowski did not forget to use his favorite technique – the reproduction (or invention) of eyewitness testimony. The main blow of the coming military campaign was aimed at Smolensk, so the writer included the following topical fragment in his pamphlet: “there is nothing there for use, wealth or great fun! Passing through there, in Smolensk, one of our people bought a capercaillie, a pair of lyryrus and a pair of hazel grouse for seven and a half Polish pennies – and this Muscovite sold not to his own, but to a foreigner!”²⁸³ The last remark refers readers to the literary heritage of S. Herberstein, within the framework of which a diplomat with a negative attitude towards Russia cultivated a stereotype that Muscovites are incorrigible liars and self-serving, and therefore will do anything to rob a trusting and honest foreigner²⁸⁴.

The knighthood of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had only to stretch out its hand to seize all the above-mentioned riches. Having made his way from proclaiming the inevitability of war to arguments about the benefits of the coming campaign for the Republic, the polemicist finished his essay with arguments about the fate of Russian lands after the war, which we have put in a separate block of questions for analysis.

Discourse on the post-war incorporation of Russian lands into the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

It should be noted at once that this thematic block differs in essence from the previous three: if the polemicist’s reflections on the war, its inevitability, the combat potential of Russian troops and the probable outcome of the forthcoming campaign aroused genuine interest among contemporaries in view of the current political situation, the question of the post-war organization of Moscow lands was perceived to a greater extent as something obviously premature. There was no doubt that a localized military campaign against Russia could bring benefits through the seizure of border territories and the plundering of urban settlements. However, in order to gain more global benefits from

²⁸² Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 67.

²⁸³ *Ibid.* S. 69.

²⁸⁴ Herberstein S. *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*. Basileae, 1556. P. 58–59.

the newly acquired lands, it was first necessary to crush Vasily Shuisky and the Russian military machine. The results of the Warsaw Sejm of 1609 clearly showed that the nobility did not believe in such an outcome. We therefore assume that Palczowski's reflections on Russia's postwar organization are of greater interest to historians than to readers of the polemicist's compatriots on the eve of the military invasion of Russia.

Palczowski's reasoning is valuable for researchers from the point of view of discourse analysis. The author departs from the old polemical tradition and cultivates new intertextual discourses, which will be adopted by subsequent authors and developed on the pages of new polemical works. As an illustration of this thesis, let us highlight *Kołąda's* colonization discourse, which is the nerve of all the propagandist's discourse.

The main difference between Palczowski's colonization plans and other projects of annexing Russian lands to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was the violent nature of the measures proposed by the polemicist. The most obvious radicality of the author's ideas becomes noticeable if they are compared, for example, with the balanced literary work of his contemporary S. Żółkiewski, who saw the accession of Moscow to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as no other way than as a voluntary step of the Russian people, requiring hard work of diplomats, patience and willingness to compromise²⁸⁵. In P. Palczowski's ideas, the Russians were destined to be considered not as a subject, but as an object – they had to be conquered, subjugated and all their orders completely reorganized. To achieve these goals, the polemicist proposed the following steps:

1. Since the eastern lands seemed excessively vast, which made it difficult to quickly absorb them, it was proposed to administratively reorganize the richest Russian cities and regions with their subsequent federalization under the high hand of the king: «first of all, the main cities, such as Veliky Novgorod, Pskov, Velikie Luki, Smolensk, Yaroslavl, Kazan, Astrakhan and others, following the example of Prussian cities of Gdańsk, Toruń, Elbląg and others, should be made free, but with the recognition of the king's supreme authority over them and with the benefits that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is due»²⁸⁶. Such an arrangement, according to the author, would help to

²⁸⁵ Zholkevsky S. Notes of Hetman Zholkevsky on the Moscow War. St. Petersburg, 1871. P. 108–109.

²⁸⁶ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 125.

pacify the Russian lands and protect them from future revolts, as the free cities would become natural political counterbalances to each other.

2. Regarding the method of reorganization of the remaining lands, as B. N. Florya noted, Palczowski again looked for inspiration in the experience of Western colonial states: «on the model of Portuguese fortresses in northern Africa»²⁸⁷ he proposed to fill Russian lands with szlachta's fortresses-settlements that would control the district. Before his readers the polemicist portrayed the following picture: «...then let to these lands people from our nations, both noble and ordinary class, to populate with them cities in the manner of Roman colonies, so that from this in those lands our strength was greater, and especially that the border castles with the nearest regions were turned into the old communities under the royal jurisdiction, and in people, animals, supplies and weapons had good sufficiency, in the manner of how in our time the Portuguese hold most of Mauritania...»²⁸⁸.

3. Discussing the place of the Russian people in the Polish-Lithuanian colonization project, the polemicist proposes the following system: "...and the remaining lands to divide into parts and plots, to give the peoples not only their own, but also Moscow's, allowing them to our rights and liberties, only not allowing one to rise above the other at them..."²⁸⁹. Under the supervision of the Polish-Lithuanian people, the Russians were to be civilized and fully integrated into the Republic. However, this was only a distant prospect, and in the near future, in the author's opinion, the Muscovites had to be protected from their own ignorance and recklessness.

This was P. Palczowski's three-part scheme of colonization of Russia. The polemicist did not touch upon such complex issues as, for example, the way of incorporation of Russian noble families into the political system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The pamphlet presented the eastern neighbors of the Polish-Lithuanian state as a homogeneous mass that was destined to occupy only the lower social strata in the Republic, and only after the acquisition of culture and civilization in the future to

²⁸⁷ Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the political development of Eastern Europe in the second half of the XVI – early XVII centuries. Moscow, 1978. P. 271.

²⁸⁸ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 126.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.* S. 127.

occupy a more privileged position. The polemicist proposed to act swiftly and ruthlessly, in view of which he often repeated that the people in question were much worse than other heretics and pagans²⁹⁰. This refrain allowed the author to provide a spiritual basis for the conquest of Russia, presenting it as a kind of “crusade” to be carried out by Polish-Lithuanian chivalry with the full support of the Catholic Church²⁹¹.

Building his colonization project on paper, P. Palczowski did not question the real possibility of its realization. The polemicist put the centuries-long experience of coexistence of Polish, Lithuanian and Russian people in the Eastern European region out of the picture: under his pen, the population of the Moscow tsardom turned into silent Indians, doomed to live in specially designated areas-reservations under the watchful eye of the nobility.

The proposed project did not immediately arouse any great interest from readers. But the more successful the military campaign against Russia was, the more actively publicists turned to the topic of active colonization of eastern spaces, loudly declared before the Warsaw Sejm by P. Palczowski²⁹². In this paragraph we have shown how this project was promoted by the author thanks to the financial and administrative support of the Royal Chancellery. To complete the picture, in the next paragraph we will turn to the work of the poet M. Paszkowski, who was not related to the central government. Using his example, we will trace how, under the influence of the actual military and political successes of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the topic of colonization of Russia was brought to the fore in Polish-Lithuanian literature.

²⁹⁰ Palczowski P. *Kołąda moskiewska*. S. 131.

²⁹¹ Czapliński W. *O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy*. Warszawa, 1966. S. 195.

²⁹² The analysis of P. Palczowski’s work and his contribution to the anti-Russian propaganda campaign cannot be considered complete without mentioning another work by the polemicist: Palczowski P. *Wyprawa wojenna Króla Jego Mości do Moskwy da Bóg szczęśliwa, Rzeczypospolitej naszej pożyteczna*, Wilno, 1609. The said edition was a semantic extract from *Kołąda* and focused the readers’ attention on two main questions: “what conclusion of the Moscow war can we expect?” and “will the annexation of Moscow to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth serve for the good of the Republic?” (For a detailed analysis see: Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa 1603-1618. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa, 1968. S. 187–189). In addition, the work again raised the theme of colonization of Russia in the format of the three-member scheme described by us. The only novelty of the work was that Palczowski sought in it to attract Tuszyn Poles and Lithuanians to the king’s side. Palczowski praised their courage, since, according to his version, they were the first to rush with sword in hand to bring retribution to the Muscovites for the murdered guests of the tsar’s wedding in 1606. However, since the king himself had already entered the war, the Tuszynians should have rather united with us – concluded the polemicist. Otherwise, *Wyprawa wojenna* again cleverly refuted the arguments of the opponents of the war and called on all loyal subjects of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to support the royal military campaign against Smolensk.

§ 4. The genesis of colonization discourse in the work of Martin Paszkowski

Our choice of M. Paszkowski's texts as an object for analyzing the genesis of colonial discourse is not accidental. The poet in his work was an irreconcilable opponent of Russia, which is his only common feature with such a prominent and close to power polemicist as the above-mentioned P. Palczowski. In all other aspects, Paszkowski's biography is very different from the life paths of many of the pro-government publicists we mentioned earlier in the framework of the dissertation research. On the example of M. Paszkowski's can be traced back to how writers, attracted by the topicality of this topic, joined the literary campaign to denigrate Russia during the Time of Troubles.

Paszkowski seems to be a second-rate poet, whose work was not noted by either compatriots or modern researchers²⁹³. The author was in poverty and decided to create anti-Moscow lampoons out of need: the desire to please his patrons prompted him to write on a rapidly gaining popularity topic.

First of all, we should note the difficult situation with the reconstruction of the biography of Paszkowski and the list of his works, which has developed to date in historical science. This poet for a long time remained a dark figure in historiography, and the crumbs of information about his biography were the property of only encyclopedic editions. The abundance of contradictory information about the poet even led to the fact that the author of the reference book "Jesuits in Poland" S. Żalenski made the following conclusion: there were at least two Paszkowski²⁹⁴.

Archbishop I. Krasicki of Gniezno was one of the first to include information about the poet in his collection, noting that Paszkowski was a jesuit²⁹⁵. The plight of the "little-known poet" was written by I. Juszyński and F. Siarczyński. According to Siarczyński, M. Paszkowski "wrote not for fame, but for profit... he wanted to correct his fate with rhymes" and "had an income so low that he could barely pay for paper and pens"²⁹⁶ and

²⁹³ See details: Prokhorenkov I. A. Riddle of the co-author of The "Chronicle of European Sarmatia" by Alexander Gvanini (about the book by Michal Kuran "Marcin Paszkowski-Poeta okolicznościowy i moralista z perwoi polowy XVII veku") // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana*. 2014. No. 1. P. 193–205.

²⁹⁴ Załęski S. *Jezuici w Polsce*. T.2. Lwów, 1901. S. 695, 705–706.

²⁹⁵ Krasicki I. *Zbior potrzebniejszych wiadomości, porządkiem alfabetu ułożonych*. T. 2. Warszawa-Lwów, 1781. S. 327.

²⁹⁶ Siarczyński F. *Obraz wieku panowania Zygmunta III, króla polskiego i szwedzkiego, zawierający opis osób żyjących pod jego panowaniem*. T. 2. Lwów, 1828. S. 62.

Juszyński noted that Paszkowski was a “poor poet”²⁹⁷, referring to autobiographical notes in Paszkowski’s work *Wizerunk wiecznej sławy sarmatow starych*²⁹⁸.

The most successful and in-depth study of Paszkowski’s biography in the 19th century was conducted by W. A. Maciejowski. Exploring the dedications of Paszkowski’s works, Maciejowski established the poet’s connections with his major patrons – Lubomirski, Młodziewski, Plaza. Thanks to Paszkowski’s acquaintance with Jan Plaza poet served for some time in the Wawel Castle²⁹⁹. Many other reference publications later relied on Maciejowski’s information and his method of analyzing initiations in Paszkowski’s works.

In 1841 the seventh volume of K. Niesiecki’s armorial was published, in which there is a small note about the Paszkowski family. According to Niesiecki, Marcin Paszkowski of the herb Zadora (herbu Zadora) came from Kraków Voivodeship³⁰⁰.

The information available to the French Jesuit researcher S. Sommervogel is interesting. In his encyclopedia, *The Library of the Society of Christ*, Sommervogel writes about Paszkowski as follows: «Born in Greater Poland in September 1584, accepted [into the Jesuits] on August 7, 1608, studied grammar, was a missionary in Ukraine, an employee and prosecutor in Vinnytsia and Pereyaslav, died during the siege of Borodino from illness on November 11, 1648»³⁰¹. In addition to the information borrowed from his predecessors, Sommervogel supplemented his article with new precise information, such as the dates of the poet’s life. Unfortunately, the work lacks references to the source of information, so the researcher’s dates are questionable.

“The Library of the Society of Christ” was relied upon by S. Żalenski when he wrote a note about Paszkowski for his collection “Jesuits in Poland”. According to Żalenski, there were two Marcin Paszkowski’s at the same time. The first was a Jesuit,

²⁹⁷ Juszyński H. *Dykcjonarz poetow polskich*. T. 2. Kraków, 1820. S. 47.

²⁹⁸ Paszkowski M. *Wizerunk wiecznej sławy Sarmatow starych, pobudzający młodź rycerską ku naśladowaniu spraw ich. Od szlachetnej Pallady, z Gniazda cnót ich, w ojczyntym Parnasie wbudowany. A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego, z przykłady mężów rzymskich, onych wielkich miłośników Ojczyzny, opisany i wydany. Hic sibi delegit sedem pulcherri navirtus, Hinc sua Sauromatas, fors super astravehit*. Kraków, 1613

²⁹⁹ Maciejowski W. A. *Piśmiennictwo polskie od czasów najdawniejszych aż do roku 1830*. T. 3. Warszawa, 1852. S. 529.

³⁰⁰ Niesiecki K. *Herbarz Polski*. T. 7. Lipsk 1841. S. 256–258.

³⁰¹ French. «né dans la Grand Pologne en September 1584, admis 7 aout 1608, enseigne la grammaire, fut missionnaire en Ukraine, minister et procureur a Winnica et a Perejaslaw et mourut au siege de Borodino, Brodoni, en soignant les maladies assiégés, le 11 novembre 1648». *Biblioteque de la Compagnie de Jesus [...] Nouvelle edition par Carlos Sommervogel SJ*. Bibliographie. T. 6. Bruxelles-Paris, 1895. S. 342.

author of anti-Turkish themes and translator of Alexander Gwagnini's *Chronicle of European Sarmatia*. The second Marcin Paszkowski is a poet from Little Russia and the author of all works related to Ukraine³⁰².

The question of the list of Paszkowski's works arose from the historian T. Wierzbowski. In the collection "Library of Forgotten Polish Poets and Prose Writers"³⁰³ we find another curious version of the poet's life. Wierzbowski investigated the authorship of the anti-Turkish chronicle poem "Venice" (1575) by K. Warszkiewicki and came to the following conclusion: «If the author of the poem is not Warszkiewicki, then it can only be M. Paszkowski, and, in my opinion, this is more likely...»³⁰⁴. Wierzbowski emphasized that, firstly, the anti-Turkish theme is not new for Paszkowski, secondly, the poem is dedicated to one of the poet's patrons, and thirdly, the poem is stylistically close to the rest of Paszkowski's work.

The researcher believed that M. Paszkowski participated either in Andrzej Taranowski's Turkish embassy or in M. Meleckiego's expedition to Wallachia in 1572. No matter in which enterprise the poet took part, the outcome is the same: M. Paszkowski fell into thirty years of Turkish captivity. In 1572, Paszkowski created the poem "Venice" and sent it to Poland. The poem fell into the hands of K. Warszewicki, who published it under his own name³⁰⁵. Wierzbowski attributes the Turkish captivity to the poet's thirty years of silence between the creation of "Venice" and the rest of his works.

Wierzbowski also discovered and linked with the poet's name a document confirming the rights of M. Paszkowski, a veteran of the wars in the Infants, to own land³⁰⁶. Half a century later, Wierzbowski's find was used by another Polish researcher, B. Baranowski, but he interpreted it as evidence of the existence of some other noble Paszkowski, unrelated to the poet³⁰⁷. In recent historiography, the biography of the poet has been reconstructed in the most detail by M. Kuran³⁰⁸. The researcher has sorted out

³⁰² Załęski S. *Jezuici w Polsce*. T. 2. Lwów, 1901. S. 695. 705–706.

³⁰³ Wierzbowski T. *Biblioteka Zapomnianych Poetow i Prozaików Polskich XVI–XVIII wieku*. Warszawa, 1886.

³⁰⁴ Wierzbowski T. *Wstęp. Wenecja. Poemat historyczno-polityczny z końca XVI wieku / Biblioteka Zapomnianych Poetow i Prozaików Polskich XVI–XVIII wieku*. Warszawa, 1886. S. XXXIX.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.* S. XL–XLI.

³⁰⁶ *Materiały do dziejów piśmiennictwa polskiego i biografii pisarzy polskich*. T. 1: 1398–1600 / zebrał T. Wierzbowski. Warszawa, 1900. S. 337.

³⁰⁷ Baranowski B. *Znajomość Wshodu w dawnej Polsce do XVIII wieku*. Łódź, 1950. S. 76.

³⁰⁸ Kuran M. *Marczin Paszkowski – poeta okolicznościowu i moralista z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku*. Łódź, 2012.

many contradictions in the versions of M. Paszkowski's life path, sifting out the most incredible of them.

The document discovered by Wierzbowski confirms the poet's participation in the Infantile company of Stefan Batory. Presumably then, in military service, Paszkowski could make all the necessary contacts with his future patrons (Młodziewski, Łaski, Sapieha), as well as establish an acquaintance with A. Guagnini. As a result of the campaign, Paszkowski received a land allotment, where he lived until about 1607/1608. The widespread Swedish offensive in the Infants forced Paszkowski to leave his possessions and begin searching for new means of livelihood.

Paszkowski linked his life with writing, coupled with a constant search for patrons. The period between 1608 and 1621 marked the stage of the poet's active creative activity. It was in this time passage that Paszkowski's largest works came out, thanks to which we can put his name on a par with the previously considered poets and publicists of anti-Russian themes. At the beginning of his creative activity, Paszkowski devoted a lot of energy to oriental themes and the literary struggle against Turkey, however, in the context of the political situation in the region that developed after the death of False Dmitry I, the poet quickly refocused on the anti-Moscow theme that was gaining popularity.

Paszkowski wrote a series of literary works directed against the eastern neighbor of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: These are poems *Wykład bogiń słowieńskich*³⁰⁹, *Posiłek Bellony słowieńskiej szlachetnemu rycerstwu Dymitra Iwanowicza*³¹⁰, *Wizerunk wiecznej sławy Saurmatow starych*³¹¹ and a short rhymed note from the chronicle of A. Guagnini *Opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska*³¹².

³⁰⁹ Paszkowski M. *Wykład bogiń słowieńskich, wesołego widzenia słońca z Panną, w złotym kole nad Krakowem*. Kraków, 1608.

³¹⁰ Paszkowski M. *Posiłek Bellony słowieńskiej szlachetnemu rycerstwu Dymitra Iwanowicza W[ielkiego] Cara Moskiewskiego przeciwko Sujskiemu i inszym zdrajcom jego*. Kraków, 1608.

³¹¹ Paszkowski M. *Wizerunk wiecznej sławy Saurmatow starych, pobudzający młodź rycerską ku naśladowaniu spraw ich. Od szlachetnej Pallady, z Gniazda cnót ich, w ojezystym Parnasie wbudowany. A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego, z przykłady mężów rzymskich, onych wielkich miłośników Ojczyzny, opisany i wydany. Hic sibi delegit sedem pulcherri navirtus, Hinc sua Sauromatas, fors super astravehit*. Kraków, 1613.

³¹² Guagnini A. *Kronika Sarmacyey Europejskiej, w ktorey sie zamyka krolestwo Polskie...: Tudziez tez Wielkie Xięstwo Litewskie, Ruskie, Pruskie, Zmudzkie, Inflantskie, Moskiewskie y czesc Tatarow... z Lacinskiego na Polskie przelozona (par Marcin Paszkowski)*. Krakow, 1611. Ks. 7. Cz. 4. P. 80–81. Published translation of this text and its history see by: Prohorenkov I. A. «Our people came to the walls with bombs in the crimson twilight...». *Storming Smolensk through the eyes of a Polish poet // Rodina*. 2013. No. 9. P. 29–30.

All these works, although devoted to different subjects, form a certain integrity thematically: the above-mentioned literary works are united by the idea of strengthening the internal unity of the Polish-Lithuanian state and turning the military expansion to the East. To justify the expansion of the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian state at the expense of its eastern neighbor, M. Paszkowski creates a curious ethnogenetic concept of the history of the Eastern European region, which looks as follows. In time immemorial antiquity, the space from the Vistula in the west to the Volga in the east was inhabited by Sarmatian tribes, which gave rise to the Polish people. Paying tribute to their bravery and virtue, the goddess Athena personally took these tribes under her protection and proclaimed the absolute rights of the Sarmatians to these territories, which was enshrined in the very name “Sarmatia”³¹³. Paszkowski called this period the “golden age” of Slavic history, appealing to the scheme of four centuries (golden, silver, copper and iron) of human history described by Ovid in his “Metamorphoses”³¹⁴.

At the coming of the centuries, the power of the Sarmatians faded. Paszkowski unambiguously points to the cause of this phenomenon. The poet writes about the affected Polish-Lithuanian people «pestilence of dissent»³¹⁵. In this metaphor he encoded the rokosh of Zebrzydowski and other acts of nobility disobedience to the central authority. Paszkowski regularly recalls «house wars» as the main problem of his contemporary Rzeczpospolita: instead of defending the borders of the Republic, the noble knights were mired in internecine strife, and peace and harmony were replaced by «riots, violence, murders, great bloodshed, massacres, disasters and other various misfortunes»³¹⁶.

All this led to the fact that in the Iron Age, of which Paszkowski himself was already a contemporary, the previously unified lands of the Sarmatian inheritance were split³¹⁷. Sarmatia, according to the author's thought, began to divide into «European» and «Asian». Though divided from each other, the shard lands of the Sarmatian inheritance

³¹³ Paszkowski M. Wizerunek wiecznej sławy Saurmatow starych. P. 5.

³¹⁴ Kuran M. Marcin Paszkowski – poeta okolicznościowy i moralista z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku. Łódź, 2012. S. 144–145.

³¹⁵ Wizerunek wiecznej sławy Saurmatow starych... P. 8.

³¹⁶ Polish.: «Powstana, gwałty, mordy, krwie rozlania wielkie, / Mężobójstwa, uciski, insze zbytki wszelkie». Paszkowski M. Wykład bogiń słoweńskich. P. 4.

³¹⁷ For more information about the genesis of this concept, see: Prohorenkov I. A. Gathering the Old Russian heritage: discourses of history and geography of Russian lands in the chronographs of the 16th – first quarter of the 17th century and in the East European historical narrative // Vestnik NNGU named after N.I. Lobachevsky. 2017. № 2. P. 63–71.

had one common destiny. Paszkowski stated that the troubles caused in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth by Zebrzydowski's rokosz and the internal wars in the Moscow tsardom due to the activities of impostors were genetically similar phenomena:

«But first of all, 6 glorious provinces
They will rebel, and within three years they will be in great trouble,
Namely, three "M" and three "P",
From these letters, the kingdoms begin their own
Names»³¹⁸.

According to Paszkowski, the united Sarmatia consisted of 6 regions, in the Iron Age divided into two opposing camps: the first («P-tree») included the regions controlled by the natural Sarmatians – this is Poland, Lithuania and Rus. Under the «M-three» the poet understood the Moscow, Kazan and Astrakhan kingdoms³¹⁹. Martin Paszkowski wrote that the devastation in these areas will not cease until all lands will not be reassembled in the form of a single restored Sarmatia. Of course, being a client of the powerful magnates of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he considered the Poles to be the people-gatherer of the lands. The poet promoted the idea that it is possible to bring back the Golden Age: as soon as Sarmatia becomes united again, immediately the unrest, riots and internal turmoil will disappear by themselves. Thus, the conquest of Moscow, or, in Paszkowski's opinion, the return to its original borders, was called by the poet the primary issue for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth already in 1608 in one of the very first of his published works.

The author continued and developed the theme of the conquest of the eastern neighbor and the gathering of Sarmatian lands in his most striking anti-Moscow work – *Posiłek Bellony słowieńskiej szlachetnemu rycerstwu Dymitra Iwanowicza*. In the first quarter of the XV century, a special genre of anti-Turkish journalism was formed in

³¹⁸ Polish: «Lecz nadewszystko jaśniej sześć prowincyj zacnych / Poruszy się i przez trzy lata będą w znacznych / Rozruchach, mianowicie M troje i P troje, / Od tych liter królestwa zaczynają swoje / Nazwiska». Paszkowski M. Wykład bogiń słoweńskich. P. 5.

³¹⁹ Czubek J. Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego, 1606-1608. T. 1. Poezya rokoszowa. Kraków. 1916. S. 339.

Polish literature – the so-called "Turks"³²⁰ (turcyki, turkiany). By the time of the heyday of Pashkovsky's work, the stylistic techniques of this genre had already been honed to the smallest detail by such famous authors as S. Orzechowski, K. Warszewicki, B. Paprocki and many others. Paszkowski, in his poem *Posilek Bellony słowieńskiej*, tried to imitate S. F. Klenovich, a famous poet and publicist of anti-Turkish themes. Historical material, in turn, for his composition Paszkowski took from the work of one of the largest historiographers of GDL, M. Strykowski. Borrowing a fair amount of text from the turcyk by Klenovich *Pozar wojny tureckiej*³²¹ and Strykowski's genealogical poem *Goniec cnoty*³²², M. Paszkowski composed an anti-Moscow work using the stylistic canons of the turcyks.

Throughout the text of the entire poem, the author tried to convince readers of the identity of the Moscow and Turkish threats, and therefore the literary form of the Turkish was chosen. Comparing Russians with Ottomans is a propaganda technique that is repeatedly found in the European political literature of the XVI century. It was used to equate the European wars with Russia with the fight against Turkish aggression in Europe, and thereby justify anti-Russian diplomatic and military activities. The poet adopted large amounts of text from other authors and subjected them to editing. Pashkovsky's addition of new keywords significantly changed the meaning of the borrowed fragment³²³:

Table 2.

| | |
|--|--|
| M. Paszkowski. <i>Posilek Bellony słowieńskiej</i> | S. F. Klonowic. <i>Pozar wojny Tureckiej</i> |
| Tak niech upadnie ta władza tyrańska, | Niech na trąbienie upandie tyrańska |

³²⁰ See details: Arzhakova L. M. The Turkish question in Polish journalism of the end of the XVI century: thesis... Candidate of Historical Sciences: 07.00.03. Moscow, 1999.

³²¹ Klonowic S. F. *Pozar wojny Tureckiej*. Upominanie do gaszenia i wróżka o upadku mocy tureckiej.[b.m.], 1597.

³²² Strykowski M. *Goniec cnoty do prawych słachcizow w którym są przykłady spraw mężow zacnych*. Przytym napominanie Oyczyzny ku prawdziwym synom. Kraków, 1574.

³²³ Further the discrepancies, that appeared under Paszkowski's editorship, will be highlighted in black in the comparative textual tables in this paragraph.

| | |
|---|---|
| Zdrajców Moskiewskich, i srogość pogańska (ln. 5–8) ³²⁴ . | Władza a sceptrum, i moc Ottomańska (ln. 435–436). |
|---|---|

Throughout the poem, Paszkowski ruled the borrowed anti-Turkish text, changing only the words in it according to the principle «Turkish = Moscow», «sultan = tsar», «Muslims = Muscovites», etc. The Moscow ruler is particularly often attacked by the poet:

Table 3.

| | |
|--|---|
| M. Paszkowski. <i>Posiłek Bellony słowieńskiej</i> | S. F. Klonowic. <i>Pożar wojny Tureckiej</i> |
| Nie mogąc pozbyć Boga żądzej wieści, Baśni mieszając, prawdziwe powieści Pieje: tak mnie też Muza prze do tego, Bym głosił zdrajcy upadek Szuyskiego (ln. 20–24) ³²⁵ . | Nie może pozbyć Boga, lecz straszliwe Baśni mieszając, powieści prawdziwe Pieje: tak mnie też Muza prze do tego, Bym pisał klęskę tyrana Thrackiego (ln. 23–26). |

In Paszkowski's conception, in contrast to Palczowski's constructions, "Tsarevich" Dmitry Ivanovich continued to play a primary role, as he actually gave the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth ideal conditions for the restoration of the ancestral Sarmatian borders. If the nobility of the nobility extends a helping hand to Dmitry Ivanovich, then, after his re-accession, he will either make territorial concessions towards the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, or completely incorporate the Russian lands into the Republic. Guided by just such an idea, Paszkowski urged the knights to help Dmitry Ivanovich as soon as possible and join his army.

As for the fate of the local population, Paszkowski's intentions were similar to the colonisation plans of P. Palczowski, and even looked even more radical. Herein lies a certain paradox and inconsistency of M. Paszkowski's ideas: while offering the nobility

³²⁴ Translated from Polish: «So let that tyrannical power and the pagan cruelty of the Moscow traitors fall». Here and further, the line numbers are given by: Paszkowski M. *Posiłek Bellony słowieńskiej szlchetnemu rycerstwu Dymitra Iwanowicza W[ielkiego] Cara Moskiewskiego przeciwko Sujskiemu i innym zdrajcom jego*. Kraków, 1608.

³²⁵ Translated from Polish: «So the muse inspires me to proclaim the fall of the traitor Shuisky».

to help Dmitri Ivanovich regain the throne of Moscow, he in parallel calls to «flood all Russian lands with the blood» of the tsar's subjects:

Table 4.

| | |
|---|--|
| M. Paszkowski. <i>Posilek Bellony słowieńskiej</i> | S. F. Klonowic. <i>Pożar wojny Tureckiej</i> |
| Niechaj karmi zwierz i ptactwo łakome, Od was złej Orze wojsko porażone. Niech się czerwienią doły i potoki, Od krwi moskiewskiej , od zsiadłej posoki (ln. 253–256) ³²⁶ . | Niechaj karmi zwierz i ptactwo łakome, Od Chreścijanów wojsko porażone. Niech się czerwienią doły i potoki, Od krwi Tureckiej , od zsiadłej posoki. (ln. 53–56). |

The author's work was filled with ideas of revenge, which may have appealed to the feelings of relatives and friends of the wedding guests of Tsarevich Dmitry and Marina Mnishek who died in May 1606. According to the poet's idea, the Moscow kingdom had to atone for all the offences inflicted on the Polish-Lithuanian people with blood, and only then to become part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Like Palczowski's pamphlet, Paszkowski's work also contained a plan for the colonisation by the Polish-Lithuanian state of its eastern neighbour. The legitimacy of this colonization was determined, according to the propagandist, by the difference in the cultural and political level of the two states: the "developed" Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth inhabited the territories of "backward" Russia. The text of the poem denounced the political system of Moscow by comparing it with the order of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth³²⁷: a barbaric despotism was contrasted with a brilliant republic, eastern slavery with noblemen's rights and freedoms, cunning and greedy boyarism with virtuous noblemen's chivalry. If during the reorganisation of the Russian lands the blood of the local population is spilled, then, in Pashkovsky's opinion, it will in no way harm the future united Sarmatian state.

³²⁶ Translation from Polish: «Let the enemy troops who fell under Orsha feed the animals and feed the birds. Let the plains and rivers turn red from Moscow's blood, from their thickened pus».

³²⁷ Kuran M. Marcin Paszkowski – poeta okolicznościowy i moralista z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku. Łódź 2012. S. 167–168.

As the current military and political events in the Eastern European region developed, anti-Moscow motives in the work of M. Paszkowski developed and changed. In this context, Paszkowski's poem *Wizerunk wieczne jslawy Saurmatow starych*, published in 1613, is interesting. In this work, for the last time, one could hear the vivid anti-Moscow appeals of the author. However, under the influence of obvious military failures, the conquest and colonization discourses gave way to more modest defensive plots. This time, the poet chose the justice of the current borders between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Muscovite Tsardom as the topic of his arguments. Since the expulsion of the Polish garrison from Moscow showed the utopian plans for the incorporation and colonization of Russian lands, the poet preferred to return to the favorite theme in Polish political literature of "just war" and the protection of its borders:

«They kept their boundaries, established from time immemorial,
Stretching from Novgorod to Pskov along the Ugra.
Beyond Kiev, 70 miles to Putivl,
From Polotsk to Mozhaïsk 80 and [one] mile,
Seventy miles from Vitebsk [in the direction] Novgorod –
There were your borders, in which we now have losses»
(ln. 237–242)³²⁸.

A consistent study of the work of two authors who occupied a polar position in Polish-Lithuanian society – Palczowski and Paszkowski – is intended to illustrate the interest that has awakened in different parts of the reading public of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth about the Turmoil in Russia and the hypothetical consequences of overcoming it. The very nature of the conflict – whether the war between the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia was presented as the defense of its borders or was

³²⁸ Polish: «Rubieże tam swe mając ze wsząd oznaczone, / Z Nowogroda i Pskowa po Uhre pomknione. / Za Kijowem sześćdziesiąt mil, aż do Putwila, / Od Połocka po Mozajsk ośmdziesiąt i mila, / Z Witebska mil siedmdziesiąt aż do Nowogroda / Granice wasze byli, dziś w nich wielka szkoda». Момера строк даны по: Paszkowski M. *Wizerunk wiecznej sławy Saurmatow starych*, pobudzający młodź rycerską ku naśladowaniu spraw ich. Od szlachetnej Pallady, z Gniazda cnót ich, w ojczystym Parnasie wbudowany. A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego, z przykłady mężów rzymskich, onych wielkich miłośników Ojczyzny, opisany i wydany. Hic sibi delegit sedem pulcherri navirtus, Hinc sua Sauromatas, fors super astravehit. Kraków, 1613.

considered as a good opportunity to colonize new territories – changed in literature under the influence of current military and political events.

Chapter III. The Siege and Capture of Smolensk as a Catalyst for the Spread of anti-Russian Literary Propaganda

§ 1. Intensification of the creation of anti-Russian writings during the military campaign of 1609–1611

As noted in the previous chapter of the thesis, King Sigismund III openly launched a military campaign against Russia in 1609 without sufficient support from the szlachta, which was clearly demonstrated by the results of the General Sejm in Warsaw. In such a situation, the authority of the royal power depended on the success of the unauthorized military campaign, so favorable coverage of events at the front was one of the most important tasks for the office of Sigismund III.

The Smolensk lands were chosen as the main direction for the invasion of Russia. Information about the fickle moods of the rural strata of Smolensk began to reach the king soon after the death of the first impostor in Moscow and the accession of Vasily Shuisky. In December 1607, the Orsha headman A. Sapieha reported to King Sigismund: «as soon as the smallest army came, the townships of Smolensk would give in to the king's favor, since they do not want to see Shuisky as sovereign»³²⁹. Chancellor L. Sapieha, whom a number of contemporaries considered the main inspirer of the campaign, actively defended the idea of the need for an early military campaign against Smolensk in front of the king³³⁰.

In the fall of 1608 – winter 1609 there was a concentration of Polish-Lithuanian military forces in the eastern regions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth³³¹. The formal reason for the invasion of Russia was the treaty of military assistance concluded by M. V. Skopin-Shuisky with Sweden in February 1609³³². Having received the desired reason, King Sigismund hastened to take advantage of it, while not forgetting to back up his military enterprise with new actions of an ideological nature.

³²⁹ Cit. by: Nazarov V. D., Florya B. N. The peasant uprising led by I. I. Bolotnikov and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth // Peasant wars in Russia in the XVII–XVIII centuries: problems, searches, solutions. M., 1974. P. 344.

³³⁰ Zholkevsky S. Notes of Hetman Zholkevsky on the Moscow War. St. Petersburg, 1871. P. 21–22.

³³¹ Alexandrov S. V. Smolensk siege. 1609–1611. M., 2011. P. 138–139.

³³² Ibid. P. 140.

In the context of the open invasion of Polish-Lithuanian troops into Russia, the royal court emphasized the external propaganda accompanying the military expedition. If the writings we analyzed earlier in the text of the dissertation had mainly internal circulation within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and were addressed primarily to the broad gentry strata, then the new propaganda actions initiated on the eve of the Smolensk campaign were already designed to justify the invasion of Sigismund III's army into Russia under the slogan of defending Christianity. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth presented itself as the "main stronghold" of Christian forces in the east of the region.

The researcher J. Chrościcki noted that the war with Russia was presented in Polish-Lithuanian propaganda as a new crusade³³³. While the troops were being assembled, Sigismund III actively corresponded with Pope Paul V. As part of this correspondence, he asked the head of Western Christianity to hurry up with the beatification of Ignatius de Loyola. It was the founder of the Jesuit order that the king saw as the patron of the Smolensk campaign³³⁴. As a result, the enterprise received even more spiritual support than Sigismund III had asked for: in October 1609, a jubilee was announced in Rome and a prayer service was organized, after which the pilgrims received a remission of all sins «for the happy success of the Most Serene King against the Schismatics»³³⁵. The King of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, in turn, did his best to stir up the interest of the papacy in the expedition, promising to raise the Catholic cross over Moscow upon its completion³³⁶.

Sigismund III's close cooperation with the Catholic Church in the preparation of the campaign is also noticeable in more localized ideological actions. For example, during the gathering of troops in Orsha, the Church of St. Michael the Archangel was laid³³⁷. The Jesuits who took an active part in this event called on the Archangel of the Heavenly Host to guide the king in his holy campaign, which was supported by the foundation of the new church.

³³³ Chrościcki J. A. *Sztuka i polityka: funkcje propagandowe sztuki w epoce Wazów 1587–1668*. Warszawa, 1983. S. 70.

³³⁴ Sobieski W. *Żółkiewski na Kremlu*. Warszawa, [1920]. S. 18.

³³⁵ Chrościcki J. A. *Sztuka i polityka*. S. 70.

³³⁶ Sobieski W. *Żółkiewski na Kremlu*. S. 20.

³³⁷ Bielski S. *Diariusz Wiadomości od wyjazdu K.I.M. z Wilna do Smoleńska*. [S.l., 1610]. K. A2v.

Political literature after the beginning of the Polish-Lithuanian intervention continued to play a leading role in anti-Russian propaganda, acquiring an increasingly bellicose coloring. Immediately after the royal troops crossed the Russian borders in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the *Pieśń o tyránstwie Szuyskiego* began to spread³³⁸, presenting the king and his knights as liberators of the Russian lands from the power of the impious usurper Vasily Shuisky.

The visual range of propaganda works of this time period is no less curious. For example, in 1609 the Italian master T. Dolabella, who worked at the court of the Polish king, produced a skillful engraving³³⁹, which depicted Sigismund III leading his troops to Smolensk on horseback. After the successful capture of the city, the same master again immortalized the king's deeds with an engraving, this time depicting Sigismund as a triumphant horseman³⁴⁰. According to Chrościcki, these were the first depictions of King Sigismund as a mounted warrior leading his troops, which significantly influenced the artistic tradition in which the Vasa dynasty began to be depicted as military leaders³⁴¹.

Contrary to all triumphant expectations, which were fueled by the purposeful activity of the royal entourage, events at the front were unfavorable for the plans of Sigismund III. The main military forces of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth approached Smolensk on September 19, 1609, and it immediately became obvious that the city prepared by voivode M. B. Shein for a long defense was not going to surrender without a fight³⁴². The first assault on Smolensk was undertaken on October 4, 1609. After its unsuccessful end, up to the middle of October there were continued attempts to take the city by storm without long siege works³⁴³. This time interval was evaluated as follows in the works of researcher S. V. Alexandrov: «the first month of the siege showed all the adventurousness of Sigismund III's campaign near Smolensk. The Polish army was clearly unprepared for the siege of the first-class Smolensk fortress»³⁴⁴.

³³⁸ *Pieśń o tyránstwie Szuyskiego*, teraz uczyniona Roku Panskiego 1609. [S.l.], 1609.

³³⁹ Dolabella T. Zygmunt III jako wódz w kampanii 1609. Miedzioryt W. Kiliiana, dedykacja królowi. Muzeum Hist. m. st. Warszawy Fot. M. H. m. st. Warszawy. [S.l.], 1609.

³⁴⁰ Dolabella T. Zygmunt III jako zwycięzca pod Smoleńskiem (w stroju polskim). Miedzioryt T. Dolabelli z 1611 r. Dział Dokumentacji Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie. Fot. ze zb. Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie. [S.l.], 1611.

³⁴¹ Chrościcki J. A. Sztuka i polityka. S. 71.

³⁴² Alexandrov S. V. Smolensk siege. 1609–1611. Moscow, 2011. P. 179.

³⁴³ Ibid. P. 180–183.

³⁴⁴ Ibid. P. 184.

After a series of initial military setbacks, as a saving option for the entire expedition, the king began to consider a campaign immediately against Moscow, within which it would be possible to leave only a small garrison in the camp near Smolensk for further blockade of the city. Because of subsequent discussions at military councils, this option was rejected in favor of a final decision to proceed with a planned siege, for which guns from Riga were hastily delivered to the royal detachments along the Dvina³⁴⁵.

It should be noted that the situation of the Polish-Lithuanian troops at Smolensk did not improve dramatically, even in view of other successes of the campaign. This statement can be illustrated by the defeat of the Moscow troops led by D. I. Shuisky, committed by S. Żółkiewski's cavalymen on July 4, 1610 at Klushin. As a consequence of this battle the hetman managed to reach Moscow unhindered and already on August 27–28, 1610 to take the oath of allegiance of the boyar government to King Wladyslaw³⁴⁶. Sigismund III never decided to let his 15-year-old son go to Moscow, and only in 1611 J. K. Chodkiewicz was sent to the Russian capital as a royal vicerex³⁴⁷.

Contrary to the above circumstances, the king did not weaken the siege of Smolensk and on August 21, 1610, one of the bloodiest attempts to storm the city during the entire period of the siege took place. Demoralization of the Polish-Lithuanian soldiers at Smolensk was so high that on August 20, 1610 the units could not be raised for the planned assault, as the nobility refused to march on the fortress on foot. The attack that happened the next day was already severely repulsed by the defenders of the fortress: 178 attackers were killed and 642 wounded³⁴⁸.

Only on June 3, 1611 Smolensk fell under the onslaught of the Polish-Lithuanian army of Sigismund III. Despite the fact that the royal military expedition was successful, the 20-month siege of the city caused a significant blow to the army and the treasury. This circumstance necessitated the king's return back to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, depriving him of the opportunity to march on Moscow with his troops³⁴⁹.

³⁴⁵ Alexandrov S. V. Smolensk siege. P. 184.

³⁴⁶ Kostomarov N. I. The Time of Troubles. The Moscow state at the beginning of the XVII century. Historical monographs and research. M., 2008. P. 528–532.

³⁴⁷ Kurbatov O. A. Military history of the Russian Troubles of the beginning of the XVII century. M., 2014. P. 148.

³⁴⁸ The Russian Historical Library, published by the Archeographic Commission. Vol. 1: Monuments related to the Time of Troubles / [edited by Prof. S. F. Platonov]. St. Petersburg, 1872. P. 656–657.

³⁴⁹ Alexandrov S. V. Smolensk siege. P. 253.

The successful capture of Smolensk was the catalyst for the emergence of a new layer of propaganda literature: the conquest by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of a seemingly impregnable city filled the current political literature and journalism of those times with optimistic sentiments about the course of the entire military campaign against Russia. «Triumph» as a genre became the dominant form of news dissemination until the expulsion of the Polish garrison from the Moscow Kremlin.

In J. Chrościcki's opinion, the creation of panegyric literature praising Sigismund III's military and political sagacity was actively supported by the royal chancellery, primarily to mitigate the internal political contradictions in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth related to the Zebrzydowski rebellion³⁵⁰. In the framework of the present dissertation research, we consider it necessary to supplement the researcher's conclusion: the apologia of the king's arbitrary actions and the emphasis on his personal success in the war with Russia were necessary in view of the Warsaw Sejm in 1609, which was unsuccessful for the king's plans. The works praising the victory of the Polish-Lithuanian troops were intended to strengthen the authority of the central government and protect the king from the attacks of political opponents who rightly saw in Sigismund III's actions a desire to strengthen their own position.

The king and his achievements were the focus of propaganda, while other subjects were obscured and silenced. This explains the silence, which in the publicism of that time enveloped the battle of Klushin on July 4, 1610³⁵¹. The silence of poets and contemporary publicists about the victory of hetman S. Żółkiewski was most capaciously characterized by J. Nowak-Dłużewski, who called it «simply scandalous»³⁵². The fairness of this assessment was confirmed by K. Zawadzki's research, which showed that in the flysheets of 1610–1611 this battle was practically not marked in any way³⁵³.

We briefly wrote about the political effect of this battle above: it is impossible not to agree with the opinion of O. A. Kurbatov that «the defeat at Klushin had the main

³⁵⁰ Chrościcki J. A. *Sztuka i polityka*. S. 69.

³⁵¹ Oszczyda A. *Tryumfy smoleńskie. Propagandowe treści wierszy triumfalnych z 1611 roku / Hołd carów Szujskich*, pod red. J. A. Chrościckiego i M. Nagielskiego. Warszawa, 2012. S. 70.

³⁵² Nowak-Dłużewski J. *Okolicznościowa poezja polityczna w Polsce*. T. 4: Zygmunt III. Warszawa, 1971. S. 212.

³⁵³ Zawadzki K. *Gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące XVI–XVIII wieku. Bibliografia*. T. 1: 1514–1661. Wrocław, 1977. S. 78–82.

consequence of the fall of Shuisky's power»³⁵⁴. In addition to the complete defeat of the Moscow troops, the sworn enemies of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Swedes, fighting on the side of Russia under the leadership of J. Delagardi, were also defeated. The tradition of glorifying such military triumphs existed in Polish literature. An example is the defeat of the Swedes at Kirchholm on September 27, 1605 by the hussars of J. K. Chodkiewicz: in the period from 1605 to 1606, at least 7 different news publications were published in Europe, colorfully describing the defeat of the Swedes³⁵⁵. In the case of the Smolensk campaign, S. Żółkiewski's successes were not recognized in actual poetry and journalism, as they could compete with the deeds of Sigismund III, which went against the main motive of the propaganda campaign.

In the context of the above-mentioned circumstances, the wide scope of commemorative actions in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth related solely to the capture of Smolensk becomes understandable: after June 1611, triumphs and parades were given, participants in the military actions received commemorative awards and medals, and European citizens learned about the king's success from quickly circulated flyers and works by publicists³⁵⁶. The propaganda campaign initiated by the central government made it possible to present Sigismund III's deeds as a continuation of the Jagiellonian foreign policy doctrine of expanding the territory of the state³⁵⁷, which was supposed to appeal to public opinion.

If earlier the Polish-Lithuanian public received information about the Troubles in Russia mainly in the wake of the activities of impostors, then since 1611 the focus of perception of events in a neighboring state has shifted under the influence of a stream of newly published propaganda writings. The war with Russia in literary monuments acquired a fresh main plot and a new central character: only the military exploits of the king and his entourage were described. To confirm this thesis, we consider it necessary to refer to the list of sources whose creation was due to the military campaign of 1609–1611.

³⁵⁴ Kurbatov O. A. Military history of the Russian Troubles of the beginning of the XVII century. Moscow, 2014. P. 112.

³⁵⁵ Zawadzki K. Gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące XVI–XVIII wieku. S. 73–77.

³⁵⁶ Chrościcki, J.A. Sztuka i polityka. S. 69–70.

³⁵⁷ Ibid. S. 71.

K. Zawadzki's bibliography records the existence of 9 flysheets issued on the occasion of the capture of Smolensk³⁵⁸:

1. Breve e vera relazione dell'acquisto e la presa della città di Smolensk in Moscovia. Roma, 1611.

2. Drei merkliche Relationen. Erste von der Viktoria Sigismunds III., des Königs von Polen und Schweden, welche er über die Moskowiter erhalten und die Festung Smolensk, am 13. Juni 1611 erobert hat. Augsburg, 1611.

3. Hofmański M. Porażka cudowna wojska moskiewskiego. Poznań, 1611.

4. Krótkie a prawdziwe opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska. [S.l.], 1611.

5. O rekuperowaniu Smoleńska od Moskwy przez Zygmunta III dnia 13 czerwca 1611. Wilno, 1611.

6. Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terażniejszym 1611, 13 dnia czerwca. Wilno, 1611.

7. Szturm smoleński. Poznań, 1611.

8. Viktoria Sigismundi III., Königs von Polen und Schweden, welche er über der Moskowiter Festung Smolensk erhalten und dieselbige am 13. Juni 1611 erobert hat. [S.l.], 1611. Wyd. A/B.

9. Viktoria und Sieg Sigismundi III., welche Ihre Königliche Majestät am 13. Juni 1611 wider die Festung Smolensk erhalten hat. [S.l.], 1611.

In addition to the flying newspapers, many literary sources concerning Sigismund III's military campaign have been studied and systematized in the works of J. Nowak-Dłużewski³⁵⁹. In recent scholarly literature, the same issue has been revisited by the Polish researcher A. Oszczyda³⁶⁰. Taking into account the contribution to the bibliography of the mentioned scholars and excluding the above titles of the flying leaves, we additionally receive the following list of sources created under the influence of the capture of Smolensk:

³⁵⁸ Zawadzki K. Gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące XVI–XVIII wieku. S. 78–81.

³⁵⁹ Nowak-Dłużewski J. Okolicznościowa poezja polityczna w Polsce. S. 212–219.

³⁶⁰ Oszczyda A. Tryumfy smoleńskie. S. 71.

1. Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziątek, na przyjazd do Wilna króla JMści, Senatu y Rycerstwa tudzież mowa po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska JW. J. MC. P. Chrystophowi Montwidowi Dorohostayskiemu marszałkowi W. X. Lit. Wilno, 1611.

2. Borastus G. Panegyricus Sigismundo III. Poloniae et Sveciae Regi etc. etc. invictissimo a Gregorio Laurentio Borasto Gotto dicatus. Vilno, 1611.

3. Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych y wielk. księztwa litewskiego, z sławnego zwycięztwa Nayiaśnieyszego i niezwycięzonego monarchy Zygmunta III., który po wzięciu stolicy Moskiewskiej y zamków przyległych, napotęźniejszy Smoleńsk szczęśliwie opanował. Kraków, 1611.

4. In triumpho serenissimi ac potentissimi principis Sigismundi III. Poloniae et Sveciae Regis etc. etc. è Moscovia post insignes gloriose partas victorias feliciter redeuntis. Oratio Caesaris Baroffii Mediolanensis J. V. D. protonotarii ap. et illustrissimi ac reverendissimi Domini D. Comitis Francisci Simonetae, episcopi Fulginatensis, nuncii in Regno Polon. apostolici, a secretis. Vilno, 1612.

5. Krajewski J. Tryumph poznański Ná radosną victoryą K. Je^o M. po wzięciu Smoleńską, który się odprávvovwał 3 dnia Lipcá 1611. Przez Jana Kraiewskiego Kom. K. J. M. teraz novvo vvydány. Poznań, 1611.

6. Loaechius A. Na szczęśliwe y pożądane zwrocenie się JKMści Zygmunta III do Wilna po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska. Wilno, 1611.

7. Łubieński S. Oratio salutatoria a Stanislao Lubienio Canonico Varsav. ad Sigismundum III cum capto Smolensco, Varsaviam redux Basilicam visitaret, nomine Capituli Varsaviensis. Warszawam, 1611.

8. Montelupi V. Gratulationes in reditum Serenissimi et Potentissimi Sigismundi III. D. G. Poloniae et Sveciae Regis Magnique Lithuaniae Ducis etc. Victoris, de Moschovia triumphantis a Valerio Montelupi de Mari philosophiae studioso in collegio romano Societ. Jesu. Poznań, 1611.

9. Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny Smoleńska, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terażnieyszym 1611 dnia 13 Czerwca, opisany przez Baltazara Ozimińskiego. Wilno, [1611].

10. Paszkowski M. Opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska przez niezwyciężonego monarchę Zygmunta III / Gwagnini, Alexander. *Kronika Sarmacyjnej Europy*. Kraków, 1611. Ks. 7. S. 80–81.

11. Radawski A. *Victoria de Moscho, Sigismundo III. Rege Maximo, triumphatore regnante, relata. Illustribus et Magnificis D. Joanni, D. Constantino Principibus Ostrogiensibus, Palatin. Wolynensibus dicata ab Alberto Radawski S. C. Cracoviae.* Kraków, 1611.

12. Skarga P. *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panu Bogu. Czynione w Wilnie 25. Iulii, w dzień S. Iákubá, 1611. ná przyjazd szczęśliwy Krolá I. M. Przez X. Piotra Skarge Societatis Iesv.* Kraków, 1611.

13. *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III.* Kraków, 1611.

14. Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska na grzmotną sławę z zwycięstwa smoleńskiego.* Kraków, 1611.

15. Witkowski S. *Wanda Ná szczęśliwe zwrocenie Ieo Krolewskiej Miłości z zwycięstwá Moskiewskiego. Pod consultáciámi Seymu wálnego Wárszawskiego, w Roku 1611. Dniá 26. Mieściáca Wrześniá. Pisana przez Stanisława Witkowskiego.* Euripides. *Consilium sapienter initum, multas manus vincit: imperitia verò cum multitudine, deterius malum est.* Kraków, 1611.

A. Oszcęda's assumptions about the reasons for the rapid appearance of a vast layer of literature³⁶¹, glorifying the victory of the Polish-Lithuanian arms, are in harmony with our previous conclusions. The royal chancellery sought to create a favorable mood in the Polish-Lithuanian society regarding the king's plans for the continuation of the war and the final subjugation of Moscow, for the sake of the fulfillment of which it was necessary to carry out new levies, which became the main topic of discussion first at the local sejmiks on August 15, and soon after them – at the General Sejm in Warsaw on September 26, 1611.

Considering the above sources not as disparate literary monuments, but as a set of homogeneous functional elements of Sigismund III's purposeful propaganda campaign,

³⁶¹ Oszcęda A. *Tryumfy smoleńskie*. S. 71.

we faced the need to form a classification scheme that takes into account the circumstances of the monuments' creation and can demonstrate the relationship between the texts under study.

The researcher of the Old Polish literary tradition M. Kuran made an attempt to fulfill this task³⁶². Departing from the genealogical and chronological categorization of sources common in scientific works, Kuran prioritized the “communication”³⁶³ aspect: the researcher put forward a number of assumptions about which layers of the reading population were targeted by certain texts. Studying how information gradually spread from the eastern frontiers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to the West, Kuran supplemented his reflections with elements of genetic analysis of texts.

In our opinion, the study of the mutual influence of multi-genre works within a broad temporal and geographical framework allows us to identify their hierarchy: a number of monuments first reported sensational information or added new details to the news canvas that was forming in the readers' minds, while other texts already widely retransmitted the known information further, accompanying it with a certain evaluation. Having considered the principles of classification that guided M. Kuran in his works, we have reworked and adapted them to the range of sources under study in view of the goals and objectives of our dissertation research. On this basis, we can distinguish five stages in the history of the creation of a literary cycle that presents to the public the circumstances and results of the siege of Smolensk.

Initially, contemporaries could learn something about the Smolensk campaign only from the notes of eyewitnesses and direct participants in the war. Personal letters and diaries from the period of the siege of the city, sheets from the royal chancellery and diariusz of the military campaign served as the basis for the news publications that were widely circulated later. The anonymous *Diariusz drogi króla Jmci Zygmunta III*³⁶⁴, broadcasting a view of events from the royal camp, played a primary role here. In addition

³⁶² Kuran M. Relacje o zdobyciu Smoleńska w 1611 roku – konwencje literackie i funkcje komunikacyjne // *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. 2011. Knyga 32. S. 57–80.

³⁶³ *Ibid.* S. 59.

³⁶⁴ *Diariusz Drogi Krola Jmci Zygmunta III Od Szczęśliwego Wyjazdu Z Wilna Pod Smolensk W Roku 1609 a Die 18 Augusta I Fortunnego Powodzenia Przez Lat Dwie Do Wzicia Zamku Smolenska W Roku 1611.* / [oprac. J. Byliński]. Wrocław, 1999.

to official channels of news dissemination, news about the course of the war seeped into the information field of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth through private documents. One of the numerous examples of this type of sources is the *Letter from Pan Wichrowski to Pan Staniszewski*³⁶⁵, in which the nephew informed his uncle about the capture of Smolensk, describing in detail the course of the assault. The mood of this letter anticipated the triumphant motifs of the soon-to-be published news brochures, and the author of the letter gleefully informed his relative: «We have something to come back with, for there is no such castle in the whole of Poland, which has been so perfectly fortified and arranged that those who have seen the strength of [other] castles in the world admit that it is difficult to find such high and strong walls [anywhere else]»³⁶⁶.

The allocation of the next stage and the principle of including sources in it are due to the fact that the glorification campaign in honor of the victory of King Sigismund entered an active stage: the information was codified, and now it was necessary to construct channels for its dissemination among the population of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The first to respond to the task were large printing centers geographically located close to the theater of operations. The effective cooperation of the royal chancellery with Vilna printers (first of all, with the printing house of the government employee J. Karcan³⁶⁷) deserves high praise. It was in Vilna that the first royal triumph was given on July 24–25, 1611 on the occasion of the capture of Smolensk. Vilna printers, after the triumphal events in the city, quickly began to produce panegyric literature in honor of the king. In addition to news publications, praise speeches of dignitaries delivered in the capital of the GDL during the royal festivities also spread among the readers. The fact that these were not sporadic displays of loyalty, but part of a well-thought-out propaganda campaign is evidenced, for example, by the publication of

³⁶⁵ The text of the handwritten source is reproduced in: Swiatkiewicz A. Ostatni szturm na Smoleńsk r. 1611 // *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1982. T. 6. Lwów. S. 90–92.

³⁶⁶ Swiatkiewicz A. Ostatni szturm na Smoleńsk r.1611. S. 92.

³⁶⁷ The following replicated texts glorifying the military successes of the king came out of Karcan's printing house: Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziątek, na przyjazd do Wilna króla JMści, Senatu y Rycerstwa tudzież mowa po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska JW. J. MC. P. Chrystophowi Montwidowi Dorohostayskiemu marszałkowi W. X. Lit. Wilno, 1611; O rekuperowaniu Smoleńska od Moskwy przez Zygmunta III dnia 13 czerwca 1611. Wilno, 1611; Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terażniejszym 1611, 13 dnia czerwca. Wilno, 1611.

the *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie*³⁶⁸ by P. Skarga. Having been delivered in Vilna, Skarga's speeches were soon published in Kraków, so that the oration glorifying the deeds of Sigismund III could reach a larger number of distant readers.

The third stage in our scheme covers the collection of literary monuments that continued to sensationalize their addressees, but were published in the regions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth far from the war by authors who were not directly related to the events they described, so they had to rely on the works of their predecessors. This range of sources can be illustrated by the popular Poznań news publication *Szturm smoleński*³⁶⁹ and the rhymed report *Opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska przez niezwyciężonego monarchę Zygmunta III*³⁷⁰ by M. Paszkowski included in the chronicle by A. Guagnini.

The fourth stage of the formation of the Smolensk propaganda cycle, when the genre of «triumph»³⁷¹ became the leading one in the literature glorifying King Sigismund's deeds, is of the greatest interest for solving the tasks of this thesis. The sensational-news aspect of the triumphal literature receded into the background, and the narrative itself was aimed at exalting the king and his recent services to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The readers were presented with a complete picture of how Sigismund III with his brave knighthood advanced to Smolensk and, as a result of the hardest battles, captured the impregnable city, after which the entire troubled Muscovy bowed its head before the crown prince. The third paragraph of the third chapter of our thesis is devoted to a detailed analysis of the triumphant literature.

Following the triumphs, it is necessary to single out a group of sources whose origin was no longer connected with the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. External propaganda of Sigismund III's military and political successes was also among

³⁶⁸ Skarga P. *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panv Bogv. Czynione w Wilnie 25. Iulii, w dzień S. Iákubá, 1611. ná przyiazd szczęśliwy Krolá I. M. Przez X. Piotra Skarge Societatis Iesv. Kraków, 1611.*

³⁶⁹ *Szturm smoleński. Poznań, 1611.*

³⁷⁰ Paszkowski M. *Opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska przez niezwyciężonego monarchę Zygmunta III / Gwagnini A. Kronika Sarmacyjej Europejskiej. Kraków, 1611. Ks. 7. S. 80–81.*

³⁷¹ Chlebowski W. *Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych y wielk. księztwa litewskiego, z sławnego zwycięztwa Nayiaśnieyszego i niezwyciężonego monarchy Zygmunta III., który po wzięciu stolice Moskiewskiej y zamków przyległych, napotężniejszy Smoleńsk szczęśliwie opanował. Kraków, 1611; Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmunтови III. Kraków, 1611; Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska na grzmotną sławę z zwycięztwa smoleńskiego. Kraków, 1611; Witkowski S. Wanda Ná szczęśliwe zwrocenie Ieo Krolewskiej Miłości z zwycięztwa Moskiewskiego. Pod consultáciami Seymu wálnego Wárszawskiego, w Roku 1611. Dniá 26. Mieściacá Wrześniá. Pisana przez Stanisława Witkowskiego. Euripides. Consilium sapienter initum, multas manus vincit: imperitia verò cum multitudine, deterius malum est. Kraków, 1611.**

the topical tasks for the royal chancellery, so news of the Christian monarch's victory over the Eastern schismatics spread rapidly throughout Europe. The first news works devoted to this event were published as early as 1611 in Rome³⁷² and Augsburg³⁷³. These sources illustrate the literature of the final stage in the development of the anti-Russian news campaign. After the release of such writings, the phase of active promotion of the news about the capture of Smolensk as an undeniable royal success in the European news space can be considered completed.

As the military and political situation in Russia developed, it became increasingly obvious that Moscow was not at all ready to submit to Sigismund III, and that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's acquisitions would be limited to the Smolensk lands. This conditioned the fact that the literature after 1612 gradually began to be filled with texts rethinking the results of the military campaign of 1609–1611. The literary reflections on the war and its results, created years and even decades later, went far beyond the royal propaganda campaign and mostly represented the private opinions of the authors.

Already in 1612, S. Żółkiewski in his manuscript indignantly noted that the king's self-confidence and his unwillingness to negotiate with the boyar government for the sake of subsequent benefits could seriously harm the Republic and negate the results achieved by military and diplomatic successes³⁷⁴. Recognizing the capture of Smolensk as a great triumph, J. Krajewski, a supporter of the king's policy, wrote bitterly about the loss of Moscow to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1615 in his epic poem *Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej*³⁷⁵:

³⁷² Breve e vera relazione dell'acquisto e la presa della città di Smolensk in Moscovia. Roma, 1611.

³⁷³ Drei merkliche Relationen. Erste von der Viktoria Sigismunds III., des Königs von Polen und Schweden, welche er über die Moskowiter erhalten und die Festung Smolensk, am 13. Juni 1611 erobert hat. Augsburg, 1611.

³⁷⁴ «The Hetman gave quite a few other reasons, advising to act in accordance with the inclination of this people and put an end to the war, since great benefits for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth could flow from the conditions now concluded near Moscow. If the king does not want to be satisfied with this, then, in addition to other inconveniences, it is necessary to start a long war, which is unknown when and what will be the end. It was also necessary, he said, to pay attention to soldiers who were prone to riots and mutinies if their salaries could not be paid, so that, after the destruction of these treatises, they would not rebel and enter the regions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, demanding from it a well-deserved payment, which, by agreement, they were supposed to receive from the treasury of Moscow. But the ears of His Majesty the king were closed to the Hetman's beliefs...». Cit. by: Zholkevsky S. Notes of Hetman Zholkevsky on the Moscow War. P. 108–109.

³⁷⁵ Krajewski J. *Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej przez Jana Krajewskiego pilnie opisana*. 1615. Cic. Is est verus triumphus cum bene meritis de Repub. testimonium a consensu civitatis datur. Honor enim est praemium virtutis studio judicioque alicujus ad aliquem delatum etc. Szablą słynąc, piękna rzecz, kto na sławę robi: Pismem się cnota każda winosi y zdobi. Kraków, [1615]. K. 32.

«And so on All Saints' Day, stained with blood,
The king was already in the Yam with the army – the capital is lost [by us]!»³⁷⁶

The poet did not criticize the ruler's actions and laid all the blame solely on the shoulders of the Muscovites themselves, presenting them as a treacherous and savage people who went against their own agreements with Sigismund III³⁷⁷.

The further chronologically from the events described, the more critical the new texts were of the king's role in the war with Russia. Such assessments can be found, for example, in *Gestorum Vladislai IV Poloniae et Sveciae regis*³⁷⁸ by E. Wassenberg, *Władysław IV*³⁷⁹ by S. Twardowski and *Historia Vladislai* by S. Kobierzycki³⁸⁰. A clearly negative assessment³⁸¹ of Sigismund III's actions during and immediately after the Smolensk campaign can be found in the chronicle of his own secretary, P. Piasecki³⁸², which was prudently published after the monarch's death.

Thus, the proposed scheme of classification of sources allows us to identify the main stages in the formation of the official triumphal discourse, in the context of which information about the successful siege of Smolensk by the royal troops was purposefully disseminated in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and neighboring countries. Based on the events of the military campaign of 1609–1611, a myth was constructed about the complete victory of Sigismund III over Russia. The gradual realization of the invalidity of this myth by contemporaries manifested itself in the creation of works with a critical rethinking of recent events.

It should be noted that the introduced rubricization of historical monuments also has merits from the point of view of source analysis. By tracing the channels of information transmission, we can identify consistently all the links in the chain of news

³⁷⁶ Polish: «I tak w dzień Wszystkich Świętych we krwi umoczona, / Już był król w Jaźmie z wojskiem – stolica stracona!» Krajewski J. *Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej przez Jana Krajewskiego pilnie opisana // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa, 2016. S. 479.*

³⁷⁷ Krajewski J. *Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej // Moskiewski Mars. S. 479.*

³⁷⁸ Wassenberg E. *Gestorum Vladislai IV, Poloniae et Succide Regis, pars I principem panegyricae representans, pars II Regem panegyricae repraesentans. Gedanii, 1643.*

³⁷⁹ Twardowski S. *Władysław IV, król polski i szwedzki. Leszno, drukarnia D. Vetter, 1649.*

³⁸⁰ Kobierzycki S. *Historia Vladislai Poloniae et Sueciae principis, ejus natales, infantiam, electionem usque ad excessum Sigismundi III. Gdańsk, 1655.*

³⁸¹ Piasecki P. *Kronika / Wstęp Julian Bartoszewicz, przekł. Antoni Chrzęszczewski. Kraków, 1870. S. 238–239.*

³⁸² Piasecki P. *Chronica gestorum in Europa singularium. Kraków, 1645.*

transmission, which allows us to take into account very rare sources, the introduction of which into scientific circulation is still an urgent task for researchers of Old Polish literature.

While leading the systematic siege of Smolensk, the king continued to deal with state affairs right in the military camp near the walls of the enemy city: active bureaucratic work was carried out, decrees were drawn up, ambassadors were received and dispatched, and ceremonial speeches were delivered. Researcher M. Barłowska has revealed that only extant ambassadorial speeches composed and read during the siege of Smolensk number 16 manuscripts³⁸³.

The activities carried out in the royal camp influenced the appearance of the entire propaganda campaign of Sigismund III: subjects that worked for the king's favorable image were cultivated and developed, while others were silenced or cut off. In particular, triumphal motifs permeated the speech delivered in the royal camp by F. Kryski on behalf of the king on the occasion of the success of the Polish-Lithuanian forces at Klushino. A. Żółkiewski, brother of hetman S. Żółkiewski, who came to Sigismund III on July 15, 1610, presented the monarch with the mace of D. I. Shuisky, which symbolized the complete military success of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the confrontation with the Moscow forces³⁸⁴. In Kryski's speech, the victory at Klushino was presented as a turning point in the military campaign, but further on this story will be pushed into the background, so that nothing could compete with the king's personal exploits in the war against Russia, as we wrote above.

In addition to triumphal and festive events, the royal administration also performed key functions during mourning events. At the camp near Smolensk, lavish farewell ceremonies were regularly held for prominent members of the nobility of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who had died during the siege³⁸⁵. For example, a large number of nobles who wanted to pay tribute to their comrade attended the farewell

³⁸³ Barłowska M. *Słowo na theatrum wojny, czyli mowy pozostałe po czasach Dymitriad. Epizod smoleński* // Napis. 2006. Seria XII. S. 210.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.* S. 218.

³⁸⁵ See details: Barłowska M. „Bo przystoi, by mężne tak wieziono ciała”. Mowy przy wyprowadzeniu ciała rycerza z obozu // *Wschodni Rocznik Humanistyczny*. 2010–2011. N. 7. S. 57–69.

ceremony for J. Lubomirski, the headman of Dobczyce (starosta dobczycki), who died of fever on July 6, 1610.

The bodies of Polish-Lithuanian knights killed in the Russian lands far from Smolensk were also brought to the monarch's headquarters. M. Wejher, who was killed during the battles near Tsaryovo-Zaymishche, was immediately taken by his comrades to the royal camp, and on October 27, 1609 his body was sent back to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It is also important to remember the fate of the remains of R. Różyński, the hetman of the Tushino camp. The body of the voivode who died on April 4, 1610 in Joseph-Volokolamsk monastery was transported to the royal camp near Smolensk, where on June 21, 1610 a solemn farewell was held to him, after which the remains of Różyński were sent to Kiev for burial.

All the above-mentioned mourning actions were accompanied by the compilation of texts dedicated to the life and merits of the deceased. Funeral monuments, both in poetic form and in prose, represent a separate direction in topical literature. This stratum of sources has mainly applied character, and from the position of informativeness in the funeral literature the narrow local subjects are revealed, inscribed in a wider historical context. Monuments of this type are rarely used on an equal footing with other types of written historical sources in generalizing studies; much more attention is paid to the funerary genre in literary studies³⁸⁶. Since funerary monuments also participated in the formation of the triumphal myth of King Sigismund, we cannot neglect this type of sources.

By the beginning of the XVIIth century, there was a well-established canon in funeral speeches and mourning works. From the standpoint of the popularity of the genres used, the most common were «trenes», «lamentations», and «nenia», which necessarily included the following themes: a description of the deceased's merits, the circumstances of his death, a moral lesson from his death, consolation to his relatives, and praise from his compatriots³⁸⁷. In the case of funerary literature related to the siege of Smolensk and

³⁸⁶ See details: Nowicka-Jeżowa A. Sarmaci i śmierć. O staropolskiej poezji żałobnej. Warszawa, 1992. S. 14–20; Nowicka-Jeżowa A. Siedemnastowieczna poezja funeralna w kręgu tradycji renesansowej. Przekształcenia i przewartościowania // *Przełom wieków XVI i XVII w literaturze i kulturze polskiej*. Red. B. Otwinowska, J. Pelc. Wrocław, 1984. S. 193–195.

³⁸⁷ For more details on the principles of the construction of funeral literature, see: Ciszewska, M. *Tuliusz domowy. Świeckie oratorstwo szlacheckie kręgu rodzinnego (XVII–XVIII wiek)*. Warszawa, 2016. P. 216–234.

the war with Russia, the situation was as follows: the circumstances of the death of a royal subject were accompanied by information about the course of hostilities, and along with the praise of the deceased from his compatriots was Sigismund III's gratitude to the loyal knight who fulfilled his duty to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Within the framework of our study, the case of the death of the Ujsko-Pilsk' headman (starosta ujsko-pilski) W. Gajewski is of particular interest. Under the date of October 17, 1609, the following was recorded in the siege diary: carelessly leaving the trench in the evening, Gajewski was killed by the defenders of the fortress from a *hakovnica*³⁸⁸. The fired shell pierced the headman's throat, which caused the dignitary to die on the spot. The incident is noteworthy in that it was one of the first prominent close associates of the king to die at the hands of the defenders of Smolensk.

For W. Gajewski, a native of the Greater Poland Voivodeship, the Smolensk Campaign was not his first combat experience: he had previously proved himself in the field, having participated in J. Zamoyski's Moldavian campaign in 1600. Later Gajewski had the opportunity to defend the interests of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Baltic, fighting against the Swedes. For his numerous services to the crown, W. Gajewski in 1606 achieved the position of the headman of Ujsko-Pilsk, but three years later he was summoned by the king for a new military campaign against Russia, where he died in the first month of the siege of Smolensk³⁸⁹.

It was decided to send the body of the deceased headman on a long journey back to the Greater Poland Voivodeship, having previously conducted a symbolic ritual of farewell to the deceased. For such rituals there was a practice of hiring a "funeral ambassador": W. Miaskowski was sent to bid farewell to the Ujsko-Pilsk' headman on behalf of the royal chancellery, who often played the role of an official representative of the central government at the funerals of important figures³⁹⁰. Presumably, on October 27, 1609, at the same time as M. Wejcher, Gajewski's body was sent to the Polish-

³⁸⁸ Diariusz drogi Krola JMci Zygmunta III od szczęśliwego wyjazdu z Wilna pod Smoleńsk w roku 1609 a die 18 Augusta i fortunnego powodzenia przez lat dwie do wzięcia zamku Smoleńska w roku 1611 / oprac. J. Byliński. Wrocław, 1999. S. 85.

³⁸⁹ Oźlański A. Dwie mowy Wojciecha Miaskowskiego wygłoszone na pogrzebie Wojciecha Gajewskiego – edycja krytyczna // *Meluzyna*. 2018. N. 2 (9). S. 73.

³⁹⁰ Oźlański A. Dwie mowy Wojciecha Miaskowskiego wygłoszone na pogrzebie Wojciecha Gajewskiego. S. 72.

Lithuanian Commonwealth³⁹¹. On that day, pre-prepared solemn funeral speeches were read.

Two texts prepared by W. Miaskowski in honor of the dead headman have survived: *Pan Wojciech Miaskowski, a nobleman of His Grace the King, thanks the guests of the funeral of Pan Wojciech Gajewski, the headman of Ujsk, killed near Smolensk*³⁹² and *The same for escorting the same body through Poznań*³⁹³.

The first text was read directly at the farewell to the body of the headman near Smolensk. W. Gajewski appeared in the speeches as an exemplary knight, who «...did not spend his life in the shadows of his home and all kinds of wealth, but devoted and gave his life to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as a virtuous son of his mother, and to his king, as a loyal subject»³⁹⁴. The outstanding loyalty and inexhaustible patriotism of the deceased attracted the personal attention of Sigismund III, as Miaskowski reported in his speech: «And with grief the King His Grace, our merciful lord, who found his servant worthy in many things, wished to reward his virtues with great wealth and dignity, and when he received the news of his passing so soon, he mourned with frequent sighs and remembrances, and almost with tears. And as a sign of his grief he decided to send me, his small servant, here to escort his glorious remains to his father's grave»³⁹⁵.

Similar motifs were used in most funeral speeches related to the war against Russia. The king's close attention to his loyal subjects, which was mentioned in the texts, was supposed to inspire the listeners to new military feats. At the same time, Sigismund III himself remained a secondary, but still active hero of the funeral speeches. Calling Gajewski the most worthy of knights, W. Miaskowski noted «...for who from those lands

³⁹¹ Diariusz drogi Krola JMci Zygmunta III od szczęśliwego wyjazdu z Wilna pod Smoleńsk w roku 1609 a die 18 Augusta i fortunnego powodzenia przez lat dwie do wzięcia zamku Smoleńska w roku 1611. Oprac. J. Byliński. Wrocław, 1999. S. 88.

³⁹² Miaskowski W. (KUL 3250). P[an] Wojciech Miaskowski, dworz[anin] k[rola] j[ego]m[ości], dziękuje gościom na pogrzebie p[ana] Wojciecha Gajewskiego, starosty ujskiego pod Smoleńskiem zabitego. Rkps Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Sygn. 3250.

³⁹³ Miaskowski W. (AHWil op. 1135, 2/40). Tenże na przeprowadzenie tegoż ciała przez Poznanie. Rkps Archiwum Historycznego w Wilnie. Sygn. 2/40.

³⁹⁴ Polish: «nie w cieniu domowym I obfitych dostatkach swoich żywot swój prowadził, ale go Rz[ecz]p[ospoli]tej jako cnotliwy syn matce i królowi panu swe[mu] jako wierny poddany oddał i poświęcił». Oźlański A. Dwie mowy Wojciecha Miaskowskiego wygłoszone na pogrzebie Wojciecha Gajewskiego – edycja krytyczna // Meluzyna. 2018. N. 2 (9). S. 79.

³⁹⁵ Polish: «A z żalem krola j[ego]m[ości], pana nasze[go] m[iłościwego], który godnym go służą w wielu rzeczach doznawszy, począł był cnotę jego większymi dostatkami i dostojenstwem zdobić, a wzięwszy wiadomość o tak nagłym ześciu jego, częstym wzdychaniem i wspomnianiem, a ledwie nie łzami obżaływał. A na znak tego żalu mnie tu małego służę swego zesłać raczył, abym to zacne ciało do grobu ojczystego doprowadził». Oźlański A. Dwie mowy. S. 80.

was more willing to be at the service of the Commonwealth and his royal Grace more than [Gajewski], who participated with great expense and loss in that current expedition, **where the king, his Grace, our lord, put his life on the line** (highlighted by me – I. P.) – I do not know. One was Gajewski from those parts, who brightened the royal court, one who never hesitated when he saw the banner spread out or heard the military trumpets»³⁹⁶.

There are no precise data on how many speeches were composed at once on the occasion of W. Gajewski's death and where exactly they were read, but a study of the text *The same to accompany the same body through Poznań* allows us to draw an important conclusion: the funeral procession escorting home the body of the headman who died near Smolensk was an agent of news dissemination in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In particular, W. Miaskowski stopped in Poznań, where he read a new funeral oration before a gathering of local nobility, informing the listeners about the course of the war.

Standard for funeral rhetoric, Miaskowski's speech in Poznań began by characterizing the deceased as a worthy knight who «...spent his years (pity, Lord, that they were short) in the service of the King His Grace and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, [and] even sacrificed his life for his dear fatherland»³⁹⁷. However, further on, a new element was introduced into the speech, which would have made no sense in the text read near Smolensk. W. Miaskowski spoke of the importance of the outcome of the war for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and even shamed those nobles who shirked their duty on the battlefield. Characterizing the path of the funeral procession, the orator noted that it was coming «...from those places where for the integrity of the fatherland, for the happy rule of his royal grace, **even for you, gentlemen, who are spending your life here at home** [emphasis mine – I. P.], I gave my life and watered the proud and stubborn Smolensk land with my blood»³⁹⁸.

³⁹⁶ Polish.: «Bo kto by z tych krajow nadeń ochotniejszy i prędszy był do Rz[ecz]p[ospoli]tej i j[ego] k[rólewskiej] m[ości] posług, kto z większym kosztem i pocztem na tę ekspedycyją terażniejszą, gdzie i krol j[ego]m[ości] pan nasz zdrowie swe poniósł, stawil się nadeń – nie widzę. Jeden był z tych krajow Gajewski, ktory dwor pański zdobił, jeden, ktory nigdy nie omieszkał, gdziekolwiek chorągwie roztoczone widział, albo trąby wojenne słyszał». Oźlański A. Dwie mowy. S. 80.

³⁹⁷ Polish.: «...i lata swe (żał się Boże, że krótkie) na posługach króla j[ego] m[ości] i R[zecz]p[ospoli]tej strawiwszy, zdrowie swe nawet dla miłej ojczyzny położył». Oźlański A. Dwie mowy. S. 78.

³⁹⁸ Polish.: "...z tego miejsca, gdzie za całość ojczyzny, za szczęśliwe panowanie j[ego] k[rólewskiej] m[ości], za w[asz]m[ości]ów nawet, którzy tu domowy wiek prowadzicie, żywot położył i krwią swoją polał hardą i twardą smoleńską ziemię". Oźlański A. Dwie mowy. S. 78.

The story of W. Gajewski's death did not remain a localized subject of manuscript texts, but soon began to be reproduced in mass sources. For the first time the epitaph on the occasion of Gajewski's death was included in the printed poetry collection *Biesiady Rozkoszne*³⁹⁹ by an unknown author who worked under the pseudonym "Baltizer from Kalisz County". The poet reproduced the circumstances of the death of the Ujsko-Pilsk' headman, and also wrote about the grief that engulfed all of Gajewski's comrades: at the end of the farewell ceremony an honor guard of knights escorted the body of the headman from near Smolensk for several more miles⁴⁰⁰. In the last lines of the epitaph, Baltizer bombards the defenders of the city with lines full of contempt, which were aimed at arousing indignation in the hearts of the readers: «O ill-fated Smolensk, you are not worthy that the noble blood of the headman of Ujsk was shed!»⁴⁰¹.

K. Miaskowski, a prominent poet and a senior contemporary of the events of the Smolensk siege, paid close attention to the death of the Ujsko-Pilsk' headman in his poems. The author himself was an ardent supporter of the royal power, which was proved by him in practice: during the years of Zebrzydowski rebellion, Miaskowski put his literary talent at the service of the central power and denounced in verse the opponents of Sigismund III⁴⁰². The poet, loyal to the crown, could not stay away from the military campaign against Russia. Anti-Russian epigrams and panegyrics praising the king's deeds filled the anthology *Zbor rytmów* published in 1612⁴⁰³.

Miaskowski dedicated two works to the subject of interest to us: *Kalliope polska na śmierć sławnej pamięci Pana Wojciecha Gajewskiego*⁴⁰⁴ and a brief *Epitafium temuż*⁴⁰⁵. *Kalliope polska* is an 86-line poetic work, compositionally and stylistically imitating funeral speeches. K. Miaskowski, being neither an eyewitness to the war nor a witness to the funeral events, mentally imagined himself as a participant in the funeral procession,

³⁹⁹ Biesiady Rozkoszne Baltyzera z Kaliskiego Powiatu. [S.l., po 1610].

⁴⁰⁰ Polish: «Ciało jego z obozu do Polski wysłano, kilka mil od rycerstwa było prowadzono». Cit. by: Biesiady Rozkoszne. K. D3r.

⁴⁰¹ Polish: «Smoleńsko nieszczęśliwe, niegodnoś ty tego, Żeś się cną krwią oblało starosty ujskiego!». Biesiady Rozkoszne. K. D3r.

⁴⁰² Bibliografia Literatury Polskiej – Nowy Korbut. T. 2: Piśmiennictwo Staropolskie. Warszawa, 1964. T. 515–516.

⁴⁰³ Miaskowski K. Zbiór rytmów. Kraków, 1612.

⁴⁰⁴ Miaskowski K. Kalliope polska na śmierć sławnej pamięci Pana Wojciecha Gajewskiego Ujskiego i Pileckiego Starosty Dworzanina K<rola> J<ego> M<ości> // Zbiór rytmów / oprac. A. Nowicka-Jeżowa. Warszawa, 1995. S. 312–315.

⁴⁰⁵ Miaskowski K. Epitafium temuż // Zbiór rytmów / oprac. A. Nowicka-Jeżowa. Warszawa, 1995. S. 315.

which he called his muse to join: «Do you not see whom we are carrying on the deathbed from the Polish camp in the cold North?» (ln. 11–12)⁴⁰⁶. Describing the merits and virtues of Gajewski, the poet draws inspiration from ancient stories, comparing the besieged Smolensk with Troy, and the tragic death of the Uisko-Pilsk' headman with the deaths of Hector and Sarpedon (ln. 19–21).

The poet's motives of consolation and moral instruction merge into one main idea: «everyone has to die, but he who died of iron in the king's service has blossomed into a new glory» (ln. 27–28). An enemy bullet cut short the life of W. Gajewski, but it also immortalized him, because, in the poet's opinion, the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth now sings a funeral song about the headman (ln. 31–38). Miaskowski tries to inspire his readers and to favor the enterprise of Sigismund III, for the sake of which he constructs the image of a hero who gained immortality in the royal service: «...therefore Gajewski did not die, but from there alive to the youth of Sarmatia he cries out: In the same way as I did, gain good glory...» (ln. 39–41).

It should be noted that K. Miaskowski's poems have indeed preserved the name of Gajewski for posterity and allowed researchers to expand his biography. The poet did not limit himself to the Smolensk plot, but also noted the previous merits of the headman. In particular, thanks to the text we know that Gajewski was a participant in the campaign of J. Zamoyski in 1601–1602 and participated in the siege of Wolmar: «Wolmar was a witness [of my bravery], for among the first at the storming he saw [me]...» (ln. 75–76).

Over time, W. Gajewski ceased to be a hero of only funeral songs and epitaphs: his name began to appear in anti-Moscow epic literature. Among all the knights of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, J. Krajewski, the compiler of the poem *Chronologia wojny Moskiewski*, was the first to single out W. Gajewski's sacrifice. The poem was composed by an author close to the royal entourage, and ideologically the poem followed the official version of the war, according to which King Sigismund's troops fought against Vasily Shuisky, who had seized the Moscow throne. It was on the conscience of the Moscow tsar that the death of Gajewski, who was killed at the walls of Smolensk by the “tyrannical

⁴⁰⁶ Here and further, the line numbering is indicated by: Miaskowski K. *Kalliope polska na śmierć sławnej pamięci Pana Wojciecha Gajewskiego*.

hand”⁴⁰⁷. Otherwise, the text again reproduced for a wide range of readers the circumstances of the siege of Smolensk, in which death found the headman in the evening of October 17, 1609 in the trenches.

On the example of a brief review of the funeral literature related to the death of W. Gajewski, we demonstrated how the information, having been codified, according to the classification scheme proposed by us, in the first circle of sources (diary of the siege, funeral speeches), gradually spread throughout the news space of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, covering all the new readership. At first, eyewitnesses wrote about the death of Gajewski, but over time the fate of the headman was discussed by authors distant from the Smolensk events, whose aim was to attract attention and put in a favorable light the military campaign of King Sigismund against the open enemies of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – the Russians. We should also note that in the end the texts about Gajewski’s death went beyond the information campaign around the successful capture of Smolensk. The name of the headman is also found in the literature of the final stage of the Time of Troubles, when it became obvious to contemporaries that the forces of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would not be able to seize Moscow. In this stratum of the source, the headman of Ujsko-Pilsk was presented as another tragic victim of the warlike Moscow people, who, according to the conviction of Polish-Lithuanian authors, would never tire of harming their neighbors.

As for the role of funeral literature in Sigismund III’s propaganda campaign, the following conclusion must be drawn: the royal chancellery skillfully used the resources available to it to influence the public opinion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in numerous ways. Dozens of knights died during the siege of Smolensk. The funeral orations written in their honor, whose recipients included both relatives of the dead and a wide range of ordinary nobles, offered many motives for supporting the war against Russia: they called for revenge for the dead, described the prospect of gaining royal favor or immortalizing one’s name with exploits for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The case of W. Gajewski shows that the king’s agents went even further: the townspeople

⁴⁰⁷ Krajewski J. Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej przez Jana Krajewskiego pilnie opisana // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczędą]. Warszawa, 2016. S. 308.

who met the body of the headman were shamed for not supporting the king and his troops, while the best sons of the crown were dying for the freedom and prosperity of the Republic.

§2. The Vilna Triumph in the context of propaganda of Sigismund III's successes in the war against Russia

In honor of the capture of Smolensk on June 13, 1611, triumphal processions with the participation of the monarch were soon organized in the four largest cities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thanks to these events, the inhabitants of Vilna, Warsaw, Krakow and Poznan were able to witness with their own eyes the success of the military campaign against Russia: the burghers were able to see the solemn arrival of the triumphant king and his victorious commanders, to look at the rich spoils and Russian prisoners captured as a result of the fighting, to listen to the praise of orators and to take part in various festive events.

Commemorative actions in honor of the victory of Polish-Lithuanian arms were held not only in the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The capture of Smolensk was greeted with the greatest jubilation among all its European neighbors in Rome, where a festive firework was given while celebrating the victory of Sigismund III⁴⁰⁸. Printed materials glorifying the Polish king were distributed among Italians, in which heraldic metaphors were used to illustrate the confrontation between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia⁴⁰⁹. In particular, an engraving from the work of V. Montelupi was reproduced, which depicted the Polish crowned eagle victoriously perched on the chest of the defeated Moscow eagle⁴¹⁰.

As we noted in the previous paragraph of our thesis, initially, contemporaries could only learn about the progress of the war with Russia from a narrow range of sources, compiled mainly in the military camp near Smolensk. Since the outcome of the campaign was not clear until June 13, 1611, the royal chancellery was in no hurry to inform the inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth about the situation of the Polish-

⁴⁰⁸ Chrościcki J. A. *Sztuka i polityka: funkcje propagandowe sztuki w epoce Wazów 1587–1668*. Warszawa, 1983. S. 73.

⁴⁰⁹ Pfeiffer B. *Caelum et regnum: studia nad symboliką państwa i władcy w polskiej literaturze i sztuce XVI i XVII stulecia*. Zielona Góra, 2002. S. 244–245.

⁴¹⁰ Montelupi V. *Gratulationes in reditum Serenissimi et Potentissimi Sigismundi III. D. G. Poloniae et Sveciae Regis Magnique Lithuaniae Ducis etc. Victoris, de Moschovia triumphantis a Valerio Montelupi de Mari philosophiae studioso in collegio romano Societ. Jesu. Posnaniae, ex typographia Joannis Wolrabi, 1611. 4°. K. 51 nlb. Изображение см. по: Buchwald-Pelcowa, P. *Emblematy w drukach polskich i Polski dotyczących XVI–XVIII wieku*. Bibliografia. Wrocław, 1981. S. 124, il. 37.*

Lithuanian troops under the walls of the besieged city. Certain doubts about the success of Sigismund III's enterprise were observed even in the mood of the royal entourage. For example, the letter of the deputy cup-bearer of the GDL J. Radziwill to L. Sapieha, written by him in May 1611, was filled with undisguised pessimism – and this was just one month before the successful assault on the city: «Whoever delves into Moscow affairs with a sober mind, putting aside feelings, will easily understand that the Lord does not favor this enterprise at all, of which Smolensk itself can serve as proof. But I don't care about that, since I decided for myself not to rack my brains with this concern of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, seeing that many worthy in this matter are still *laboraverant in vanum* [working in vain – I. P.], and as if they were drawing water with a sieve»⁴¹¹.

Despite the growing demoralization of his troops, Sigismund III managed to bring the siege of Smolensk to an end and seize the city. This event gave a powerful impetus to the dissemination of news literature: the Regalists had a story that could be used both as an exhaustive apologia of the king's willful actions and as, as propagandists then imagined, unquestionable evidence of Russia's complete military defeat.

The beginning of a large-scale campaign to glorify Sigismund III's victory was marked by the king's solemn entry into Vilna on July 24, 1611. Being a major center of political and economic life in the GDL Vilna was also a good choice as a starting point in the string of events glorifying the king because of the city's geographical proximity to the theater of military operations. It is no less important to take into account the fact that by the time of Sigismund's military expedition against Russia, the capital of the GDL also occupied a prominent position among other cities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in terms of the spread of printing. According to the opinion of book researchers, active development of the printing art in Vilna was observed from the 70s of the XVIth century⁴¹². The works of A. Kawecka-Gryczowa demonstrate that in the period from 1574 to 1612 twelve large publishing houses were operating in the capital of the

⁴¹¹ Polish: «W sprawy moskiewskie kto jeno bez afektu zdrowym okiem i rozsądkiem wejrzy, snadnie się tego domaca, że Pan Bóg tej imprezie zgoła nie błogosławi, czego i sam Smoleńsk dokumentem być może, ale mnie do tego nic, którym sobie rezolwował nie psuć sobie głowy sprawami Rzplitej, wodząc że wszyscy cnotliwi w tej materie in vanum dotąd laboraverant, a prawie rzeszotem wodę czerpać». Cit. by: Byliński J. Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu. Wrocław, 2016. S. 21.

⁴¹² Niedzwiedz J. Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655). Retoryczna organizacja miasta. Kraków, 2012. S. 195.

GDL⁴¹³. The presence of developed printing production in the city significantly facilitated the process of mass “discovery” of Sigismund III’s military and political successes by the inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as a number of Vilna printers⁴¹⁴ loyal to the central government managed to quickly establish the production of publications glorifying the king’s military successes by the end of the summer of 1611⁴¹⁵.

The circumstances of Sigismund III’s triumphal entry into Vilna on July 24, 1611 were reproduced in varying degrees of detail in numerous texts of panegyric nature, composed both by eyewitnesses of the events and by later compilers. In our opinion, the most complete description of the royal triumph is found in the Latin relation *Triumphus et ingressus regis Vilnam die 24 Iulii 1611 anno*⁴¹⁶. The public events accompanying the king’s entry into the capital of the GDL played an important role in the campaign to attract public attention to the military and political successes of Sigismund III, therefore, we consider it necessary to focus our attention on the information contained in the above-mentioned source.

On the night of July 23–24, 1611, King Sigismund was preparing for his triumphal entry into Vilna, having camped overnight three miles from the city. At dawn, king’s wife Constance of Austria went to meet him at the head of a procession of 400 of the most prominent Vilna nobles, magistrates, merchants and burghers. Sigismund III’s cortege, which left the place of overnight stay in the direction of Vilna, met the procession of

⁴¹³ Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku. Z. 5 : Wielkie Księstwo Litewski / Oprac. Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa. Wrocław-Kraków: Zakł. nar. im. Ossolińskich, 1959. See the sections on the activities of the Mamonich printing press (ca. 1574–1624), Nicholas Krzysztof Radziwill’s Orphans (1576–1586); the printers Jan and Josef Kartsan (1580–1620); Daniel of Łęczyca (1582–1600); Basil Garaburda (1582); the Jesuit Academic Printing House (Drukarnia Akademicka, 1586 - 1805); the Calvinist "drukarni zborowej" (1592); Jakub Markowicz’s printing house (1592–1607); the Orthodox Printing House of the Brotherhood of the Holy Spirit (1595–1610 in Vilna, after 1611 in Ewie); the printing house of Solomon and Ulrik Sultzer (1596–1603); Melchior Petkiewicz (1598); Piotr Blastus Kmita (1611–1612).

⁴¹⁴ For more information about printers in the royal service, see: Prohorenkov I. A. Military and Political Printed Propaganda of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Late XVI – Early XVII Century: Printers in the Royal Service // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*. 2021. № 2. P. 53–63.

⁴¹⁵ Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziełek, na przyjazd do Wilna króla JMści, Senatu y Rycerstwa tudzież mowa po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska JW. J. MC. P. Chrystophowi Montwidowi Dorohostayskiemu marszałkowi W. X. Lit. Wilno, 1611; Borastus G. Panegyricus Sigismundo III. Poloniae et Sveciae Regi etc. etc. invictissimo a Gregorio Laurentio Borasto Gotto dicatus. Wilno, 1611; In triumpho serenissimi ac potentissimi principis Sigismundi III. Poloniae et Sveciae Regis etc. etc. è Moscovia post insignes gloriose partas victorias feliciter redeuntis. Oratio Caesaris Baroffii Mediolanensis J. V. D. protonotarii ap. et illustrissimi ac reverendissimi Domini D. Comitis Francisci Simonetae, episcopi Fulginatensis, nuncii in Regno Polon. apostolici, a secretis. Wilno, 1612; Loaechius A. Na szczęśliwe y pożądane zwrocenie się JKMści Zygmunta III do Wilna po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska. Wilno, 1611; Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny Smoleńska, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terażniejszym 1611 dnia 13 Czerwca, opisany przez Baltazara Ozimińskiego. Wilno, [1611].

⁴¹⁶ *Triumphus et ingressus regis Vilnam die 24 Iulii 1611 anno*. Rkps. Czart., sygn. 1577 IV.

Queen Constance at a place prepared in advance, where the royal family celebrated a thanksgiving mass in luxurious Persian tents. After the service, the two processions merged into one and reached Vilna by noon.

In his work devoted to the cultural life of Vilna, the researcher J. Niedźwiedź, based on sources contemporary to the events, writes about the impression the royal parade made on contemporaries⁴¹⁷. The procession that stretched across the Vilna suburbs, because of its length, reminded the witnesses of a giant snake crawling into the gates of the city⁴¹⁸. The solemn entrance to the triumphal arches, the magnificent parade, the demonstration of booty and captives – the whole complex of festive events was conducted in the manner of ancient military triumphs. Especially in the solemn procession stood out the king himself. Entering Vilna on horseback, Sigismund III was dressed in richly decorated purple robes and girded with a red bandage, which, according to eyewitnesses, resembled the ancient Caesars⁴¹⁹.

On entering the city, the king was warmly greeted by the dignitaries with congratulatory speeches prepared in advance. In view of the day's busy festivities, most of the speakers thanked the king for his victory in brief and succinct terms, such as the papal nuncio F. Simonetta. Nevertheless, the meeting of the king was not without lavish and florid congratulations: according to an anonymous author, Bishop B. Woyna read his speech for almost an hour⁴²⁰.

Having finished with this part of the welcoming events, the solemn procession led by the king entered the Gate of Dawn (Ostra Brama). Contemporaries were surprised by the elaborate product made and installed on the city gates by Vilna craftsmen on the occasion of the royal triumph: a mechanical eagle sat above the entrance to the city, capable of flapping its wings and twisting its neck, and besides, according to the author of the report, congratulations to the king sounded from its beak⁴²¹.

⁴¹⁷ Niedźwiedź J. *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655). Retoryczna organizacja miasta*. Kraków, 2012. S. 355–364.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.* S. 356.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.* S. 356.

⁴²⁰ *Triumphus et ingressus regis Vilnam die 24 Iulii 1611 anno, rkps Czart., sygn. 1577 IV. K. 182r.*

⁴²¹ *Triumphus et ingressus regis Vilnam die 24 Iulii 1611 anno, rkps Czart., sygn. 1577 IV. K. 182v.* A similar mechanism was used during the ceremonial entry of royalty into Kraków and has survived to this day. For more details see: Targosz, K. *Oprawa artystyczno-ideowa wjazdów weselnych trzech siostr Habsburżanek (Kraków 1592 i 1605, Florencja 1608) // Theatrum ceremoniale na dworze książąt i królów polskich. Materiały konferencji naukowej zorganizowanej przez Zamek*

A *theatrum* was assembled from the side of the city at the Gate of Dawn, a stage from which panegyrics were read in honor of Sigismund's victory, while a procession was passing next to it. Similarly, when the king passed by the Orthodox Church of the Holy Spirit and the Uniate Church of the Holy Trinity located next to the city gates, congratulations were also waiting for him on behalf of the clergy⁴²². The action was organized in such a way that it seemed as if all denominations were rejoicing over the deeds of Sigismund III: the Jesuits sang Latin hymns in the king's honor, and the students of the fraternal Orthodox school greeted the triumphant king with poems and songs in Greek.

In the city itself, the king happened to pass through three triumphal arches in succession. The first arch was erected at the expense of the city magistrate near the Market. The second one was erected by order of the Jesuits on Zamkova Street near the Radziwill Palace. The last arch, put by the efforts of the royal entourage, was located at the Dolny Castle. When Sigismund reached it, the royal chapel greeted the triumphant with music. The festivities lasted all day, and the king was able to enter the castle only when it was already dark. Even then, however, the trumpets and kettledrums did not cease in the city, and in the castle itself, cannons were fired in honor of the victory of Polish-Lithuanian arms over the long-time enemy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The celebrations in honor of the royal triumph were not limited to one day and continued on July 25. At this stage, during church services, prayers of thanksgiving to God for the happy return of the monarch were heard, and in parallel with them in the city, ordinary people could listen to praise speeches of famous publicists. From the point of view of publicizing the king's foreign policy successes, the most striking phenomenon of the day was the speech of the celebrated polemicist P. Skarga. Skarga's speech, delivered during the king's honoring in Vilna, is an outstanding monument of the Jesuit art of eloquence⁴²³. The text of the speech prepared by the orator was later published in

Królewski na Wawelu i Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego wniach 23-25 marca 1998, red. M. Markiewicz, R. Skowron. Kraków, 1999. S. 211.

⁴²² Triumphus et ingressus regis Vilnam die 24 Iulii 1611 anno, rkps Czart., sygn. 1577 IV. K. 182v.

⁴²³ Wojciechowski K. Piotr Skarga. Lwów, 1912. S. 25-44.

Krakow⁴²⁴, thanks to which the story soon spread throughout the provinces of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth far from Vilna.

Piotr Skarga's solemn speech was built according to a unified narrative strategy: in order to create praise and an apology for the actions of Sigismund III, the polemicist constructed an image of a crusader king and a Christian warrior in front of his listeners, who endured military hardships on an equal footing with ordinary soldiers and encouraged others to feats by personal example⁴²⁵. The distinctive features of the speech *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo kazanie* lie in the fact that the author did not try to silence the "problematic nature" of the king's military enterprise, but, on the contrary, brought the information about the hardships endured by the royal army to the forefront. In a literary and propagandistic context, this approach had its obvious advantages – the more hopeless Sigismund III's military campaign looked at the beginning, the more dramatic the effect on the audience was produced by the news of its happy outcome, and, most importantly, the Lord's favor on the king's initiative became quite evident.

Skarga speaks of God's will as the main engine of the entire war already in the introductory part of his speech: «First of all, we marvel at how the Lord let the King of His Grace know that the time had come for the return of what the enemy had torn from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Crown... And neither the small number of soldiers, nor the hasty preparation of a campaign against such a powerful and vast state [Moscow], nor poverty and lack of money, **nor the willfulness and promiscuity of some soldiers** [emphasis mine – I. P.], nor other great troubles, which could have prevented the wisest»⁴²⁶. The emphasised fragment of the text, which can be interpreted as a reference to the demoralization of the royal troops in the camp near Smolensk, as well as evidence of the existence of oppositional sentiments towards the war among certain strata of the szlachta, confirms the thesis we put forward earlier: P. Skarga did not avoid and skillfully

⁴²⁴ Skarga P. *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panv Bogv. Czynione w Wilnie 25. Iulii, w dzień S. Iákubá, 1611. ná przyjazd szczęśliwy Krolá I. M. Przez X. Piotra Skarge Societatis Iesv. Kraków, 1611.*

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.* K. A2v.

⁴²⁶ Polish: «Naprzód się wielce dziwuiem, iako Krolowi J. M. Dał znać P. Bog, iż był czas na odebranie tego co wziął nieprzyiaciel od W. X. Lit. y Korony... Y nie odradziła mu tey wojny mała liczba żołnierzow, przedka wyprawa na tak mocne y wielkie Państwo, bezpieniężność y niedostatek skarbow, swowolność y niekarność niektorych żołnierzow, y ine wielkie przeszkody, ktorze namędrszego odrazić mogły...». Skarga P. *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panv Bogv.* K. A2v.

interwoven into his narrative even inconvenient plots that other propagandists sought to silence.

All of the above mentioned by Skarga seemed to his listeners insignificant in the way of Providence. The proof of this, according to the Jesuit, was right in front of the Vilna burghers: Sigismund III had returned unharmed from the war, and for his zeal God gave the Shuisky themselves into the royal hands. «He who used to be sovereign of all Muscovy is now a prisoner»⁴²⁷ – the polemicist solemnly concluded.

In the text *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo kazanie*, the tireless concern for the welfare of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was called as the main virtue of Sigismund III. P. Skarga insisted: the king did not arbitrarily start the war in his own interests, as his opponents presented, but simply fulfilled the oath given at his coronation, which obliged him to protect the borders of the state and to safeguard the inheritance of his predecessors on the throne⁴²⁸. By opposing Moscow for the sake of restoring the territorial integrity of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the king, according to P. Skarga, acted fully within the laws of the state⁴²⁹: «That military campaign was correctly and justly organized for the return of the seized Seversky principality and its main castle Smolensk... And everyone knows that a hundred years ago during the reign of King Sigismund the First, the Severia and Smolensk ceased to obey the kings of Poland. It so happened that **both justice, and the oath**, and love for the fatherland demanded that what had been despicably stolen should now be justly returned. **And that is why our king went to Smolensk itself, but did not attempt to attack Moscow's riches and lands, which they now themselves give** [emphasis mine – I. P.]»⁴³⁰.

Summarizing all of the above, the main idea that P. Skarga wanted to convey to his listeners is as follows. The successful siege of Smolensk is, first of all, a personal spiritual

⁴²⁷ Skarga P. *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie*. K. A3r.

⁴²⁸ A description of the coronation ceremony, which included the royal oath, is detailed in the text of A. Guagnini's chronicle. See details: Gwagnini A. *Kronika Sarmacyjej Europejskiej*. Kraków, 1611. Ks. 1. S. 229–238.

⁴²⁹ For P. Skarga's notions of a "just war" see: Homa T. *Rzeczpospolita. Wybrane zagadnienia myśli obywatelskiej Piotra Skargi SI*. Kraków, 2020. S. 141–159.

⁴³⁰ Polish: «Woienna ta wyprawa słusznie y sprawiedliwie podniesiona iest o przywrocenie wydartego Xięstwa Siewierskiego y głównego zamku iego Smoleńska... y iawna rzecz iest, iż przed stem lat tylo, z ręku Króla Zygmunta pierwszego od posłuszeństwa Królów Polskich Siewierska ziemia z Smoleńskiem odpadła. Godziło się, y dobrego Pana czuyność y przysięga, y miłość ku oyczyźnie to wyciągała: aby to co zle wydarto, sprawiedliwie przywroczone było. Y dla tego Pan nasz samego Smoleńska pilnował, na Moskiewskie się dobra y krainy nieskwapiając, ktore oni sami przez się oddalio» Skarga P. *Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panv Bogv*. K. A3v.

feat of the king. Sigismund III spent two years under the walls of the enemy fortress, leaving behind the luxury of his possessions and even his own family. Instead, the king daily endured all the severity of military conditions, which inspired those around him: He was not discouraged in adversity, suffered the loss of comrades and material losses, stood firm for the interests of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and trusted in God, who, seeing the king's firmness and piety, granted him not only this amazing victory, but also Moscow itself⁴³¹.

We consider it necessary to conclude our analysis of P. Skarga's speech with a fragment, the message of which was reproduced in many writings of the Regalists, defending "justice" and the need for war against Russia: «War in itself is evil and harms people; but we all long for a golden peace, in which human households become stronger and grow. For peace itself wars can be waged, and thus their harmfulness is mitigated, like the bitterness of medicine, which is useful for health»⁴³².

Not all texts glorifying the king's deeds, the creation of which was connected with the triumph in Vilna, could compare in quality and depth of conceptual content with the speech of P. Skarga. Many publicists and the Vilna printers who copied their texts worked in difficult labor conditions, which affected the quality of the publications. They had to prepare panegyric publications in the shortest possible time, before the news lost its sensational component, which favored the king's image on the eve of the Sejm in Warsaw. Indirect evidence of the conditions in which this work took place is provided by an analysis of the panegyric by the Jesuit V. Bartoszewski *Pienia wesole dziatek na przyjazd do Wilna króla*⁴³³. The text of the work opened with an atypical for the panegyric genre address to the reader:

⁴³¹ Skarga P. Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie. K. A4r.

⁴³² Polish: «Woyny same z siebie złe są, y szkody wielkie ludziom przynoszą: a pokoju złotego wszyscy pragniem, w którym dobra ludzkie rosta, szerzą się i trwają. Dla samego pokoju woyny się podnosić mogą, y tym złość ich słodzi się iako gorzkość w lekarstwach, która do zdrowia służy» Skarga P. Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panu Bogu. K. B2r.

⁴³³ Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesole dziatek, na przyjazd do Wilna króla JMści, Senatu y Rycerstwa tudzież mowa po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska JW. J. MC. P. Chrystophowi Montwidowi Dorohostayskiemu marszałkowi W. X. Lit. Wilno, 1611. Here and further, the numbers of the quoted lines are given according to the reprint of the work: Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa, 2016. S. 374–386.

«Both Poles and Lithuanians say:

“Don't look a gift horse in the mouth”.

Even though [he] is lame, even though he is blind, even though he carries [loads] with
difficulty,

It was given freely without asking for anything.

Reader, those poems cost you nothing,

Don't rack your brains, remember it's free.

Please don't criticize, don't say, “this is out of place”,

“It could have been [written] differently”, “it's too frivolous”;

And I could easily condemn – believe me – your [lines] [too],

If you had given me verses, I would have immediately found mistakes [in them].

Sweet brother, keep with gratitude what comes so easily,

And who now has [such] a talent [to] please many?»⁴³⁴.

V. Bartoszewski cannot be called a novice in the literary field: his cantos and spiritual songs were a notable phenomenon in the cultural life of Vilna in the first quarter of the XVIIIth century⁴³⁵. Nevertheless, from the very first lines the author recognizes the low quality of his own literary material, comparing the lines he wrote to a “lame” and “blind horse”. The selection of metaphors used, the urgent request not to judge strictly the proposed poems, and Bartoszewski's playful threat that he would also easily destroy any lines written by the alleged reader, cumulatively go beyond the self-deprecating practices accepted in the era under study. The presence of this fragment in the text can be explained by an apparent lack of time, which prevented the author from preparing a high-quality text for the king's arrival, and Bartoszewski decided to satirize this circumstance in the introduction to the main text.

⁴³⁴ Polish: «Pospolicie Polacy i Litwa mawiają: / „Darownemu koniowi w zęby nie patrząją”. / Choć chromy, chociaż ślepy, chociaż ciężko nosi, / Byle go darmo dano, nie jeden óń prosi. / Czytelniku, wiersze te ciebie nie kosztują, / Głowyś sobie nie łamał, darmość przystępują; / Proszę cię, nie taksujże, nie mów „To nic k rzeczy”, / „To mogło być inaczej”, „To są lekkie rzeczy”; / I ja bych twoje – wierz mi – łatwie mógł osądzić, / Kiedybyś wiersze swe dał, zdałby się wnet błdzić. / Bracie miły, bierz z łaską, coć snadnie przychodzi, / A kto teraz rozumem tak wielom dogodzi?». Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziątek. S. 375. Do czytelnika. W. 1–12.

⁴³⁵ Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy, 1564–1995 / Oprac. L. Grzebień przy współpracy zespołu jezuitów. Kraków, 1996. S. 248.

In addition to his personal confession, the poems themselves also testify to the low quality of the material: in the address to the reader in lines 7 and 8 quoted above, the same word is used for the end rhyme (“To nic k rzeczy” at the end of line 7 and “To są lekkie rzeczy” in line 8). It should be noted that this kind of primitivism was alien even to monuments of low-grade topical poetry, written on the motives of less significant events.

After the publication of *Pienia wesole* already on August 4, 1611 W. Bartoszewski released his next pamphlet in the printing house of J. Karcan, which is a collection of funeral poetry on the death of Prince M. Kroszyński⁴³⁶. The above circumstance speaks in favor of the fact that it was the abundance of tasks to which Bartoszewski’s creative forces were directed that did not allow the author to perform his work qualitatively.

Bartoszewski’s second-rate poems were accompanied by low-quality typesetting. The presence of some misprints of a fundamental nature in the brochure dedicated to the military victory of paramount importance for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth cannot but cause bewilderment among readers. In particular, the title of one of Bartoszewski’s poems looked scandalous: *Panu Boreckiemu w szturmie postrzelonemu, nazajutrz zmarłemu rotmistrzowi K.J.M*⁴³⁷. The “Pan Borecki” mentioned in the title was actually S. Gorecki, a royal captain who died during the general assault on Smolensk on June 13, 1611. While W. Gajewski, mentioned in the previous paragraph of our dissertation research, was the first notable victim during the siege of the city, S. Gorecki in the literature devoted to the Smolensk anabasis was already presented as the last hero who gave his life to the royal military enterprise. Gorecki was commemorated by such major poets as B. Ozymiński⁴³⁸ (whose work also came out of the Vilna printing house of J. Karcan), S. Witkowski⁴³⁹ and J. Krajewski⁴⁴⁰. S. Żółkiewski spoke in prose about

⁴³⁶ Bartoszewski W. Trzy columny od trzech cnot na pogrzeb godney pamięci kniazia Mikołaja Kroszyńskiego, dzielnego y zacie urodzonego rycerza, w Moskwie pod Smoleńskiem zmarłego. Przez Walentego Bartoszewskiego na wieczną pamiątkę wystawione. Probos mores, sua praemia non relinquunt. Wilno, 1611.

⁴³⁷ Bartoszewski W. *Pienia wesole* dziełek. S. 384.

⁴³⁸ Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terazniejszym 1611, 13 dnia czerwca. Wilno, Jan Karcan, 1611. W. 143–146.

⁴³⁹ Witkowski S. Safo słowieńska na grzmotną sławę z zwycięstwa smoleńskiego. Kraków, 1611. W. 653–660.

⁴⁴⁰ Krajewski J. Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej przez Jana Krajewskiego pilnie opisana. 1615. Cic. Is est verus triumphus cum bene meritis de Repub. testimonium a consensu civitatis datur. Honor enim est praemium virtutis studio judicioque alicujus ad aliquem delatum etc. Szablą słynąc, piękna rzecz, kto na sławę robi: Pismem się cnota każda winosi y zdo. Kraków, Bazyli Skalski drukował, [1615]. W. 984–985.

the memorable death of a captain who did not live long enough to see the victory⁴⁴¹. In the case we are considering, the print run of W. Bartoszewski's work *Pienia wesole* was distributed with a typo in the surname of the hero to whom a separate story was dedicated, which indicates technical carelessness of the work.

The author urged his readers "not to criticize" all these faults, reminding them that the poems "cost them nothing". We have no convincing data that would allow us to believe with certainty that the texts published in Vilna on the occasion of the king's victory were indeed distributed free of charge among the city's inhabitants. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned appeal of Bartoszewski to the readers is also impossible to ignore, and we will interpret it in favor of the existence of the practice of freely distributing texts glorifying the deeds of Sigismund III in the context of the royal triumph in Vilna.

⁴⁴¹ Żółkiewski S. Początek i progres wojny moskiewskiej / Wstęp i komentarz Wacława Sobieskiego. Kraków, 1920. S. 123.

§3. The main discourses of anti-Russian literary propaganda in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the capture of Smolensk on June 13, 1611

The literature hastily disseminated on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the end of the siege of Smolensk and glorifying the successes of King Sigismund in the war against Russia was extremely heterogeneous genre-wise and stylistically⁴⁴². The application of textual analysis to this layer of sources contributes to the identification of genetic links between the monuments, as well as demonstrates the dynamics of their distribution in the period under study. Nevertheless, due to the aforementioned heterogeneity of the material, textual criticism alone does not allow us to generalize the texts under consideration and comprehensively explain their functional significance in the anti-Russian propaganda campaign. It becomes possible to overcome this obstacle and characterize the sources relevant to the tasks set by applying discourse analysis to them, which is what this paragraph of our study is devoted to.

When studying the texts published after the capture of Smolensk, in which the authors expressed support and approval of Sigismund III's military actions against Russia, we have identified five main sense-making discourses contained in most of the studied monuments. Two of them – **the discourse of succession** between the rulers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and **the discourse of antiquitization** of the subjects presented – although they were habitual for the Polish panegyric tradition⁴⁴³, however, immediately after the king's return from the theater of hostilities in July 1611, they received a significant impetus for further development.

The festive events held in Vilna in honor of the capture of Smolensk were not something fundamentally new both in the context of the history of the capital of the GDL in particular and in the commemorative culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a whole⁴⁴⁴. Earlier, in March 1579 and February 1582 Vilna burghers welcomed Stefan

⁴⁴² Kuran M. Relacje o zdobyciu Smoleńska w 1611 roku – konwencje literackie i funkcje komunikacyjne // *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. 2011. Knyga 32. S. 58–59.

⁴⁴³ See details: Kowalczyk J. Triumf i sława wojenna „all'antica” w Polsce XVI w. / *Renesans. Sztuka i ideologia*, red. Tadeusz Jaroszewski. Warszawa, 1976. S. 293–349.

⁴⁴⁴ See details: Dziechcińska H. Zabawa jako komponent życia literackiego w dawnej Polsce / *Z dziejów życia literackiego w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku*. Praca zbiorowa pod red. H. Dziechcińskiej. Wrocław, 1980. S. 71–95; *Europa Triumphans*:

Bathory entering the Gate of Dawn with triumph⁴⁴⁵. These celebrations were caused by the king's military successes against Russia at the final stage of the Livonian War. The circumstances of the solemn entry of Vladislav IV into Vilna on June 24, 1634 were also similar. On this day, the townspeople already met the son of Sigismund III, who victoriously returned after the capitulation of Russian troops following the results of the Smolensk War⁴⁴⁶. Along with Vilna, the practice of military triumphs existed in other major cities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth before the campaign of King Sigismund in 1609–1611⁴⁴⁷. The commemorative actions in honor of military and political successes of the rulers had an occasional character and were organized with significant chronological breaks, but the propaganda literature was able to unite them among themselves to promote the idea of political continuity of power.

The festivities in honor of the capture of Smolensk in the publicistic and panegyric texts published in the aftermath were logically connected with the celebrations in honor of the successes of Sigismund III's predecessors on the throne of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The study of written monuments shows that in the perception of contemporaries triumphs could even overlap. For example, M. Hofmanski, an ardent supporter of the royal power⁴⁴⁸ tried to convince his readers that the celebrations held in Vilna on July 24–25, 1611 vividly reminded the audience of the triumphs of 1582–1583 by Stefan Bathory⁴⁴⁹. This kind of tendentiousness of Hofmanski can be explained by the influence of the current political agenda, which the Regalist writer tried to take into account. The utilitarian component of the author's intention has received the following assessment in historiography: «With the help of the description of the scenes of triumph, Hofmanski produces a translation of political ideas and directives of the actual program of the royal camp. The atmosphere of general celebration reigning in the largest cities of

Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe. [Edit] J. R. Mulryne, H. Watanabe-O'Kelly, M. Shewring, E. Goldring, S. Knight. T. 1-2. Aldershot-Burlington, 2004.

⁴⁴⁵ Poplatek J. *Studia z dziejów jezuickiego teatru szkolnego w Polsce*. Wrocław, 1957. S. 138–140.

⁴⁴⁶ Niedźwiedz J. *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655). Retoryczna organizacja miasta*. Kraków, 2012. S. 358.

⁴⁴⁷ Oszczyda A. *Tryumfy smoleńskie. Propagandowe treści wierszy triumfalnych z 1611 roku // Hołd carów Szujskich / pod red. J. A. Chrościckiego*. Warszawa, 2012. S. 78–79.

⁴⁴⁸ Moskiewski Mars. *Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]*. Warszawa, 2016. S. 495.

⁴⁴⁹ Hoffmanski M. *Wojna smoleńska, w której słuszne przyczyny Króla Jego Mości podniesienia wojny [...] przytem wyprawa, ciągnięcie, powód wzięcia i opanowania Moskwy [...] do tego i szturm Smoleńska szczęśliwy [...] także tryumfy Króla Jego Mości krótko opisane*. Poznań, 1611. K. Hv.

the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was to convince the addressees that the decision to start the war was correct, and the coming benefits and the proximity of the final end of the war were to induce the nobility to support the continuation of the war and to accept new levies»⁴⁵⁰.

The idea of the existence of a certain unified policy, which was implemented on the eastern borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth by successive elected monarchs, was understandable to the Polish-Lithuanian contemporaries of the events of the Time of Troubles at least in the military aspect. In this context, the testimony of A. Guagnini, the Commandant of Vitebsk, is curious. Being a constant participant in the wars of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia since the time of Sigismund II Augustus, Guagnini in his voluminous work *Kronika Sarmacyjej Europejskiej*⁴⁵¹ characterized the campaign of Sigismund III against Smolensk as a logical continuation of the Livonian War. From the siege of Pskov by Stefan Bathory to King Sigismund's march on Smolensk, there was a shaky truce between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Moscow, which, according to the author, eventually would have been violated⁴⁵². A. Guagnini saw the relations between the two neighboring states as an ongoing conflict, chronologically significantly beyond the life of one generation.

A similar interpretation of the events of the Time of Troubles and the military invasion of Russia by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth can be found in the panegyric *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III* published in 1611⁴⁵³. The anonymous author emphasized the continuity of Bathory's and Sigismund III's deeds through the regularly repeated poetic refrain «Stefan beat Muskovits, [but] Sigismund III beat more...» (ln. 72–73)⁴⁵⁴. The couplet was reproduced throughout the work, changing only the increasing number of opponents defeated by the king: the monarch successively defeated «ten thousand» (ln. 72–73), «one hundred thousand» (ln. 116–117), and finally «thousand of thousands» (ln. 180–181) Russian warriors.

⁴⁵⁰ Oszczyda A. Tryumfy smoleńskie. S. 80.

⁴⁵¹ Gwagnini A. *Kronika Sarmacyjej Europejskiej*. Kraków, 1611.

⁴⁵² Ibid. Ks. 7. S. 72–74.

⁴⁵³ *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III, z łaski Bożej królowi polskiemu*. Kraków, 1611.

⁴⁵⁴ Polish: «Bił Stefan Moskwę, Zygmunt Trzeci więc[ej]: Dziesięć tysięcy». Cit. by: Moskiewski Mars. *Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612)*. Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa, 2016. S. 351.

Following the results of the Smolensk campaign, the anonymous author portrayed Sigismund III as an ancient Caesar-triumphator, and urged to reward the monarch with all the attendant attributes of a victor: «Let us make a chariot decorated with elephant ivory, / Let us prepare cannons, guns, and salutes, / Let us place a crown of laurel on the glorious temples, / Let us harness the pegasus horses» (ln. 102–105)⁴⁵⁵. It should be noted that while other authors in 1611 tried to find analogs in Greco-Roman history to describe the deeds of Stefan Bathory and Sigismund III, the compiler of *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III* did not limit himself to this and in parallel sought inspiration in Old Testament events. Biblical kings were chosen as prototypes for the monarchs of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the verse refrain was changed as follows: «Saul beat a thousand, but David beat more: ten thousand» (ln. 80–81)⁴⁵⁶.

Conceptually, the author revealed the identity of Stefan Bathory and Sigismund III with Kings Saul and David in the following way: just as the Lord prompted his chosen ones to action in ancient times, so now he called the Polish-Lithuanian sovereigns to service. It did not matter where exactly the predestined mission was fulfilled: «Under the mighty Pskov or the strong walls of Smolensk» (ln. 7–8)⁴⁵⁷ – all this took place within the framework of the single Providence of God. King Sigismund succeeded and fulfilled his mission, in view of which the poet called on the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to celebrate this grandiose victory. According to the anonymous author, if the Polish-Lithuanian kings were completely similar to the biblical kings, they should be honored in the same way: «So the Hebrews were good, / They honored their kings. And what will our Poland now reward / The king, the invincible lord, / For the present victory...?» (ln. 84–88)⁴⁵⁸.

Presenting the relationship between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia as a permanent confrontation, the Regalist writers glorifying Sigismund III's

⁴⁵⁵ Polish: «I wóz z słoniowych kości ubuduje, / Armaty, strzelby, ogniów nagotuje, / Wieniec laurowy na udatne skronie, / Pegaskie konie». Cit. by: *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 353.

⁴⁵⁶ Polish: «Bił Saul tysiąc, ale Dawid więc[ej]: Dziesięć tysięcy». Cit. by: *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 352.

⁴⁵⁷ Polish: «Pod wielkim Pskowem albo Smoleńskimi Murami mocnymi». Cit. by: *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 349.

⁴⁵⁸ Polish: «To tak Żydowie obyczajni byli, / Królowie swe czcili. / A Polska nasza co też odda swemu / Królowi, panu niezwyciężonemu, / Za to zwycięstwo...?». Cit. by: *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 352.

victory in 1611 could not but touch upon the topic of military conflicts between the two states, which were played out chronologically earlier than the royal military expedition to Smolensk in 1609. In this context, the propaganda was not limited to mentioning only the military successes of King Sigismund's direct predecessor on the throne of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – Stefan Bathory. Poets and publicists could touch upon much older chronological layers. This thesis can be most clearly illustrated by the text of the *Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych y wielk. księztwa litewskiego*⁴⁵⁹.

The Krakow poet L. Chlebowski, author of the specified work, was a well-known supporter of royal power during the period of Zebrzydowski's rebellion⁴⁶⁰. The king's arbitrary march to Smolensk did not affect the political views of the poet, who continued to act in literature as an apologist of Sigismund III's actions. Describing the king's way to declare war on Russia, Chlebowski recalls the events of almost a century ago: «Ninety and seven years [have passed] since the cruel tyrant / Sent his mighty horns against Poland» (ln. 27–28)⁴⁶¹. With the couplets quoted by us, the author referred readers to the conquest of Smolensk by Vasily III, the Grand Prince of Moscow and Vladimir, in 1514, which, in his opinion, started the protracted conflict. Choosing this year as a starting point, the poet briefly summarized the main historical milestones of how the united forces of the Poles and Lithuanians resisted Moscow's westward expansion (ln. 27–74). In content, the history of this confrontation fell into three parts.

Initially, Sigismund I the Old and Sigismund II Augustus could only hold back the Russian offensive, sometimes conducting successful counterattacks. For example, the battle of Orsha on September 8, 1514, after which King Sigismund I «wanted to return the rejected Smolensk by force, but (for our sins) could not succeed in that» (ln. 41–42)⁴⁶², was called a clear success. At the second stage of the confrontation, Stefan Bathory had already managed to finally stop the advance of his opponents in the Inflants, after which

⁴⁵⁹ Chlebowski W. *Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych y wielk. księztwa litewskiego, z sławnego zwycięstwa Nayiaśniejszego i niezwyčajzonego monarchy Zygmunta III., który po wzięciu stolice Moskiewskiej y zamków przyległych, napotężniejszy Smoleńsk szczęśliwie opanował. Kraków, 1611.*

⁴⁶⁰ Moskiewski Mars. *Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612)*. Warszawa, 2016. S. 494.

⁴⁶¹ Polish: «Dziewięćdziesiąt lat i siedm jako tyran srogi / Podniósł był przeciw Polsce swoje pyszne rogi...». Cit. by: Chlebowski W. *Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 358.

⁴⁶² Polish: «I wziętego Smoleńska chciał był mocą dostać, / Lecz (za grzechy naszemi) nie mógł temu sprostać». Cit. by: Chlebowski W. *Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 358.

he undertook a retaliatory military offensive against Russia. Finally, as the author presented the situation to the readers, at the final stage of the conflict, which came after 1609, Sigismund III will be able to return to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth all the lands previously seized by the Muscovites, which the Poles and Lithuanians claimed, considering them their own.

The fact that in constructing the political succession between the kings of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, poets and publicists in 1611 did not forget to emphasize the family ties linking the generations of monarchs deserves a special mention. In our opinion, such an emphasis in the texts should have awakened sympathy among readers for Sigismund III, as well as cultivate in the minds of the idea of the existence of a certain unified policy towards Russia, whether it was a purposeful activity of monarchs from one family, or the rulers simply acted in accordance with Divine Providence.

L. Chlebowski found it necessary from the very first lines of his panegyric to remind the readership of the maternal lineage of King Sigismund III – Jagiellon: «The happiness, courage and bravery of Sigismund the Third, the king of many nations, [a scion] of the Jagiellonian tribe, who filled these vast lands with glory» (ln. 2–4)⁴⁶³. The text emphasized that by fighting at Smolensk, King Sigismund was completing the deeds of his most worthy ancestors. W. Bartoszewski also drew attention to the question of the origin of the protagonist of the triumphs of 1611, calling Sigismund III the legitimate successor of the old Polish kings both by deeds and by blood: «Oh, thrice happy family of the Jagiellons, from which the abundance of virtue flows! From this garden the Third King Sigismund came, who glorified his family and Poland so much» (ln. 31–34)⁴⁶⁴. Such remarks are found in the majority of authors glorifying the military campaign of Sigismund III, which allows us to characterize the discourse of succession we have identified as a multifaceted phenomenon: it was not only about political, but also about

⁴⁶³ Polish: «Szczęście, męstwo i dzielność Zygmunta Trzeciego, / Króla możnych narodów, Jagiełłowe plemię, / Który sławą napełnił tę szeroką ziemię». Cit. by: Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych // Moskiewski Mars. S. 357.

⁴⁶⁴ Polish: «O szczęśliwe po trzykroć plemię Jagiełłowe, / Z którego wynikają cnót hordy gotowe! / Z tego ogródka trzeci król Zygmunt się zjawiał, / Który ród swój i polską krainę tak wślawił». Cit. by: Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dzieciak, na przyjazd do Wilna króla Jmści // Moskiewski Mars. S. 376.

genetic succession between the rulers in the context of the defense of the eastern borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

As we have already shown above, the Regalist writers tried to choose prototypes and artistic images from ancient history for the heroes of the military-political events relevant to them. Antique themes were invariably popular in Polish-Lithuanian literature of the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries⁴⁶⁵.

The scale and patriotic content of military stories from ancient Roman history attracted the panegyrists of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as it was artistically difficult to find a more worthy role for the praised ruler than the image of an invincible Caesar-triumphant, defeating any enemies of his state⁴⁶⁶. Stefan Bathory appeared in a similar image in the topical literature published in the wake of the Poznan triumph of 1583: the king was portrayed as a new Scipio, who brought a happy peace and a new golden age for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁴⁶⁷.

In the case of Sigismund III and the military campaign of 1609–1611, a relevant set of images and archetypes was quickly found: the literary apologists of the Smolensk expedition presented the king's campaign as a new Trojan War. The clerk of the royal chancellery⁴⁶⁸, B. Ozimiński, whose work *Szturm pocieszny smoleński*⁴⁶⁹ was printed immediately for the Vilna triumph in the printing house of the royal servitor J. Karcan⁴⁷⁰, was the first to draw this parallel in literature glorifying the deeds of Sigismund III and propagandizing the continuation of the war with Russia.

In terms of artistic value, Ozimiński's text was very lowly evaluated by the researcher of Polish poetry J. Nowak-Dłużewski⁴⁷¹. As in the case of W. Bartoszewski's panegyric work, discussed in the previous paragraph of our dissertation research, Ozimiński wrote within a tight time frame, which directly affected the quality of his

⁴⁶⁵ Dziechcińska H. Kultura literacka w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku. Zagadnienia wybrane. Warszawa, 1994. S. 10–13.

⁴⁶⁶ Balbuza K. Triumfator. Triumf i ideologia zwycięstwa w starożytnym Rzymie epoki cesarstwa. Poznań, 2005. S. 11–16.

⁴⁶⁷ Oszczyda A. Tryumfy smoleńskie. Propagandowe treści wierszy triumfalnych z 1611 roku // Hołd carów Szujskich / pod red. J.A. Chrościckiego. Warszawa, 2012. S. 78.

⁴⁶⁸ Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). S. 496.

⁴⁶⁹ Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terazniejszym 1611, 13 dnia czerwca. Wilno, 1611.

⁴⁷⁰ Jarczykowa M. Szturm Smoleński (13 VI 1611) w siedemnastowiecznych drukach okolicznościowych // Senoji Lietuvos literatūra. 2011. Knyga 32. S. 81.

⁴⁷¹ Nowak-Dłużewski J. Okolicznościowa poezja polityczna w Polsce. Zygmunt III. Warszawa, 1971. S. 212.

literary material. Despite such conditions, the poet decided to put an additional test before his talent and chose to sing the deeds of King Sigismund in acrostics. The initial letters of the first 8 lines of the panegyric formed the word “SMOLINSK”⁴⁷², which was followed by a coded praise of the king with the enumeration of all his titles, as well as congratulations to King Władysław⁴⁷³. This strategy of text construction narrowed the possibility of choosing words for the beginning of poetic lines, which, together with the tight time frame for preparing the text for publication, resulted in the low quality of the panegyric.

B. Ozymiński portrayed Smolensk as a new Troy from the very first lines of his work. The impregnable city taken by the king, according to the author, would have astonished even the heroes of antiquity: «If Aeneas had risen up and seen those walls, forty towers, without two, and heard the roar from them, how he would have marveled at an unprecedented miracle» (ln. 11–13)⁴⁷⁴. To the events, toponyms and personalities associated with the military campaign of 1609–1611, the poet consistently found analogies from the ancient epic. Since it was Sigismund III who happened to become the conqueror of the Russian “Troy”, the literary prototype for him was chosen with similar merits: the king of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was named Achilles, which emphasized the personal valor of the king in the heat of battle. It should be noted that since the plot of the panegyrics we have studied was primarily built around Sigismund III and it was the ruler of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who received the most attention, the king was compared in various aspects with other heroes of the Trojan War. Sigismund’s military talents and his care for his soldiers, for example, were emphasized through his comparison with the king of Pylos, Nestorius.

⁴⁷² Polish: «Szturm wesoly smoliński czerwca trzynastego / Miał król tysiąc sześćset roku jedenastego. / O Boże, któremu racz do końca tak swojej / Łaski świętej użyzczać, jakby z ręki Twojej / Już wszystko otrzymać mógł, co przedsięwziął śmie! / Nażycz mu granic więcej i daj mu ich wiele, / Skąd imię Twoje święte zawsze chwalić będzie / Król z ludem swym – to z ust ich nigdy nie wynidzie!» Cit. by: Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński // Moskiewski Mars. S. 330.

⁴⁷³ The first letters of all the lines of Balthazar Oziminski's work come together in the following acrostich: «ZYGMUNT TRECZI Z ŁASKI BOŻEJ KRÓL POLSKI, WIELKIE KSIĄŻĘ LITEWSKI, RUSKIE, PRUSKIE, MAZOWIECKIE, ŻMODZKIE, INFLANCKIE I SIEWIERSKIE A SZWEDZKI, GOCKI, WANDALSKI DZIEDZICZNY NIEZWYCIĘŻONY KRÓL WŁADYSŁAWOWI KRÓLEWICOWI POLSKIEMU TEGOŻ BŁOGOSŁAWIENSTWA OD BOGA OJCOWSKIE ŻYCZY».

⁴⁷⁴ Polish: «Eneaszy by powstawszy, a te mury widział, / Czterdzieści baszt, beze dwu, i grzmot z onych słyszał, / Iak cudowi jakiemu musiałby się dziwić». Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński // Moskiewski Mars. S. 331.

The game of metaphors introduced into the panegyric literature by Ozimiński was supported by L. Chlebowski. Describing the storming of Smolensk by the royal troops, the poet self-deprecatingly lamented that he lacked the talent to describe the bravery of the king and his soldiers in its entire splendor. In his opinion, even the brilliant poets of antiquity could not cope with such a task: «Oh, glorious knighthood, I don't have the strength to describe what kind of courage [was displayed] there and [what] battles were fought – Homer himself wouldn't have coped with it ([who] wrote so much about Troy)» (ln. 189–192)⁴⁷⁵.

W. Bartoszewski put the importance of Sigismund III's military campaign against Russia above the wars of antiquity, and addressed the following lines to the Polish-Lithuanian knights storming the "Trojan walls": «The Greeks had glorious men like Hector in battle, and the Romans were known for bravery like [Mark Furius] Camillus...» (ln. 1–4)⁴⁷⁶. Now, in the author's opinion, when it would be necessary to find a metaphor for outstanding courage in literature, the comparison should be made with the Polish-Lithuanian soldiers of King Sigismund who stormed the walls of Smolensk, who surpassed all the ancient heroes in their courage.

A logical continuation of the discourse of political and genetic succession of the monarchs of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, depicted in the panegyric literature of 1611 as antique heroes, was the **discourse of a defensive, or "just", war**. The prevalence of this theme in the anti-Russian literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has been discussed earlier in the text of our dissertation research. In the preceding paragraph we also analyzed the Vilna speech of P. Skarga on July 25, 1611, in which the publicist paid special attention to the issue of justifying the "justice" of the war against Russia. In the propaganda literature, which was disseminated in the four largest cities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in time for the royal triumphs, the justification of the necessity of war with Moscow could not but become one of the main topics.

⁴⁷⁵ Polish: «O, przesławni rycerze, nie mojej to siły / Pisać jakie tam męstwo i potyczki były – / I sam by tu Homerus nie sprostał (co Troje / Pisał walki przeważne)». Cit. by: Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów // Moskiewski Mars. S. 364.

⁴⁷⁶ Polish: «Sławni byli u Greków w boju Hektorowie, / A u Rzymian wiadomi w męstwie Kamillowie...». Cit. by: Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziełek // Moskiewski Mars. S. 383.

In 1611, authors glorifying King Sigismund's success in the war with Russia defined the essence of the "just war" as a struggle to avenge grievances and to regain territories seized by the enemy. Literary writers mainly appealed to three subjects of the past relevant to them: the capture of Smolensk in 1514 by Vasily III, the confrontation between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia in the Livonian War of 1558–1582/3, and, finally, the attack on Polish-Lithuanian guests in Moscow during the wedding celebrations of the marriage of False Dmitry I and M. Mniszech in May 1606.

J. Krajewski, a poet and a courtier of Sigismund III, who had personally participated in the Battle of Klushino, regularly compiled literary apologies for various royal actions since 1607. He rejoiced over the return to the royal hands of Smolensk, which had been torn away almost a century ago⁴⁷⁷: «Victorious our lord became, the invulnerable king, took Smolensk, torn off earlier from the Crown!» (ln. 17–18)⁴⁷⁸. In the marginal note to line 50 of his panegyric, the author quoted Demosthenes, once again emphasizing the legality of Sigismund III's actions: «a just war is one that begins on the basis of [the following] principles: to regain back lost lands and in response to [another's] attack»⁴⁷⁹. In lengthy historical excursions, as in the case of L. Chlebowski quoted earlier, or brief remarks, as in W. Bartoszewski's text («What your ancestors lost, you [now] gained when you besieged Smolensk for several years» (ln. 15–16)⁴⁸⁰) – the theme of the king's return of his lands was a common theme in the propaganda literature of 1611.

Developing the question of the fairness of the current war, the publicists noted that the king not only liberated territories, but also exported Polish-Lithuanian valuables previously captured by the Muscovites. The anonymous author of the panegyric *Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III* described the division of the loot captured in Smolensk, which, in his opinion, had previously been taken out of the Baltic during the Livonian War by the Muscovites, as follows: «[He] went to glorious Smolensk and

⁴⁷⁷ Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady. S. 495.

⁴⁷⁸ Polish: «Zwycięzcą pan nasz został, król niezwyciężony, / Wziął Smoleńsk oderwany przedtym od Korony!». Cit. by: Krajewski J. Tryumf poznański Ną radosną victoryą K. Je° M. po wzięciu Smoleńská. Poznań, 1611 // Moskiewski Mars. S. 367.

⁴⁷⁹ Lat.: «Bellum iustum est, quod fit de praecepto principiis, de rebus repetendis et de repelenda invidia». Cit. by: Krajewski J. Tryumf poznański // Moskiewski Mars. S. 368.

⁴⁸⁰ Polish: «Co przodkowie stracili twoi, toś odiskał, /Kiedyś Smoleńsk przez całą parę lat uciskał». Cit. by: Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziełek // Moskiewski Mars. S. 376.

distributed Moscow's riches from the [captured] pile [of loot], of which several hundred carts were taken out of the Inflant [by the Muscovites] when they [those lands] were ravaging. Take, King, your own, take pearls in gold, distribute [the loot] to the infantry» (ln. 124–129)⁴⁸¹. Also, the poet did not forget to once again emphasize the idea promoted in Polish propaganda that it was Moscow that once unleashed this war itself, while the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was only defending itself: «It is already difficult for Moscow to swim against the current, it was better to live with the king in peace» (ln. 66–67)⁴⁸².

In recalling more and more recent offenses inflicted by the Muscovites on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the propagandists invariably appealed to the events of the first Dimitriada. The author of *Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów* summarized the grievances against the Russians as follows: «The ambassadors of the king, our lord, were humiliated, some glorious nobles were tortured in captivity, others were barely released alive. Oh, cursed people, did you not know that the hour of revenge would come for this [all]?» (ln. 72–76)⁴⁸³.

Among the apologists of the war against Russia in 1611, S. Witkowski stood out vividly – a poet and publicist devoted to the king, famous for his socio-moralizing creativity⁴⁸⁴. Two works of interest to us belong to Witkowski: *Safo słowieńska na grzmotną sławę z zwycięstwa smoleńskiego*⁴⁸⁵ and *Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie Je[go] Królewskiej Miłości z zwycięstwa moskiewskiego*⁴⁸⁶. While the literary material of many of the previously mentioned poets has been characterized as second-rate, either because of the haste in composing the congratulatory texts or because of the lack of the necessary skills and talents of the authors themselves, Witkowski's work is an exception: his works were highly appreciated in literary studies and successfully fulfilled not only a utilitarian

⁴⁸¹ Polish: «Na sławny Smoleńsk a rozdawał z kupy / Moskiewskie łupy, / Których paręset kolas przywieziono / Z Inflant, naonczas, gdy je plondrowano. / Bierz królu jak swe, bierz perły we złocie, / Rozdaj piechocie». Cit. by: Tryumf niezwyčajonemu monarsze Zygmunutowi III // Moskiewski Mars. S. 354.

⁴⁸² Polish: «Już trudno Moskowie pływać przeciw wodzie, / Lepiej jej było mieszkać z królem w zgodzie». Cit. by: Tryumf niezwyčajonemu monarsze Zygmunutowi III // Moskiewski Mars. S. 351.

⁴⁸³ Polish: «Króla, pana naszego, posłów znieważyli, / Jednych znacznych szlachciców w więzieniu dręczyli, / Drugich, ledwie ze zdrowiem, znędzonych, puścili. / O, przekłety narodzie, czyś nie wiedział tego, / Byś za to pomsty nie miał wziąć czasu swojego?». Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów // Moskiewski Mars. S. 360.

⁴⁸⁴ Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady. S. 497.

⁴⁸⁵ Witkowski S. Safo słowieńska na grzmotną sławę z zwycięstwa smoleńskiego. Kraków, 1611.

⁴⁸⁶ Witkowski S. Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie Je[go] Królewskiej Miłości z zwycięstwa moskiewskiego. Kraków, 1611.

function in the context of anti-Russian propaganda, but also had pronounced literary and aesthetic merit.

Describing the misfortunes that befell the wedding guests of False Dmitry I and M. Mniszech, Witkowski exclaimed: «Having invited guests, they treacherously murdered them, prepared their death... Blood instead of drinks, knives instead of treats – our good Lord!» (ln. 47–48, 51–52)⁴⁸⁷. The retribution for this dishonor, according to the author of the quoted lines, nevertheless caught up the Muscovites in the person of King Sigismund, which is why Witkowski's texts serve as a clear example of the existence of the **discourse of the identity of the capture of Smolensk to the complete victory over Russia** in Polish-Lithuanian literary propaganda. In the propaganda literature published after the end of the military campaign of 1609–1611, the discourse we have identified can be observed in two similar variations: some authors cultivated the idea that the capture of Smolensk would inevitably lead to the complete subjugation of Russia in the very near future, while others stated that Sigismund III's military campaign had already ended with the final fall of Moscow.

The first variation of the discourse served as the ideological basis for Witkowski's panegyric *Safo słowieńska*. The author organized the text according to a metaphorical concept inspired by biblical history: the successes of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the war against Russia unfolded to the sound of the seven trumpets of Jericho, and when each successive trumpet sounded, the Muscovites suffered a sensitive defeat and more misfortunes fell on their heads. In the text of the poem, the stages of the deepening conflict between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia were separated by a repeated refrain: «Fall, fall the capital of Moscow, blow the trumpet a second time⁴⁸⁸, God's soldiers!» (ln. 85–86, 105–106, 361–362, 453–454, 545–546, 685–686)⁴⁸⁹.

This concept allowed the author to attempt a historiosophic rethinking of the long conflict between Russia and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth by relating each

⁴⁸⁷ Polish: «Gośćmi ich zowiąc, zdradziecko mordują, / Śmierć im gotują... Krew miasto trunków, noże za potrawy – / Boże nasz prawy!». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 398.

⁴⁸⁸ In the quoted refrain, only the numeral denoting the sequence of trumpets sounded was changed.

⁴⁸⁹ Polish: «Upaść już, upaść moskiewskiej stolicy, / Trąbcie wtóry raz, Pańscy bojownicy!». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska // Moskiewski Mars*. S. 400.

trumpet sounded to a story from the military and political history of the two states (e.g., the battle of Orsha in 1514, the siege of Pskov by Stefan Bathory in 1581–1582, etc.). Against this possibility, and probably because of the need to release his text as soon as possible for the general celebration of Sigismund III's victory, Witkowski could not realize such an idea. The first five trumpets sounded in *Safo słowieńska* portended only abstract misfortunes for Russia. For example, the thunder of the second trumpet symbolically signaled that «tyranny is fading away, [true] faith is coming, Moscow is defeated!» (ln. 103–104)⁴⁹⁰. Only the last two trumpets of Jericho were linked to specific events.

The sixth trumpet of Jericho in the development of the conflict between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Moscow, according to Witkowski, metaphorically became the storming of Smolensk on June 3, 1611. The author described in detail the decisive attack of the city and listed by name the merits of the heroes from the Polish-Lithuanian side (ln. 545–684)⁴⁹¹. The poet brought readers to the realization that after the demolition of the fortress walls by B. Novodvorsky the fate of not only the impregnable city was decided («The rumble, as in the destruction of Sodom, tower after tower fell and were destroyed just like Troy, and Smolensk collapsed when the king attacked it» (ln. 613–617)⁴⁹²), but also the whole Russia, since immediately after the successful siege, the last trumpet sounded.

The rumbling of the seventh trumpet of Jericho, according to S. Witkowski's conception, is the actual present for the contemporaries of Sigismund III's triumphs. The poet states that the trumpet sounds right now and marks the final fall of Moscow, for which it is necessary to take the final step: «Therefore the righteous king leads you, corrects the stubborn Moscow heresy, hurry after him, brave knights, as true sons [of the Crown]» (ln. 705–708)⁴⁹³. Note that Witkowski, like M. Hofmański, urged the szlachta not to provide direct military aid to the king at the final stage of the war, but to support

⁴⁹⁰ Polish: «Tyraństwo gaśnie, wiara następuje, / Moskwę wojuje!». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska* // Moskiewski Mars. S. 400.

⁴⁹¹ Moskiewski Mars. *Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej*. S. 406–412.

⁴⁹² Polish: «Grzmot właśnie jakby Sodoma gorzała, / Baszta zaś basztę, lecąc, rozbijała; / Jako więc Troja tak się Smoleńsk kurzył, / Gdy go król burzył». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska* // Moskiewski Mars. S. 408.

⁴⁹³ Polish: «Oto pobożny król wam kredensuje, / Błędy niestworne moskiewskie wprawuje, / Spieszże się za nim, rycerzu cnotliwy, / Jak syn prawdziwy». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Safo słowieńska* // Moskiewski Mars. S. 413.

Sigismund III at the coming Sejm. The adoption of new levies would help to finish off the agonizing Moscow, which, in turn, should have turned into a common good for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and all its inhabitants.

Witkowski's second panegyric published in Krakow to coincide with King Sigismund's triumph – *Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie* – presented the situation in the war with Russia in a similar way. As proof of Moscow's imminent subjugation, the poet emphasized the military successes already achieved by King Sigismund: «Belaya and Roslavl, Dorogobuzh and Vyazma were torn from the hands of the Muscovite, Mozhaysk, Borisov, Velikiye Luki were taken; Starodub, Eagle, Osipov were taken away. Novogradok, Pochap, and Kromy are also in our hands – we cordially welcome you, warlike king! Smolensk – we see strong walls destroyed because of so many holes» (ln. 205–212)⁴⁹⁴. Witkowski emphasized that not only the most important Russian cities and fortresses, but the tsar himself was already in the hands of the Polish king: «He deposed the Tsar of Moscow from the capital, who disturbed our ancestors with many troops, the treacherous Shuisky left the state, now he is humble in the hands of the Polish» (ln. 193–196)⁴⁹⁵.

Texts like the quoted panegyrics by S. Witkowski obviously exaggerated Sigismund III's military and political successes and concealed the real situation in the Russian capital. While the situation of the Polish garrison trapped in the Moscow Kremlin was deteriorating day by day due to lack of supplies and reinforcements, Polish-Lithuanian propagandists called for celebrating a complete victory over the conquered Moscow. For example, the state of affairs after the king's return from Smolensk was described by J. Krajewski as follows: «Invite joyful Rome to see the triumph that brought us victory, that the terrible crushed Muscovite puts his back under the master's feet! His glory has been trampled, his banners have been torn apart, his power and strength have

⁴⁹⁴ Polish: «Białą i Rosław, Drobuż i Wiazina / Naszy odjęli z ręku Moskwicina, / Możajsk, Borysów, Welkie Łuki wzięli, / Starodub, Orzeł, Osyszów odjęli. / Nowogródek, Poczepów także Kramy / U naszych w ręku – słusznie cię witamy, / Waleczny królu! Smoleńsk – twarde mury / Widzę zniszczone przez tak gęste dziury». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie* // *Moskiewski Mars*. S. 391.

⁴⁹⁵ Polish: «Z stoliceś cara moskiewskiego złożył, / Który więc wojski przodki nasze trwożył, / Opuścił państwo Szujski wiarołomny, / Już ten tyran z ręku polskich skromny». Cit. by: Witkowski S. *Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie* // *Moskiewski Mars*. S. 390.

all been taken away, the crown has been torn from his head, and cruel hearts are fed with regret, their drink is sad tears» (ln. 2–8)⁴⁹⁶.

Together with famous writers indirectly or directly connected with the royal court, the deeds of Sigismund III were also universally praised by anonymous authors. The unknown compiler of a flyleaf circulated in Poznan, *Szturm smoleński*⁴⁹⁷ congratulated his readers-addressees on the monarch's victory and presented the results of the royal policy in the following form: «Poland, after the domestic war, has flourished in peace again, and the king finds more and more happiness in the Moscow lands every day. He is already, with God's help, the lord of Smolensk and the [Russian] capital» (ln. 3–8)⁴⁹⁸. The outcome of the Smolensk campaign was summarized more succinctly by another anonymous panegyrist, whose work was published in Krakow: «The gates to Moscow are open to everyone – and [even] to the smallest» (ln. 96–97)⁴⁹⁹.

Thus, from promises of a quick and final victory over Russia to the statement that Moscow had already been subjugated, optimistic expectations of Sigismund III's eastern policy were characteristic of all the literary monuments of anti-Russian orientation published on the occasion of the royal triumph that we have studied.

The fifth discourse we have singled out summarized the ideas cultivated in the propaganda literature of 1611 and encouraged readers to take certain actions, which reveals the utilitarian nature of the texts we have studied. After describing the causes and consequences of the monarch's military campaign to Smolensk, as well as explaining the coming benefits of the capture of Moscow for the Republic, the propagandists invariably turned to the theme of **consolidation of the peoples of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth around their king**. Literary propaganda presented the situation in such a way that Russia, thanks to the military merits of Sigismund III, was already in the hands

⁴⁹⁶ Polish: «Rym wesoly zaczynjcie na ten tryumf, który / Zwycięstwo nam przyniosło, że Moskwićin srogi / Zniszczony kładzie panu swój kark dziś pod nogi! / Zdeptana sława jego, chorągwie zdrapane, / Potęga, siły wszy<t>kie już są odebrane, / Korona z głowy zdarta, a serca okrutne / Narzekani<e>m się karmią, napój ich – lzy smutne». Cit. by: Krajewski J. Tryumf poznański Ną radosną victoryą K. Je° M. po wzięciu Smoleńską // Moskiewski Mars. S. 367.

⁴⁹⁷ *Szturm smoleński*. Poznań, 1611.

⁴⁹⁸ Polish: «Polska po domowym boiu, / Znowu roskwitla w pokoiu, / A Krol w moskiewskiey krainie / Co dzień w więtszym szczęściu słynie. / Już iest z Boskiey obietnice, / Pan Smoleńska y stolice». Cit. by: *Szturm smoleński*. Poznań, 1611. S. 1.

⁴⁹⁹ Polish: «Otwarte wrota do Moskwy każdemu – / I namniejszemu». Cit. by: Tryumf niezwyćężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III // Moskiewski Mars. S. 352.

of the Poles and Lithuanians, but for the final incorporation of the new lands it was necessary to unite and accept all the king's proposals at the Sejm in Warsaw.

Putting aside conflicts with the Confederates, dissatisfaction with the king's religious policy on the part of dissenters, and many other internal political problems of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the propagandists presented Sigismund III as an ideal leader, under whose rule the peoples of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth worked together to achieve a common goal. Describing the last days of the siege, L. Chlebowski presented readers with the following touching picture of the subjects uniting around their military leader: «When the brave Poles and Lithuanian regiments said goodbye cordially with warm tears [in their eyes] to the king, their master, because they were ready to die according to the will of the dear Fatherland and according to yours, king; they jumped up like wild lions and tigers on the walls...» (ln. 113–118)⁵⁰⁰. The emphasis on such scenes could work for the reputation of the royal power in the context of the recent *rokosz* in Poland: literary monuments emphasized the unity with King Sigismund in matters of Moscow policy even on the part of his recent political opponent – the voivode of Krakow M. Zebrzydowski⁵⁰¹.

In addition to the consolidation of subjects with the ruler, the authors also noted the deepening solidarity between Poles and Lithuanians. For example, S. Witkowski felt it necessary to emphasize the equality of merit of both nations at the storming of Smolensk, thus illustrating the unity of the king's subjects: «Hearts held together in the battle – Litvin to the Pole, the Pole helped Litvin, everyone fought equally, they were not inferior to each other in any way» (ln. 649–652)⁵⁰². Such cohesion, according to panegyrists, was supposed to serve as an example for the *szlachta* during the decision-making about the continuation of the war.

⁵⁰⁰ Polish: «Kiedy mężni Polacy z pułki litewskimi, / Pożegnawszy się mile ze łzami ciepłymi / Przed królem, panem swoim, że umrzeć gotowi / K woli milej Ojczyźnie i tobie – królowi, / Skoczyli, jak okrutni lwi i tygrysowie, / Na mury...». Cit. by: Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów // Moskiewski Mars. S. 361.

⁵⁰¹ As early as June 9, 1608, a universal proclaiming the reconciliation between the king and Ziebrzydowski was issued in Kraków. The document assumed that in case of war with Moscow, the voivode, at his own expense, would exhibit a flag to help Sigismund III (Byliński J. Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu. Wrocław, 2016. S. 19). During the Smolensk campaign, Regalist writers recalled this arrangement between the king and Ziebrzydowski, which was used in polemics to defend Sigismund III against criticism from the former *Rokoshans* (see, for example: Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntovi III // Moskiewski Mars. S. 350, w. 26–41).

⁵⁰² Polish: «Jednakież serce stanowili w bitwie – / Litwin Polakom, Polak zasię Litwie / Pomagał, wszyscy równo pracowali / Nic wprzód nie dali». Cit. by: Witkowski S. Safo słowieńska // Moskiewski Mars. S. 410.

The poets tirelessly reminded that the war was fought primarily in the interests of all estates of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. J. Krajewski's text illustrates this point. The poet emphasized that the king worked precisely for the good of his subjects: «You can no longer say that [the king] was traveling out of personal interest, because he did not spare his own losses, did not spare his entourage, finally, himself, he gave everything for military needs» (ln. 55–58)⁵⁰³.

The Sejm in Warsaw was to be the last step on the way to the mastery of the whole of Russia. The propagandists urged readers to keep this in mind, since for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth the war with Moscow seemed to be of paramount concern: «Let insignificant amusements disappear at this time, let everyone see those glorious roads that God, Luck and royal labors grant, right to the Crown attach the lands of Moscow, where the open gates [in the hands] of the Poles...» (ln. 233–238)⁵⁰⁴. Addressing his panegyric to the Sejm deputies, S. Witkowski advised not to disrupt the work of the Sejm and to vote according to the interests of the Republic, i.e., to support the King: «Go happily to the general discussions (i.e., to the Sejm – I. P.), as the harsh Mars protects the Crown, as Astrea [protects] rights and freedoms, [so] it is necessary to hold agreement at that Sejm. Let personal care remain at home, give universal cordiality, eternal Lord, let harmony reign in all hearts and lead them to good counsel» (ln. 225–232)⁵⁰⁵.

The five discourses we have analyzed, which filled the Polish-Lithuanian topical literature and journalism after King Sigismund's successful storming of Smolensk on June 3, 1611, were closely related to each other. Literary forms, compositional principles and metaphors changed, but the main idea remained the same and linked the texts into a single cycle. The propaganda broadcast the following concept.

⁵⁰³ Polish: «Już nie rzeczesz, że jachał dla swojej prywaty, / Atoli nie żałował własnej swej utraty, / Nie żałował przyjaciół, / na koniec sam siebie, / Odważył wszystko razem wojennej porzebie». Cit. by: Krajewski J. Tryumf poznański // Moskiewski Mars. S. 369.

⁵⁰⁴ Polish: «Próżne zabawy niech wtenczas ustana, / Niech uważają tę drogę usłaną, / Którą Bóg, Szczęście i królewska praca, / Podając, prawie do Korony wtacza / Moskiewskich włości, gdzie otwarte wrota | Są Polakowi...». Cit. by: Witkowski S. Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie // Moskiewski Mars. S. 391.

⁵⁰⁵ Polish: «Wjedź już szczęśliwie na wspólne namowy / Jakby Korony Mars bronił surowy, / Jako Astrea prawa i święboby / Ma na tym sejmie poprawić dla zgody. / Niechże prywatą tam w domach zostanie, / Daj spólną miłość, wiekuisty Panie, / Niech zgoda serca wszystkich opanuje, / A ku dobremu rady ich kieruje!» (str. 225-232). Cit. by: Witkowski S. Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie // Moskiewski Mars. S. 391.

Sigismund III, who resembled an ancient Caesar-triumphator, continued the defensive policy of his illustrious ancestors and took revenge on the Muscovites for all the offenses and oppressions accumulated for almost a century. With the support of his loyal subjects, the king began a just military campaign against Smolensk and returned all the captured territories back to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The authors loyal to Sigismund III, who worked against Russia in the literary field, promoted the idea that the ruler's actions were accompanied by a resounding success, which is why he was one step away from a complete victory over Moscow. On the eve of the Sejm in Warsaw, the Regalist writers expressed the hope that the nobility would support their king and allow Sigismund III to settle with Moscow once and for all.

The symbolism of the king's triumphal procession during the Sejm in Warsaw, which took place from September 26 to November 9, 1611, was in full harmony with the discourses of political literature published after the capture of Smolensk. This circumstance prompts us to classify the monuments we have studied as elements of a purposeful propaganda campaign. The following paragraph of our dissertation research is devoted to its influence on the course of the Warsaw Sejm.

§4. The Warsaw Sejm of 1611 and its decisions in the context of anti-Russian propaganda of the royal camp

From September 26 to November 9, 1611 a session of the regular ordinary Sejm was held in Warsaw, convened every two years in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to discuss current domestic and foreign policy problems of the state. We are interested in this Sejm because of the debates about King Sigismund's military campaign of 1609–1611 and the prospects for its continuation. The study of the decisions made and the analysis of the course of the discussions on the issue of war and peace with Moscow will help us to conclude whether the king's anti-Russian propaganda was able to influence the mood of the Sejm deputies in any way and direct the course of the political debate in a direction favorable to Sigismund III.

The Warsaw Sejm produced a large number of documents, thanks to which it is possible to reconstruct the history of its work in detail. Most of these historical monuments are concentrated in the General Archive of Ancient Acts in Warsaw (AGAD), in the state archives of Gdańsk (Archiwum Państwowe w Gdańsku) and Krakow (Archiwum Państwowe w Krakowie), as well as in the Central State Archive in Merseburg (Centralne Archiwum Państwowy NRD w Merseburgu). In addition to the archives, texts describing the work of the Sejm are preserved in the collections of the Jagiellonian Library (Biblioteka Jagiellońska) and the Czartoryski Princes Library (Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich) in Krakow. Among all the monuments, we would like to emphasize the Sejm Diariusz⁵⁰⁶ of the Sanok ambassador J. Stano. In this source the work of the Sejm was scheduled by day, all the discussions were recorded and the speeches of the presenters were written down⁵⁰⁷. In analyzing the discussions that arose during the Warsaw Sejm around state policy towards Russia, we will rely on this monument as a priority.

Contrary to the optimistic pictures of the consolidation of the peoples of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth around their ruler, with which the propaganda literature we

⁵⁰⁶ Diariusz sejmu. Biblioteka Jagiellońska w Krakowie (hereafter: B. J.). Akc., 5/52.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid. k. 34r–64.

studied in the previous paragraph of the dissertation research was filled, in reality, the aggressive policy of Sigismund III caused rejection in the most diverse strata of society. We can name two sources of dissatisfaction with their ruler in the Polish-Lithuanian society, which encouraged the nobility to oppose the royal initiatives.

First of all, the antagonism between Sigismund III and his subjects was caused by the growing claims of the royal court. The ruler was accused of violating the political traditions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, striving for unified power and making arbitrary decisions without the authorization of the Sejm. By the time of the Warsaw Sejm, such sentiments were still expressed by the former participants of the *rokosz* and the nobility circles sympathetic to them. As noted in the historiography of the issue, the reconciliation of the king with the members of Zebrzydowski rebellion was of an ostentatious nature, and in reality the *szlachta*'s discontent with their king remained considerable⁵⁰⁸. The political activity of the rebels during the Time of Troubles was extensively studied in the works of J. Maciszewski⁵⁰⁹ and W. Polak⁵¹⁰. The researchers' opinions coincided: the king's relations with the opposition-minded nobility of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth can be objectively characterized only as strained.

The political opponents of Sigismund III became active as soon as the plans for the royal campaign against Smolensk became known to the general population of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Due to the growing public discontent, at the insistence of S. Żółkiewski, King Sigismund had to address the meeting of the crown tribunal in Lublin on June 9, 1609 and announced that the ruler would not claim new lands and all territorial gains from the coming war would go exclusively to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁵¹¹. The king also admitted that although there was no Sejm sanction for the war, but he did not hide his plans from his subjects and the question of the possibility of a military campaign against Russia was discussed both with senators and at local *sejmiki*. The king assured that he would certainly get the permission of the *szlachta*, but

⁵⁰⁸ Byliński J. *Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowym opracowaniu*. Wrocław, 2016. S. 19.

⁵⁰⁹ Maciszewski J. *Szlachecka opinia publiczna w Polsce wobec interwencji Moskwy (1604–1609)* // *Kwartalnik Historyczny. Studia Sławistyczne*. Warszawa, 1963. T. 72. Z. 2. s. 363–386.

⁵¹⁰ Polak W. *O Kreml i Smoleńszczyznę. Polityka Rzeczypospolitej wobec Moskwy w latach 1607–1612*. Toruń, 1995. S. 31–34.

⁵¹¹ Żółkiewski S. *Początek i progres wojny moskiewskiej / Wstęp i komentarz Wacława Sobieskiego*. Kraków, 1920. S. 23.

the real reason for war – Russia’s alliance with Sweden – appeared after the end of the Sejm, which was held in Warsaw from January 15 to February 26, 1609. Having finished his business with the crown tribunal, King Sigismund moved to Vilna, where on July 25, 1609 he issued a new manifesto addressed to the nobility, in which the main ideas of the Lublin speeches were repeated in an expanded form. Thus, Sigismund III was well aware of the discontent that had erupted in society because of the willful outbreak of war with Russia, and tried in every possible way to mitigate it⁵¹².

Despite the above actions, agitation was still actively conducted against Sigismund III at local seimiks by former participants of the rokosz, as well as adherents of the false tsarevitch Dmitry and J. Mniszech. A strong condemnation of the actions of the king, for example, was pronounced by the sejmik in Minsk, convened on the initiative of the well-known participant of the rebellion P. Stabrowski⁵¹³. Opponents of the monarch pointed out that he wanted to appropriate to himself the successes in the war against Moscow, already achieved by Poles and Lithuanians who supported “Tsarevich Dmitry”, and to use the situation for his own dynastic purposes⁵¹⁴. Excitement among the Polish-Lithuanian soldiers in the camp of False Dmitry II against the king was so strong that they formed a confederation and on its behalf sent a group of negotiators headed by N. Marchocki to Sigismund III in the camp near Smolensk. The confederates demanded that the king, under the threat of a new rokosz, abandon the siege, disband the army and immediately return back to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁵¹⁵.

As time passed, the situation in the royal camp near Smolensk also threatened to get out of control: Sigismund III’s refusal to march directly on Moscow caused considerable resentment among the soldiers. The siege of the impregnable city dragged on, and each new unsuccessful assault on the walls fueled the discontent of the szlachta more and more. It became obvious that if the king did not achieve any significant successes in the war against Russia by the next ordinary Sejm, a new internal political

⁵¹² Kozłowski S. Elekcja królewicza Władysława Wazy na tron moskiewski (1609–1612) // *Przegląd Powszechny*, 1889. T. XXII. S. 218.

⁵¹³ Sobieski W. *Żółkiewski na Kremlu*. Warszawa, [1920]. S. 27–30.

⁵¹⁴ Byliński J. *Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu*. Wrocław, 2016. S. 23–24.

⁵¹⁵ Marchocki M. *Historia wojny moskiewskiej. Moskwa w rękach Polaków. Pamiętniki dowódców i oficerów garnizonu polskiego w Moskwie w latach 1610-1612 / Oprac. Kubala M., Ścieżor T.* Kraków, 1995. S. 5–55.

crisis in the Republic could not be avoided⁵¹⁶. That is why in 1611 the king's victory at Smolensk, the propaganda of which became the most urgent task for the Regalists, was promoted in the information space of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The second source of discontent with royal power was the confessional issue in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Contrary to the traditions of religious tolerance, Sigismund III, with the full support of the Jesuits and the papacy, actively worked to strengthen Catholicism in the state, which caused rejection on the part of "dissenters" – non-Catholic Christians. The discontent of the Orthodox population of the GDL was especially pronounced, who rightly feared that if the king really succeeded in subjugating Moscow and imposing Catholicism on it, it would directly affect the position of all adherents of the Greek faith.

Seeing Moscow subjects as their co-religionists, the Orthodox inhabitants of the GDL actively cooperated with the Russian spies during King Sigismund's military campaign against Smolensk, passing them information of strategic importance⁵¹⁷. In parallel with the propaganda of the necessity of war with Russia coming from the royal camp, religious dissidents spread their own polemical writings against the actions of the central government throughout the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. For example, Sigismund III's religious policy and his desire to convert Moscow to Catholicism after the supposed success of the military campaign were actively criticized in pamphlets that were handwritten by Orthodox monks in the possession of Prince J. Zasławski⁵¹⁸.

Similar discontent was shown by the dissenters living directly in the Polish Crown lands. While the king was fighting at Smolensk, in 1610 pogroms took place in Vilna and Krakow, because of which Protestant prayer houses were destroyed⁵¹⁹. Outraged Polish dissidents complained to the governor of Krakow and demanded that the instigators of the pogrom be extradited, claiming that the religious freedoms guaranteed by the Warsaw Confederation of 1573 had been flagrantly violated. Having failed to obtain any action

⁵¹⁶ Kozłowski S. Elekcja królewicza Władysława Wazy na tron moskiewski (1609 – 1612) // *Przegląd Powszechny*, 1889. T. XXII. S. 351–352.

⁵¹⁷ Sobieski W. *Żółkiewski na Kremlu*. S. 20–21.

⁵¹⁸ Byliński J. *Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu*. Wrocław, 2016. S. 32.

⁵¹⁹ Zhukovich P. N. The Moscow turmoil of the beginning of the XVII century and its reflection in the Lithuanian-Polish state // *Christian reading*. 1902. No. 11. P. 653.

from the royal representative, the religious dissidents began to gather in congresses, where it was decided to demand justice from Sigismund III and to sabotage any initiatives of the king until the guarantees of equal status of representatives of all Christian denominations on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were confirmed⁵²⁰.

Thus, the accumulated claims of the subjects against their king could not but affect the course of the Warsaw Sejm of 1611, problems at which began immediately after its opening. The researcher J. Byliński described the first day of the Sejm as follows: «...a battle was broke out in the (ambassadorial – I. P.) government office over the burning issue of expressing gratitude to the king and senators close to him during the Smolensk campaign. Almost all the sejmiks were concerned about the fact that the war had started without the consent of the estates, but they ordered the ambassadors to thank the king for territorial gains and risking their own person for the good of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Nevertheless, some sejmiks insisted that the ambassadors reproach the senators for allowing the violation of the rights of the crown. The sejmik of Sandomierz, the most oppositional among the sejmiks of the crown lands, resolutely forbade to salute the senators and instructed his ambassadors to “inquire” who advised to start a war without the consent of the estates in order to punish him severely...»⁵²¹.

The ambassador of Greater Poland M. Broniewski made an important contribution to these discussions. He delivered a long speech, the main motive of which was reconciliation between the subjects and the king. On the one hand, the ambassador expressed his support for Sigismund III's initiatives, but on the other hand, he also hastened to express his fears that further actions without the Sejm's approval were dangerous for the state and could lead to the king's “absolutum dominium”⁵²². Broniewski tried to please everyone: by urging to continue the military offensive and to gain a foothold in Moscow, the ambassador sought to protect the nobility from the hardships of new levies. For example, according to the polemicist, the money for the continuation of

⁵²⁰ Zhukovich P. N. The Moscow turmoil of the beginning of the XVII century. P. 654.

⁵²¹ Byliński J. Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu. S. 132.

⁵²² Diariusz sejmu. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 52v.

the war should have been sought from senators and representatives of the clergy. In addition, it would be good to attract not nobles, but volunteers and Lithuanian Tatars for further participation in the war. As for the szlachta itself, the sejmik that sent Broniewski was ready to authorize only one more levy, and further financial assistance to the king could be provided only if new privileges were granted⁵²³.

J. Bylinski's assessment of M. Broniewski's sentiments regarding the course of the war with Russia is important for our study: «Broniewski, like a significant part of the szlachta of Greater Poland, was so enthusiastic about the Moscow war and believed in its successful outcome that he began to speculate about ways of governing the defeated state»⁵²⁴. He repeated the plan of colonization of Russia proposed two years earlier by P. Palczowski, but softened the most radical ideas of his predecessor. The ambassador proposed a complete reorganization of the Moscow administrative system. After the supposed victory, new settlements were to be founded on Russian lands, in which the Polish-Lithuanian element would dominate ethnically over the autochthonous population. Eventually, according to Broniewski, these settlements were to become the centers of new voivodships. Nevertheless, unlike P. Palczowski, the ambassador of Greater Poland Broniewski expressed confidence that the Russian population would also find its proper place in the new triune Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In particular, he urged the Russian representatives of the noble class to find positions worthy of their position in the new system as soon as possible, which would allow them to merge painlessly into the Polish-Lithuanian political culture⁵²⁵.

M. Broniewski's speech was one of the longest speeches of the Sejm, but even after it, the nobility did not come to any consensus on the king's arbitrary war with Russia. Next after Broniewski, P. Horajski, representing the position of the szlachta of the Sandomierz voivodeship, addressed the assembly of the ambassadorial office. The ambassador fervently stood up for the political traditions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth violated by the king. J. Stano wrote the following lines about the speech

⁵²³ Diariusz sejmu. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 43v.

⁵²⁴ Byliński J. Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu. S. 133.

⁵²⁵ Diariusz sejmu. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 43v–44r.

of this zealot of the old orders in the Sejm diary: «... arguing in various matters, he spoke freely and declared that he did not care that he would not receive any reward for his speeches, but wanted only one thing – to die in freedom»⁵²⁶.

The question of the war with Russia and the sources of its financing was fiercely debated every day during the 1611 Warsaw Sejm. Whenever the Regalists pointed to the success of the war and the expected benefits for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after its conclusion, the noblemen's ambassadors cited numerous counterarguments against the king's initiatives. Apart from the former participants of the *rokosz*, who invariably accused the king of violating the political order, the most prominent destabilizing factor in the work of the Sejm was the position of the dissenters. In particular, on October 10, 1611, religious dissidents refused to participate in the public congratulations to the king and his advisers on the successes of the war organized by the ambassadorial office. They were going to maintain such a position until all their claims were considered and the actual cases of oppression by Catholics were dealt with⁵²⁷.

The work of the ambassadorial office took place in an extremely nervous atmosphere, so that the Sejm sessions were regularly interrupted by scandals. The following episode from J. Stano's diary clearly demonstrates the tricks that the Regalists had to go to in order to ensure that the Sejm decisions favorable to King Sigismund regarding the war with Russia were made no matter what. On October 11, 1611, a storm broke out in Warsaw, so the deputies were not supposed to attend the Sejm on that day: it was expected that all the discussions would continue after the weather changed. However, the senators and marshal of the Sejm managed to gather ambassadors loyal to the royal policy to discuss new tax levies for military needs on that day. Thus, less than half of all the deputies who arrived in Warsaw participated in the discussion of the issue of paramount importance, on the solution of which the continuation of the war with Russia depended⁵²⁸. As a result of the discussion, the *szlachta* pledged to pay at least 2 new military levies. Since even these measures were not enough, it was decided to look for

⁵²⁶ Polish: «...siłą materiej rozmaitych wnaszał i libere mówił i powiedział, że nie dbam, choć mi nie dadzą nic, tedy jednak przy wolności chcę umrzeć». Cit. by: *Diariusz sejmu*. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 44v.

⁵²⁷ Byliński J. *Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu*. S. 136.

⁵²⁸ *Diariusz sejmu*. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 45r.

additional sources of financing the war: to introduce new taxes for the clergy and burghers, to demand tribute from Wallachia, to use the Lithuanian quarta, etc. Finally, after these hastily conducted discussions, the marshal of the Sejm urged the assembly not to lose time and to send authorized delegates to the king as soon as possible in order to notify Sigismund III about the agreement to new taxes from the ambassadorial office and to determine their specific amounts⁵²⁹.

The next day – Wednesday, October 12, 1611 – the szlachta's ambassadors came to the Sejm in full force. After learning about the results of the previous session, the delegates were furious. The author of the Sejm diary also emotionally assessed the situation: «we fear that the Sejm itself might end in war...»⁵³⁰. The szlachta's ambassadors reviled the names of the Sejm marshal and senators, and the dissenters threatened to leave the same day if the decisions were not overturned. In the end, when the king announced that he was expecting the promised delegation from the ambassadorial office, the nobility still sent their representatives to him: seven ambassadors from Greater Poland and seven ambassadors from Lesser Poland, as well as four deputies from the sejmiks of the GDL went to discuss the financing of the war⁵³¹.

As a result of the joint work of the senators and 18 elected noblemen's representatives, a memorandum was prepared for the ambassadorial office, which set forth a view of the war with Moscow that was identical to the propaganda works we examined in the previous paragraph of our study. It should be noted in particular that the text of the document recognized the king's right to continue the war. According to J. Stano, although the memorandum was accepted by the ambassadorial chamber, the noblemen openly demonstrated the discontent caused by it⁵³². The antagonism between the szlachta and the king remained the main factor in the work of the Warsaw Sejm of 1611, which also delayed the determination of the amount of taxes.

Under these circumstances, the king made a last attempt to attract public opinion to his side and to entice the szlachta to war with Russia: the Sejm ambassadors were

⁵²⁹ Diariusz sejmu. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 45r.

⁵³⁰ Polish: «Obawiamy się tego, żeby samą wojną sejmu nie kończono...». Cit. by: Diariusz sejmu. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 45r.

⁵³¹ Ibid. K. 46r.

⁵³² Ibid. K. 50–51.

invited on October 29, 1611 to participate in the festivities in honor of the victory at Smolensk. The principles of the ceremonial parade in Warsaw differed significantly from the king's earlier triumphal entry into Vilna⁵³³. This time Sigismund III was not an active participant in the festive procession. He waited in the Royal Castle for the arrival of the procession, surrounded by his family and the Sejm estates. The parade was led from the Krakow Fore-town (Krakowskie Przedmieście) by S. Żółkiewski.

The triumphal procession was organized as follows. The Hetman rode at the head of the column in a carriage drawn by six white horses, followed by a guard of honor. In visual terms, the emphasis of the Warsaw parade was on Moscow prisoners and loot captured in Russia. For example, the honor guard was followed by an open carriage with Dmitri, Ivan and Vasily Shuisky, a spectacle that was especially memorable to the burghers of Warsaw. The prisoners were followed by army ranks and wagons with the spoils of war. The solemn procession was closed by another carriage, in which M. Shein and Patriarch Filaret were transported⁵³⁴.

S. Żółkiewski personally presented the honorable prisoners to the king and the Senate. The former tsar of Moscow and his brothers were forced to bow to Sigismund III, then they were allowed to kiss the royal hand. After accomplishing the above ceremonial actions, Żółkiewski read a prepared solemn speech. Pointing to the prisoners, the hetman presented them to the Sejm estates: Vasily Shuisky, the ruler of the immense Muscovite state, who for so many years had wronged the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and his brother Dmitry, the voivode over 180,000 Russian soldiers, have now been defeated and are paying their respects to King Sigismund⁵³⁵.

The utilitarian nature of the triumphal events organized in Warsaw is fully revealed when analyzing the speech of F. Kryski, who addressed the king and the Sejm immediately after Żółkiewski. Glorifying the merits of Sigismund III, the Deputy Chancellor directly addressed the szlachta's ambassadors and urged them not to ruin the

⁵³³ For a detailed description of the celebrations held in Warsaw in honor of the victory of King Sigismund at Smolensk, see: Kostomarov N. I. *The Time of Troubles. The Moscow state at the beginning of the XVII century. Historical monographs and research.* Moscow, 2008. P. 664–666; Tsvetaev D. V. *Tsar Vasily Shuisky with his brothers at the Warsaw Sejm.* Warsaw, 1905; Kraushar A. *Z dziejów Warszawy. Grobowiec carów Szujskich.* Kraków, 1984. S. 4–6; Niedzielski K. *Pod Smoleńskiem i pod Moskwą lat temu 300 (1609 – 1612).* Warszawa, 1911. S. 129–135.

⁵³⁴ Byliński J. *Sejm z 1611 roku.* S. 141.

⁵³⁵ Prochaska A. *Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski.* Warszawa, 1927. S. 69–70.

king's plans. An eloquent assessment of this speech, which contrasted markedly with the panegyric oration that preceded it, was made by the researcher A. Białowski. According to his observation, Kryski «had to ask the szlachta in an almost pleading voice not to leave his monarch without material aid at the critical moment and thus not to destroy the loot that had been the result of two years of Polish-Moscow confrontation»⁵³⁶. J. Byliński, in his evaluation of Kryski's complaint speech, came to a clear conclusion: the nobility had to be directly asked for financial assistance in the war, first of all because the demonstration of the captured Moscow tsar and other propaganda actions did not have the effect on the Sejm estates that the royal entourage hoped to achieve⁵³⁷.

In addition to the obvious financial problems, by the time of the Sejm in Warsaw, rumors about the real state of affairs in Moscow began to reach the szlachta's ambassadors. Already in August 1611, the Polish garrison was actually trapped within the walls of the Moscow Kremlin. O.A. Kurbatov characterized the situation in the Russian capital as follows: «Having decided the fate of Moscow, the battle of August 22–24, 1612 became a turning point in the history of the entire war of liberation, burying any real hopes of the interventionists to take possession of the entire Moscow state»⁵³⁸.

The demonstration of the honorable prisoners before the Sejm estates by King Sigismund and Hetman S. Żółkiewski did not lead to any positive developments in the search for means to continue the war. Moreover, the subsequent course of discussions shows that the szlachta ambassadors found a witty way to counter the royal claims by turning the main motive of anti-Russian propaganda against Sigismund III himself. The new painful question that the noble ambassadors put to their king can be summarized as follows: if Moscow was already in the hands of Polish-Lithuanian soldiers, the tsar was a prisoner in Warsaw, and the Russian troops were completely defeated, as reported by the royal entourage and many propaganda works published in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, why could not all the royal debts be paid using the treasury of the defeated state?

⁵³⁶ For the text of the speeches read before King Sigismund and the Sejm estates, see: Bielowski A. *Pisma Stanisława Żółkiewskiego*. Lwów, 1861. S. 558–561.

⁵³⁷ Byliński J. *Sejm z 1611 roku*. S. 143.

⁵³⁸ Kurbatov O. A. *Military history of the Russian Troubles of the beginning of the XVII century*. Moscow, 2014. P. 151.

Up to the last days of the Warsaw Sejm, the conflict over the financial question continued to grow. New economic issues generated by the Russian-Polish war consistently surfaced and remained unresolved. In the first days of November the Sejm discussed the claims of the Tushino Poles, who demanded payment for participation in the war against Shuisky. The answer of the nobility was unchanged – the soldiers should be rewarded from the treasury of conquered Moscow⁵³⁹. The deputies of the quartier army, dissatisfied with the royal policy, received a similar answer⁵⁴⁰. As a result, after the representatives of the regiments of J. P. Sapieha and A. Zborowski declared at the Sejm their rights to a large part of Moscow's loot, since their service had begun while they were still in the army of the self-appointed tsarevich, the king himself had to admit that the Moscow treasury was not so rich as to pay all debts at once, and the situation in the conquered state was not so calm that it was possible to freely dispose of Russia's wealth⁵⁴¹.

Summarizing the results of the Warsaw political debates in October–November 1611, it should be noted that financially all the money allocated by the Sejm could hardly cover only the royal debts incurred due to the siege of Smolensk in 1609–1611. An active continuation of the campaign against Russia was out of the question in the near future, as the army and economy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were exhausted by the last war years. The hopes that the king had placed on the work of the Warsaw Sejm were not justified, and even active propaganda campaigns (celebration of triumphs in major cities, demonstration of prisoners, distribution of literature glorifying the military exploits of the ruler) could not change the negative attitude of the nobility to Sigismund III's military adventure.

⁵³⁹ Diariusz sejmu. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 56v.

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid. K. 56v.

⁵⁴¹ Byliński J. Sejm z 1611 roku. S. 148.

It should be noted that the propaganda of the war with Russia itself was in some aspects disastrous for the royal plans. When discussing the sums spent by the royal power on the triumph in Vilna, J. Niedźwiedź concluded unequivocally that in the conditions of war with Russia the monarch was engaged in inexcusable waste⁵⁴². The propagandized panegyrics in honor of the king's victory also led to unforeseen situations: the part of the nobility that believed in the success of the war could not understand why new taxes were needed in the conditions of the victory that had already taken place. Any attempts to appeal to the military needs and the subsequent benefits that would accrue to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were defeated by the Sejm deputies' counter-proposals to use the Russian treasury. In those cases where the royal authority recognized the impossibility of immediately disposing of Moscow's resources, the szlachta immediately declared that their powers were limited. An eloquent illustration of such diplomatic tactics is the clerical response given by the Kalish ambassador M. Mielżyński to another call to impose additional taxes: «we cannot be led by these speeches to approve the levies, since we were strictly forbidden to undertake it (at the Seimik – I.P.)»⁵⁴³.

Attempts to change and direct the opinion of the szlachta deputies in a direction favorable to royal policy through propaganda actions should be recognized as a failure. While the king spent money on showy festivities and tried unsuccessfully to attract the nobility to himself at the Sejm, in Moscow the popular liberation movement against the invaders was gaining strength. Soon the expulsion of the Polish-Lithuanian garrison from the walls of the Moscow Kremlin became a turning point in the history of the confrontation between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia. Despite the fact that the Polish-Lithuanian troops later tried to take revenge and invaded Russia again (Lisowski's raid in 1615, Hetman Sahajdaczny's march on the capital in 1618), the Western contemporaries of the Time of Troubles gradually came to the realization that it was possible to see Moscow annexed to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth only on the pages of propaganda works, while in reality it could not happen.

⁵⁴² Niedźwiedź J. *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655)*. Retoryczna organizacja miasta. Kraków, 2012. S. 364–365.

⁵⁴³ *Diariusz sejmu*. B. J., akc. 5/52. K. 63v.

Conclusion

The events of the Time of Troubles, which significantly shaped the course of history of the entire Eastern European region, directly affected the interests of Russia's neighboring states. Especially the aggravation of the internal political situation in the Moscow kingdom attracted the attention of Polish-Lithuanian contemporaries, who were not satisfied with the role of only passive observers of the crisis phenomena that affected the Russian lands. The trace of purposeful political activity of the magnates of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is evident from the very first days of the military campaign of False Dmitry I to Moscow. Over time, the influence of the Polish-Lithuanian factor on the development of socio-political crisis in Russia only increased. The apogee of the antagonism between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Tsardom of Muscovy was the official declaration of war by King Sigismund III, who in 1609 led his troops to Smolensk.

The direct participation of Poles and Lithuanians in the events of the Troubles led to the emergence of a vast layer of literature devoted to the current political situation in Russia. Popular among the readers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were the popular works of "small literary forms": flysheets, occasional poetry, political journalism, topical pamphlets, collections of satirical epigrams, panegyrics, etc. In the framework of our thesis we made an attempt to consider these multi-genre sources not as disparate historical monuments, but as a single literary cycle, the functional meaning and ideas of which changed under the influence of the actual events of the Time of Troubles.

Based on the results of our research, we have identified three major stages in the history of (anti-)Russian-themed works published from 1604 to 1612 in the territories of the Kingdom of Poland and the GDL:

1. The events of the first Dimitriada prompted Polish-Lithuanian authors to think about the possibility of a new political union between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia. If only a few years before the expedition of False Dmitry I to Moscow, G. Pielgrzymowski in his epic poetry predicted an imminent war with the Russians, the literary writers who had already witnessed the adventure of the self-

appointed tsarevich saw completely different prospects for relations between the two states. From 1604 to 1606, propaganda works were published in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, calling for volunteers to support the claims of “Tsarevich Dmitry” to the Moscow throne. This thematic direction is vividly illustrated by the so-called “moscow trilogy” by J. Żabcic. The events, public moods and expectations of the first Dimitriada were comprehensively reflected in the works of S. Grochowski and J. Jurkowski. The marriage of Dmitry and M. Mniszech was interpreted by most authors as a triumph of the union, within which united nations could challenge their natural enemies: the Swedes and the Turks.

2. The death of False Dmitry I during the Moscow wedding festivities in May 1606 ended all hopes for a peaceful unification of the two states. After this event, the writers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until 1609 tried to find an explanation for the tragedy in Moscow, during which many Poles and Lithuanians suffered. Both the idea of immediate revenge and opponents of further interference in Russian affairs were promoted in the literature. The dynamics of the consistent growth of anti-Moscow sentiments can be traced if we turn to the works of S. Liffel and S. Petrycy published during this period. The anti-Russian polemic was especially vivid in the works of P. Palczowski, who compared the mission of the Polish-Lithuanian knighthood in Russia to the actions of the conquistadors in the New World.

3. After 1609, Sigismund III’s military campaign against Smolensk became the central subject in Polish-Lithuanian literature on the events of the Time of Troubles. When the royal military campaign successfully ended, panegyrics and triumphs immediately dominated the news space of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. From 1611 to 1612, more than twenty poems describing the capture of Smolensk were published. In the vast majority of cases, the texts we studied were inspired by the royal entourage and written by authors close to the central authorities. In view of this circumstance, we concluded that the reason for the rapid spread of anti-Russian propaganda writings in 1611 was their commissioned nature. Sigismund III sought to use all means at his disposal to induce the nobility to continue the war with Russia.

In assessing the effectiveness of anti-Russian literary propaganda, we turned to the history of the Ordinary Sejm in Warsaw, which took place from September 26 to November 9, 1611. Contrary to the king's hopes, it was not possible to convince the szlachta of the need for additional taxes for military needs. The szlachta's ambassadors appealed to the mythology, widespread in propaganda texts, that the capture of Smolensk was tantamount to Russia's total defeat in the war, and therefore all royal debts should be covered by funds from the treasury of the defeated state.

After the expulsion of the Polish-Lithuanian invaders from the Moscow Kremlin, contemporaries gradually came to realize that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would still not be able to subjugate the whole of Russia. In this context, propaganda texts became a cushioning factor that worked to maintain the prestige of the central power: although Moscow had eluded the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the annexation of Smolensk had already been presented to the royal subjects as an unprecedented military triumph of Polish-Lithuanian arms. Such views persisted throughout the reign of Sigismund III. Their gradual reassessment began to occur during the reign of Wladyslaw IV, when the opinion appeared in the political literature that King Sigismund's own dynastic ambitions, who spent almost two years in a siege camp and did not want to compromise with the Russian side, did not allow the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to seize Moscow.

References and Sources

Archival sources

1. Diariusz sejmu z 1611 r. Biblioteka Jagiellońska w Krakowie. Akc. 5/52.
2. Miaskowski W. (KUL 3250). P[an] Wojciech Miaskowski, dworz[anin] k[rola] j[ego]m[ości], dziękuje gościom na pogrzebie p[ana] Wojciecha Gajewskiego, starosty ujskiego pod Smoleńskiem zabitego. Rkps Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Sygn. 3250.
3. Miaskowski W. (AHWil op. 1135, 2/40). Tenże na przeprowadzenie tegoż ciała przez Poznanie. Rkps Archiwum Historycznego w Wilnie. Sygn. 2/40.
4. Triumphus et ingressus regis Vilnam die 24 Iulii 1611 anno. Rkps. Czart., sygn. 1577 IV.

Bibliography and catalogs

1. Bibliografia Literatury Polskiej – Nowy Korbut. T. 2: Piśmiennictwo Staropolskie. Hasła osobowe: A–M. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1964. 551 s.
2. Estreicher K. Bibliografia Polska. Tom XVII. Kraków, 1899. 491 s.
3. Sommervogel C. Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. Nouvelle édition par Carlos Sommervogel SJ. Bibliographie. Vol. 6. Bruxelles, Paris: Schepens/Picard, 1895. 869 p.
4. Zawadzki K. Gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące XVI–XVIII wieku. Bibliografia. T. 1: 1514–1661. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1977. 228 s.

Encyclopedias, reference books and dictionaries

1. The encyclopedic dictionary of F. A. Brockhaus and I. A. Efron. Volume IXa. St. Petersburg: printing house of the Brockhaus-Efron Joint-Stock Company, 1893. 974 p.
2. Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku. Z. 5 : Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie / oprac. A. Kawecka–Gryczowa. Wrocław–Kraków: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1959. 270 s.
3. Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti. T. 16. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana fondata da Giovanni Treccani, 1949. 973 p.
4. Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy, 1564–1995 / oprac. L. Grzebień. Kraków: WAM, 1996. 888 s.
5. Juszyński H. Dykcjonarz poetow polskich. T. 2. Kraków: Drukarnia Józefa Mateckiego, 1820. 615 s.
6. Krasicki I. Zbior potrzebniejszych wiadomości, porządkiem alfabetu ułożonych. T. 2. Warszawa, Lwów: Michał Groll, 1781. 628 p.
7. Maciszewski J. Kryski Feliks vel Szczęsny z Drobnina (Drobina) h. Prawdzic // Polski słownik biograficzny. T. 15. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1970, S. 482–485.
8. Niesiecki K. Herbarz Polski. T.7. Lipsk: Breitkopf i Haertel, 1841. 613 s.
9. Polski słownik biograficzny. T. 17 (Lewiński Franciszek Ksawery – Linde Adrian von der). Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1972. 640 s.
10. Sobieszczański F. M. Czasopisma polskie // Encyklopedia Powszechna Orgelbranda. T. VI. Warszawa: S. Orgelbrand, 1861. S. 304–353.
11. Wierzbowski T. Biblioteka Zapomnianych Poetow i Prozaików Polskich XVI – XVIII wieku. Warszawa: Józef Berger, 1886. 917 s.
12. Wierzbowski T. Materiały do dziejów piśmiennictwa polskiego i biografii pisarzy polskich. T. 1: 1398–1600. Warszawa: Drukarnia L. Szkaradziński i S-ki, 1900. 641 s.

Published and reprinted sources

1. Bobkova O. V. Sheet of the scribe of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Eliaz Pielgrzymowski. August 1600 // Historical Archive, No. 6. 2004. P. 199–201.
2. Verzhbovsky F. F. Materials on the history of the Moscow state in the XVI and XVII centuries. Issue 3: The Time of Troubles in contemporary Polish literature. Part 1: 1605–1607. Warsaw: Type. Warsaw School District, 1900. 163 p.
3. Zholkevsky S. Notes of Hetman Zholkevsky on the Moscow War, published by Pavel Aleksan. Mukhanov. 2nd edition. St. Petersburg: printing house of Eduard Prats, 1871. 300 p.
4. The Zholkevsky manuscript. The Notes of Stanislav Nemoevsky (1606-1608). The Zholkevsky manuscript / comp. A. I. Tsepkov. Ryazan: Alexandria, 2006. 496 p.
5. The Russian Historical Library, published by the Archeographic Commission. Vol. 1: Monuments related to the Time of Troubles / [edited by Prof. S. F. Platonov]. St. Petersburg: Printing house of V. I. Golovin, 1872. 846 p.
6. Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis / red. A. Chmiel. Cracoviae: Universitatis Jagellonicae, 1904. T. 3 : 1551–1606.
7. Anonim. O Dymitrze // Pamiętnik sandomierski / wyd T. Ujazdowski. T. 2. Poszyt 7. Warszawa: [s.l.], 1830. S. 410–413.
8. Archiwum domu Sapiechów. T. 1: Listy z lat 1575–1606 / wyd. A. Prochaska. Lwów: nakł. Rodziny, 1892. 577 s.
9. Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziełek, na przyjazd do Wilna króla JMści, Senatu y Rycerstwa tudzież mowa po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska JW. J. MC. P. Chrystophowi Montwidowi Dorohostajskiemu marszałkowi W. X. Lit. // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczęda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 374–386.

10. Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 357–367.
11. Czubek J. Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego, 1606–1608. T. 1: Poezya rokoszowa. Kraków: nakł. Akademji Umiejętności, 1916. 375 s.
12. Diariusz Drogi Krola Jmci Zygmunta III Od Szczesliwego Wyjazdu Z Wilna Pod Smolensk W Roku 1609 a Die 18 Augusta I Fortunnego Powodzenia Przez Lat Dwie Do Wziecia Zamku Smolenska W Roku 1611 / [oprac. J. Byliński]. Wrocław: Wydawn. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1999. 302 s.
13. Gradowski F. Hodoeporicon Moschicum. Wyprawa moskiewska. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich, 2011. 163 p.
14. Jurkowski J. Tragedia o polskim Scylurusie y o trzech synach koronnych Oyczyzny polskiej / oprac. S. Pigoń. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1949. 68 s.
15. Klonowic S. F. Dzieła Fabiana Sebastiana Klonowicza / wyd. J. N. Bobrowicz. Lipsk: druk. Breitkopfa et Haertela, 1836. T. II. 158 s.
16. Krajewski J. Chronologia wojny Moskiewskiej przez Jana Krajewskiego pilnie opisana // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 454–480.
17. Krajewski J. Tryumph poznański Ná radosną victoryą K. Je° M. po wzięciu Smoleńská, który się odprávvovvał 3 dnia Lipcá 1611. Przez Jana Kraiewskiego Kom. K. J. M. teraz novvo vvydány. Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 367–374.
18. Marchocki M. Historia wojny moskiewskiej // Moskwa w rękach Polaków. Pamiętniki dowódców i oficerów garnizonu polskiego w Moskwie w latach 1610-1612 / Oprac. Kubala M., Ścieżor T. Kraków: Platan, 1995. S. 53–55.

19. Miaskowski K. Zbiór rytmów / wyd. A. Nowicka-Jeżowa // Biblioteka pisarzy staropolskich. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 1995. T. 3. 494 s.
20. Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. 524 s.
21. Ozimiński B. Szturm pocieszny smoleński // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 330–340.
22. Palczowski P. Kolęda moskiewska / wyd. i oprac. G. Franczak // Biblioteka Dawnej Literatury Popularnej i Okolicznościowej. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2010. T. 6. 146 s.
23. Petrycy S. Horatius flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2006. 458 s.
24. Piasecki P. Kronika Pawła Piaseckiego, biskupa przemyskiego / polski przekład wedle dawnego rękopisu, poprzedzony studjum krytycznym nad życiem i pismami autora / wstęp J. Bartoszewicz, przekł. A. Chrzęszczewski. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1870. 457 s.
25. Pielgrzymowski E. Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta Trzeciego / wyd. i oprac. R. Krzywy. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2010. 454 s.
26. Rymsza A. Deketeros akroama, to jest Dziesięćcrocna powieść wojennych spraw Krysztofa Radziwiła // Archiwum Literackie. T. XVI. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1972. S. 133–223.
27. Strykowski M. O początkach, wywodach, dzielnościach, sprawach rycerskich i domowych sławnego narodu litewskiego, żemojdzkiego i ruskiego, przedtym nigdy od żadnego ani kuszone, ani opisane, z natchnienia Bożego a uprzejmię pilnego doświadczenia / oprac. J. Radziszewska. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1978. 762 s.
28. Świątkiewicz A. Ostatni szturm na Smoleńsk // Kwartalnik Historyczny. T. 6. Lwów: TH, 1892. S. 90–92.

29. Szymon Marycjusz z Pilzna. O szkołach, czyli akademiach ksiąg dwoje / przeł. A. Danysz, wstęp H. Barycz. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1955. 269 s.
30. Tryumf niezwyciężonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III, z łaski Bożej królowi polskiemu // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 349–356.
31. Witkowski S. Wanda na szczęśliwe zwrócenie Je[go] Królewskiej Miłości z zwycięstwa moskiewskiego // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 386–396.
32. Witkowski S. Safo słowieńska na grzmotną sławę z zwycięstwa smoleńskiego // Moskiewski Mars. Wiersze polskie czasu pierwszej dymitriady (1605–1612). Antologia / [oprac. A. Oszczyda]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2016. S. 396–417.
33. Żółkiewski S. Pisma Stanisława Żółkiewskiego kanclerza koronnego i hetmana / wyd. A. Bielowski. Lwów: Drukarnia Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, 1861. 628 s.
34. Żółkiewski S. Początek i progres wojny moskiewskiej / wstęp i komentarz W. Sobieskiego. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1920. 100 s.
35. Żółkiewski S. Początek i progres wojny moskiewskiej, powst. 1612 / wyd. K. Słotwiński pt. Historia wojny moskiewskiej aż do opanowania Smoleńska. Lwów: [s.l.], 1833. 213 s.

Old printed sources

1. Avviso della gran vittoria ottenuta da Sigismondo III, re di Polonia, appresso Riga, il 27 settembre 1605, contro il duca Carlo di Sudermania. Roma: Guglielmo Facciotto. 1605. 4 k.

2. Bartoszewski W. Pienia wesołe dziełek, na przyjazd do Wilna króla JMści, Senatu y Rycerstwa tudzież mowa po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska JW. J. MC. P. Christophowi Montwidowi Dorohostayskiemu marszałkowi W. X. Lit. Wilno: Jan Karcan, 1611. 16 k.
3. Bartoszewski W. Trzy columny od trzech cnot na pogrzeb godney pamięci kniazia Mikołaiia Kroszyńskiego, dzielnego y zacnie urodzonego rycerza, w Moskwie pod Smoleńskiem zmarłego. Przez Walentego Bartoszewskiego na wieczną pamiątkę wystawione. Probos mores, sua praemia non relinquunt. W Wilnie: w drukarni Jana Karcana. 1611. 16 k.
4. Bielski M. Kronika tho iest historya swiata na sześć wiekow. Kraków: v Máttheuszá Siebeneychera, 1564. 467 k.
5. Bielski M. Kronika wszystkiego świata na sześć wieków, monarchie cztery rozdzielona, z kosmografią i z rozmaitemi królestwy, tak pogańskimi, żydowskiemi, jako i krześcijańskimi, z Sybillami i prorocctwy ich, po polsku pisana, z figurami, w której też żywoty cesarskie, papieskie i tych królów z ich królestwy, asyryjskich, egipskich, żydowskich, greckich, perskich, tureckich, węgierskich, czeskich i inych królów, książąt, jako inych przełożonych, od początku świata aż do tego roku, który się pisze 1551, są wypisane, między któremi też nasza Polska na ostatku z osobna jest wypisana. W Krakowie : [u Unglerowej] wdowy, [1551]. 823 s.
6. Bielski S. Diariusz Wiadomości od wyjazdu K.I.M. z Wilna do Smoleńska. [S.l., 1610]. 36 s.
7. Biesiady Rozkoszne Baltyzera z Kaliskiego Powiatu. [S.l., po 1610]. 20 k.
8. Borastus G. Panegyricus Sigismundo III. Poloniae et Sveciae Regi etc. etc. invictissimo a Gregorio Laurentio Borasto Gotto dicatus. Vilnae: in typograpia Petri Blasti, 1611. 4°. 42 k.
9. Breve e vera relazione dell'acquisto e la presa della città di Smolensk in Moscovia. Roma: Giacomo Mascardi, 1611. 4 k.
10. Chlebowski W. Tryumf radosny wszystkich obywatelów koronnych y wielk. księztwa litewskiego, z sławnego zwycięztwa Nayiaśnieyszego i

- niezwyciężonego monarchy Zygmunta III., który po wzięciu stolicy Moskiewskiej y zamków przyległych, napotężniejszy Smoleńsk szczęśliwie opanował. Kraków: [s.l.], 1611. 4 k.
11. De scholis seu academiis libri duo. Kraków: drukarnia H. Szarffenberg, 1551. 192 s.
 12. Drei merkliche Relationen. Erste von der Viktoria Sigismunds III., des Königs von Polen und Schweden, welche er über die Moskowiter erhalten und die Festung Smolensk, am 13. Juni 1611 erobert hat. Augsburg: Chrysostomus Dabertzhoffer, 1611. 8 k.
 13. Ein neues Lied von der Belagerung der Stadt Riga und Schlacht bei Kirchholm zwischen dem Feldobersten von Polen Johann Karl Chodkiewicz und Herzog Karl aus Schweden am 27. September 1605. [S.l.], 1605. 8 k..
 14. Gradovius F. Hodoeporicon Moschicum Illustrissimi Principis ac Domini Christophori Radivvilonis, Ducis in Birza et Dubinga, Castellani Trocensis, Vicecancellarij et campiductoris in Magno Ducatu Lituaniae, Capitanei Borissoviensis et Solecensis etc. Scriptum a Francisco Gradouio. Vilnae: [s.l.], 1582. 18 p.
 15. Grochowski S. Piesni na fest ućieszny wielkim dwiema narodom polskiemu y moskiewskiemu, przemoznego monarchy Dymitra Iwanowica cara moskiewskiego [...] od autora powtore wydane, z przyczynieniem niektorych rytmow, do slawy tegoz wielkiego cara sluzacych. W Krakowie: w drukarniey Jana Szeligi, 1606. 17 k.
 16. Gwagnini A. Kronika Sarmacyey Europejskiej, w ktorey sie zamyka krolestwo Polskie...: Tudziez też Wielkie Xięstwo Litewskie, Ruskie, Pruskie, Zmudzkie, Inflantskie, Moskiewskie y część Tatarow Przez Alexandra Gwagnina [...] Pierwey Roku 1578 po Lacinie wydana ; A teraz zas z przyczynieniem tych Krolow, ktorych w Lacińskiej niemaß, Tudziez krolestw [...] Przez tegoż Authora [...] Rozdziałami na X Ksiąg krociuchno zebrana, A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego za staraniem Authorowym z Lacińskiego na Polskie przełożona. Kraków: Drukarnia Mikołaiia Loba, 1611. 843 s.

17. Herberstein S. von. *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*. Basileae: Per Ioannem Oporinum, 1556. 175 p.
18. Hoffmanski M. *Wojna smoleńska, w której słuszne przyczyny Króla Jego Mości podniesienia wojny [...] przytem wyprawa, ciągnienie, powód wzięcia i opanowania Moskwy [...] do tego i szturm Smoleńska szczęśliwy [...] także tryumfy Króla Jego Mości [...] krótko opisane*. Poznań: J. Wolrab, 1611. 67 k.
19. Hofmański, Michał. *Porażka cudowna wojska moskiewskiego*. Poznań: Jan Wolrab, 1611. 8 k.
20. Horatius Flaccus. *Poetarum institutiones ad pisones*. Q. Horatij flaccij *Carmen seculare*. G. L. Cracovie: Kasper Hochfeder, 1505. 16 k.
21. Hyacinthus B. *Panegyricus In Excidium Polocense atq[ue] in memorabilem Victoriam Stephani invictissimi Poloniarum Regis magniq[ue] Ducis Lituaniae ex potentissimo Moschorum Principe III. Cal. Septemb. MDLXXIX. Reportatam*. Patavii: apud Laurentium Pasquatam, 1580. 24 p.
22. *In triumpho serenissimi ac potentissimi principis Sigismundi III. Poloniae et Sveciae Regis etc. etc. è Moscovia post insignes gloriose partas victorias feliciter redeuntis. Oratio Caesaris Baroffii Mediolanensis J. V. D. protonotarii ap. et illustrissimi ac reverendissimi Domini D. Comitis Francisci Simonetae, episcopi Fulginatensis, nuncii in Regno Polon. apostolici, a secretis*. Vilnae: Petri Blasti Kmitae, 1612. 15 k.
23. Jurkowski J. *Hymenaeus niaśnieysze[go] monarchy Dymitra Iwanowica, z łaski Bożey wielkiego cara moskiewskiego, wołodimirskie[go], rezańskie[go], nowogrodzkiego, etc. etc., wielkieg[o] hospodara iugurskieg[o], lapskiego, obdorskiego, etc. etc., cara razańskiego, astrahańskiego, sibirskiego, inowłayce y dziedzica ruskiego, y niasnieyszey paniey, iey mości paniey Marynie, carowey moskiewskiej etc. etc., iaśnie wielmożne[go] pana, p[ana] Ierze[go] Mniszka [sic] z Wielkich Kończyc, wojewody sędomiarskiego, lwowskiego, samborskiego, medeńskiego etc. starosty, córki; przez Iana Iurkowskiego wydany*. Kraków: Wojciech Kobyliński, 1605. 6 k.

24. Klonowic S. F. Pożar wojny Tureckiej. Upominanie do gaszenia i wróżka o upadku mocy tureckiej. [S.l.], 1597. 16 k.
25. Kobierzycki S. Historia Vladislai Poloniae et Sueciae principis, ejus natales, infantiam, electionem usque ad excessum Sigismundi III. Gdańsk: sumptibus Georgii Försteri, 1655. 952 p.
26. Krajewski J. Chronologia woyny Moskiewskiey przez Jana Krajewskiego pilnie opisana. 1615. Cic. Is est verus triumphus cum bene meritis de Repub. testimonium a consensu civitatis datur. Honor enim est praemium virtutis studio judicioque alicujus ad aliquem delatum etc. Szablą słynąc, piękna rzecz, kto na sławę robi: Pismem się cnota każda winosi y zdo. Kraków: Bazyli Skalski drukował, [1615]. 32 k.
27. Krajewski J. Tryumph poznański Ná radosną victoryą K. Je^o M. po wzięciu Smoleńską, który się odprávvovwał 3 dnia Lipcá 1611. Przez Jana Kraiewskiego Kom. K. J. M. teraz novvo vvydány. Poznań: w drukárniey Janá Wolrabá, 1611. 5 k.
28. Krótkie a prawdziwe opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska. [S.l.], 1611. 2 k.
29. Libenrodensi I. M. Divina gratia imperante Sigismundo Augusto Polonorum rege potentissimo, Magno Lithuaniae Duce etc. Victoria de Moschis reportata a Magnifico Domino Gregorio Chodcieuitio Castellano Vilmensi, Capitaneo Grodnensi, stipendiarii militis supremo gubernatore. Viennae: ex officinal Michaelis Zimmermani, 1564. 24 p.
30. Liffel S. Gody moskiewskie tamże na Moskwi opisane. Kraków: w drukarni Symona Kęmpiniusa, 1607. 16 k.
31. Loechius A. Na szczęśliwe y pożądane zwrocenie się JK Mści Zygmunta III do Wilna po rekuperowaniu Smoleńska. Wilno: [s.l.], 1611. 8 k.
32. Łubieński S. Oratio saluatoria a Stanislao Lubienio Canonico Varsav. ad Sigismundum III cum capto Smolensco, Varsaviam redux Basilicam visitaret, nomine Capituli Varsaviensis. [S.l.], 1611. 8 k.
33. Mercurius Sauromaticus sive rerum in septentrionalibus regnis in decursu 1605 anni gestarum, relatio in gratiam lectoris novorum cupidi ex peregrino idiomate

- in Latinum versa. Darzu Eigentliche Beschreibung der Königlichen Hochzeit in Polen. Welcher gestalt der Eintritt, Krönung, Vermehlung, auch andere Ceremonien und Solennitäten, vorgangen: Dessgleichen was sonst für Pracht und Pomp, getrieben, so vor dieser Zeit nie gesehen noch gehört worden. Gehalten in der Königlichen Statt Cracaw, im Monat Decemb. nechst abgewichenen 1605 Jahrs. Mainz: [s.l.], 1606. 12 k.
34. Miaskowski K. Nenia na rozruch domowy // Zbiór rytmów. Kraków: drukarnia B. Skalski, 1612. 275 s.
 35. Modrzewski F. A. Andrzejca Fricza Modrzewskiego O poprawie Rzeczypospolitey księgi czwore. Przez Cypriana Bazilika z lacińskiego na Polski przetłumaczone. Łosk: Jan Karcan, 1577. 299 s.
 36. Modrzewski F. A. Commentariorum de Republica emendanda libri quinque. Basileae: J. Oporinus, 1551. 393 s.
 37. Montelupi V. Gratulationes in reditum Serenissimi et Potentissimi Sigismundi III. D. G. Poloniae et Sveciae Regis Magnique Lithuaniae Ducis etc. Victoris, de Moschovia triumphantis a Valerio Montelupi de Mari philosophiae studioso in collegio romano Societ. Jesu. Posnaniae: ex typographia Joannis Wolrabi. 1611. 51 k.
 38. Nowiny z Inflant o porażce, która się stała nad Karolem, księciem Sudermańskim przez Jana Karola Chodkiewicza dnia 27 września 1605. Kraków: Mikołaj Scharffenberger, 1605. 4 k.
 39. O rekuperowaniu Smoleńska od Moskwy przez Zygmunta III dnia 13 czerwca 1611. Wilno: Jan Karcan, 1611. 4 k.
 40. Ozimiński, Baltazar. Szturm pocieszny smoleński, który był odprawowany szczęśliwie w roku terażniejszym 1611, 13 dnia czerwca. Wilno: Jan Karcan, 1611. 8 k.
 41. Palczowski P. Kolęda moskiewska. To iest, Woyny Moskiewskiej, Przyczyny Sluszne, Okazyja pozadana, Zwycięstwa nadzieia wielka, Państwa tam tego pożytki y bogactwa, nigdy nieoszacowane. Krótko opisane Przez Pawła

- Palczowskiego, z Palczowic, Szlachćica Polskiego. Kraków: Mikołaj Szarffenberger, 1609. 36 k.
42. Palczowski P. Status Venetorum Fsiue Brevis tractatus de origine et vetustate Venetorum, traktat po łacinie o ustroju Republiki Weneckiej. Cracoviae: in officina Lazari, 1604. 47 s.
43. Palczowski P. Wyprawa wojenna Króla Jego Mości do Moskwy da Bóg szczęśliwa, Rzeczypospolitej naszej pożyteczna. Wilno: Jan Karcan, 1609. 15 k.
44. Paszkowski M. Opisanie wzięcia Smoleńska przez niezwycięzonego monarchę Zygmunta III / Gwagnini A. Kronika Sarmacyjej Europejskiej. Kraków: Mikołaj Lob, 1611. Ks. 7. S. 80–81.
45. Paszkowski M. Posiłek Bellony słowieńskiej szlachetnemu rycerstwu Dymitra Iwanowicza W[ielkiego] Cara Moskiewskiego przeciwko Sujskiemu i inszym zdrajcom jego. Marcina Paszkowskiego. W Krakowie: [s.l.], 1608. 8 k.
46. Paszkowski M. Wizerunk wiecznej sławy Saurmatow starych, pobudzający młódz rycerską ku naśladowaniu spraw ich. Od szlachetnej Pallady, z Gniazda cnót ich, w ojczystym Parnasie wbudowany. A przez Marcina Paszkowskiego, z przykłady mężów rzymskich, onych wielkich miłośników Ojczyzny, opisany i wydany. Hic sibi delegit sedem pulcherrina virtus, Hinc sua Sauromatas, fors super astra vehit. Kraków: u dziedziców Jakuba Siebeneichera, 1613. 11 k.
47. Paszkowski M. Wykład bogiń słoweńskich, wesołego widzenia słońca z Panną, w złotym kole nad Krakowem. [S.l.], 1608. 8 k.
48. Petrycy S. Horatius Flaccus w trudach więzienia moskiewskiego na utulenie żalów... w lyryckich pieśniach zawarty. Kraków: w drukarni Bazylego Skalskiego, 1609. 204 s.
49. Piasecki P. Chronica gestorum in Europa singularium. Kraków: drukarnia F. Cezary, 1645. 627 s.
50. Pieśń o tyránstwie Szuyskiego, teraz uczyniona Roku Panskiego 1609. [S.l.], 1609. 2 k.

51. Poseł z Moskwy, który przez Litwę idąc, potkał go szlachcic polski i pytał o nowiny. [S.l.], 1608. 6 k.
52. Radawski A. Victoria de Moscho, Sigismundo III. Rege Maximo, triumphatore regnante, relata. Illustribus et Magnificis D. Joanni, D. Constantino Principibus Ostrogiensibus, Palatin. Wolynensibus dicata ab Alberto Radawski S. C. Cracoviae: In Offic. Joannis Scharffenberger, 1611. 2 k.
53. Radvanus I. Radivilias, sive, De vita, et rebus praeclarissime gestis, immortalis memoriae, illustrissimi principis Nicolai Radivili Georgii filii, ducis in Dubinki ac Bierze [...] libri quatuor, Ioannis Radvani Lit[uani]; iussu ac auctoritate mag. d. Ioannis Abramowicz, in Worniany [...] Addita est oratio funebris, generosi d. Andreae Volani, secretarii sacrae regiae magestatis, et quorundam auctorum epigrammata, vilnae metropoli lituanorum: ex officina Ioannis Kartzani. Vilnae: Ex Officina Joannis Kartzani, [1592]. 168 s.
54. Rudimenta cosmographica. Kraków: Universitatis Jagellonicae, 1530. 78 k.
55. Rymsza A. Deketeros Akroama to jest dziesięćroczna powieść wojennych spraw oświeconego księżęcia i pana, pana Krzysztofa Radziwiła, księżęcia na Birżach i Dubinek, pana trockiego, podkanclerzego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i hetmana polnego, borysowskiego, soleckiego etc. starosty. Ku temu posługi niektórych rotmistrzów i ludzi rycerskich pod sprawą jego mości będących są przypomnione i imiona napisane, która się poczyna od roku po narodzeniu Pana Chrystusowym 1572 aż do roku, który pisano 1582. Wilno: przez Daniela Łęczyckiego, 1585. 88 s.
56. Semusouio I. S. Conflictus ad Nevelam Polonorum cum Moschis. Bononiae: [s.l.], 1568. 68 p.
57. Skarga P. Na Moskiewskie zwycięstwo Kazanie y Dzięki Panv Bogv. Czynione w Wilnie 25. Iulii, w dzień S. Iákubá, 1611. ná przyjazd szczęśliwy Krolá I. M. Przez X. Piotra Skarge Societatis Iesv. W Krakowie: z Drukarni Andrzeia Piotrkowczyka, 1611. 8 k.

58. Strykowski M. *Goniec cnoty do prawych slachciczow w którym są przykłady spraw mężow zacnych. Przytym napominanie Oyczyzny ku prawdziwym synom.* Kraków: Maciej Wirzbięta, 1574. 85 k.
59. Strykowski M. *Kronika polska, litewska, zmodzka i wszystkiej Rusi.* Krolewiec: v Gerzego Osterbergerá, 1582. 791 s.
60. *Szturm smoleński.* Poznań: Jan Wolrab, 1611. 1 k.
61. *Tryumf niezwycięzonemu monarsze Zygmuntowi III.* Kraków: B. Skalski, 1611. 4 k.
62. Twardowski S. *Władysław IV, król polski i szwedzki.* Leszno: drukarnia D. Vetter, 1649. 275 s.
63. *Viktoria Sigismundi III., Königs von Polen und Schweden, welche er über der Moskowiter Festung Smolensk erhalten und dieselbige am 13. Juni 1611 erobert hat.* [S.l.], 1611. 4 k.
64. *Viktoria und Sieg Sigismundi III., welche Ihre Königliche Majestät am 13. Juni 1611 wider die Festung Smolensk erhalten hat.* [S.l.], 1611. 4 k.
65. *Wahrhaftige Neue Zeitung und Beschreibung der sieghaften Schlacht Sigismundi III., Königs von Polen, durch Carolum Chodkiewicz mit Carolo Fürsten von Sudermanland.* [S.l.], 1605. 5 k.
66. Wassenberg E. *Gestorum Wladislai IV, Poloniae et Succide Regis, pars I principem panegyricè representans, pars II Regem panegyricè repraesentans.* Gedanii: typis Hünefeldianis, 1643. 208+257 (465) s.
67. Witkowski S. *Sapho Słowienska Ná grzmotną sławę z zwycięstwá Smolenskiego. Ku oddániu winnego podziękowánia Przedwiecznemu, á wieczney pámiątce y nieśmiertelney sławie Iego Krolewskiey Miłości Páná, Páná nam szczęśliwie pánuiącego. Stanisława Witkowskiego, wiernego poddánego Io Krolewskiey Miłości. Ouidius Lib. 12. Methamor. Fama tenet, summaq; domum sibi legit in arce, Innumerosq; aditus, ac mille foramina tectis Addidit, & nullis inclusit limina portis. Nocte dieq; patet, tota est ex aere sonanti, Tota fremit, vocesq; refert, iteratq; quod audit.* Kraków: z Drukárni Andrzeiá Piotrkowczyká, 1611. 16 k.

68. Witkowski S. Wanda Ná szczęśliwe zwrocenie Ieo Krolewskiej Miłości z zwycięstwá Moskiewskiego. Pod consultáciami Seymu wálnego Wárszawskiego, w Roku 1611. Dniá 26. Mieściá Wrześniá. Pisana przez Stanisława Witkowskiego. Euripides. Consilium sapienter inicum, multas manus vincit: imperitia verò cum multitudine, deterius malum est. W Krakowie: z Drukarni Andrzeiá Piotrkowczyká, 1611. 8 k.
69. Żabczyc J. Mars moskiewski krwawy. Kraków: drukarnia M. Szarffenbergera, 1605. 24 k.
70. Żabczyc J. Mars moskiewski krwawy (wyd. 2). Kraków: drukarnia M. Szarffenbergera, 1606. 24 k.
71. Żabczyc J. Poseł moskiewski. Kraków: drukarnia M. Szarffenbergera, 1605. 8 k.
72. Żabczyc J. Poseł moskiewski (wyd. 2). Kraków: drukarnia M. Szarffenbergera, 1606. 8 k.
73. Żabczyc J. Żegnanie ojczyzny możnej cesarzowej moskiewskiej. Kraków: drukarnia M. Szarffenbergera, 1606. 8 k.

Pictorial sources

1. Burova O., Ivanov V. S. "There is no such force that would enslave us" (Kuzma Minin). Poster. Moscow: Publishing house "Art", 1942. 1 l.
2. Burova O., Ivanov V. S. "Our truth. Fight to the death!" (Dmitry Pozharsky). Poster. Moscow: Publishing house "Art", 1942. 1 l.
3. Dolabella T. Zygmunt III jako zwycięzca pod Smoleńskiem (w stroju polskim). Miedzioryt T. Dolabelli z 1611 r. Dział Dokumentacji Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie. Fot. ze zb. Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie. 1 k.
4. Dolabella T. Zygmunt III jako wódz w kampanii 1609. Miedzioryt W. Kiliana, dedykacja królowi. Muzeum Hist. m. st. Warszawy Fot. M. H. m. st. Warszawy. [S.l.], 1609.

Historical works

1. Alexandrenko V. N. Materials on the Time of Troubles in Russia of the XVII century // *Antiquity and novelty*. Book 14. 1911. P. 185–453.
2. Alexandrov S. V. Smolensk siege. 1609–1611. Moscow: Veche, 2011. 304 p.
3. Antonov D. I. The amusing hell of False Dmitry, or the monster on the Moskva River // *In Umbra: Demonology as a semiotic system. The Almanac. Issue 2 / Rev. ed. and comp. D. I. Antonov, O. B. Khristoforova. M., 2013. P. 45–56.*
4. Antonov D. I. Smuta in the culture of medieval Russia: the evolution of ancient Russian mythologies in the bookishness of the early XVII century. Moscow: RSUH, 2009. 448 p.
5. Arzhakova L. M. The Turkish theme in Peter Skarga's "Sejm sermons" // *Problems of social history and culture of the Middle Ages and early Modern times. Issue 5. St. Petersburg, 2005. P. 75–86.*
6. Arzhakova L. M. The Turkish question in Polish journalism of the end of the XVI century: thesis... Candidate of Historical Sciences: 07.00.03. Moscow, 1999. 233 p.
7. Bockman H. The German Order: Twelve chapters from its history. Moscow: Ladomir, 2004. 273 p.
8. Voytak M. Genology of everyday texts // *Genres of speech. No. 1(11), 2015. P. 38–50.*
9. Gipich V. V. The Moscow state of the first half of the XVII century and the "Time of Troubles" in the writings of Polish burghers // *Time of Troubles in Russia: conflict and dialogue of cultures. St. Petersburg, 2012. P. 55–59.*
10. Golenishchev-Kutuzov I. N. The Italian Renaissance and Slavic literature of the XV-XVI centuries. Moscow: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1963. 415 p.
11. Gralja H. "In der Tyrannen Hand": The Russian colonization of Livonia in the second half of the XVI century. Plans and results // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana. No. 2(16). 2014. P. 175–193.*

12. Dvornichenko A. Y. Smuta as a factor of Russian history // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. History*. 2018. Vol. 63. Issue. 3. P. 677–701.
13. Dzarnovich O. I. Matey Strykovsky's poem "The Battle of Ula" (1564): A figurative series and event specifics // *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana*. 2010. No. 2(8). P. 127–134.
14. Doroshkevich V. I. *New latin poetry of Belarus and Lithuania: the first half of the XVI century*. Minsk: Science and Technology, 1979. 208 p.
15. Zhukovich P. N. The Moscow turmoil of the beginning of the XVII century and its reflection in the Lithuanian-Polish state // *Christian reading*. 1902. No. 11. P. 629–664.
16. Kovalev S. *Heroic and epic poetry of Belarus and Lithuania at the end of the XVI century*. Minsk: universitetskoe, 1993. 102 p.
17. Kovalev S. *Multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Renaissance*. Minsk: Knigosbor, 2010. 376 p.
18. Karnaukhov D. V. The historical image of Muscovy in the Polish chronography of the Renaissance // *Bulletin of the Russian State University for the Humanities*. 2008. № 10. P. 101–114.
19. Karnaukhov D. V. *Concepts of the history of medieval Russia in the Polish chronography of the Renaissance*. Novosibirsk: NGPU, 2010. 291 p.
20. Karnaukhov D. V. The Polish-language historical book in the intellectual culture of the Renaissance // *Humanities in Siberia*. 2008. No. 3. P. 34–37.
21. Karnaukhov D. V. The problem of Russian chronicle sources by Jan Dlugosh and Maciej Strykovsky in Russian and foreign historiography // *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*. 2011. No. 346. P. 69–73.
22. Kozlyakov V. N. *False Dmitry I*. Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya, 2009. 256 p.
23. Kostomarov N. I. *The Time of Troubles. The Moscow state at the beginning of the XVII century*. Historical monographs and research. M., 2008. 784 p.
24. Kurbatov O. A. *Military history of the Russian Troubles of the beginning of the XVII century*. Moscow: Quadriga, 2014. 232 p.
25. Le Goff J. *The Birth of Europe*. St. Petersburg: Alexandria, 2008. 400 p.

26. Nazarov V. D., Florya B. N. The peasant uprising led by I. I. Bolotnikov and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth // Peasant wars in Russia in the XVII–XVIII centuries: problems, searches, solutions. Moscow: Nauka, 1974. P. 327–353.
27. Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Latin-speaking poets of the XVI—XVII centuries - enlighteners of Belarus and Novolatinsk poetry as a phenomenon of Belarusian book culture // The role of enlighteners in Belarus and Turkey: materials of the international scientific and practical conference (Minsk, April 19, 2011). Minsk: RIGA, 2011. P. 84–89.
28. Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Belarusian Latin-language poem: late Renaissance and early Baroque. Minsk: Belarusian State University, 2011. 231 p.
29. Nekrasevich-Korotkaya J. V. Glory and the lament of a patriot and a prophet: the poem "Philopatris" (1597) // Acta Albaruthenica. 2003. No. 3. P. 8–10.
30. Nikolaev S. I. The works of Jan Zhabchits in Russian translations of the XVII century. // TODRL. T. 36. L., 1981. P. 163–192.
31. Nora P. Problematics of places of memory // France-memory. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press, 1999. P. 17–50.
32. Penskoï V. V. The Russian Turmoil of the beginning of the XVII century. Is it a local phenomenon or part of a global process? // The Time of Troubles in Russia: conflict and dialogue of cultures. St. Petersburg, 2012. P. 234–238.
33. Prohorenkov I. A. «Our people came to the walls with bombs in the crimson twilight...». Storming Smolensk through the eyes of a Polish poet // Rodina. 2013. No. 9. P. 29–30.
34. Prohorenkov I. A. Military and Political Printed Propaganda of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Late XVI – Early XVII Century: Printers in the Royal Service // Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana. 2021. № 2. P. 53–63.
35. Prohorenkov I. A. Riddle of the co-author of The “Chronicle of European Sarmatia” by Alexander Guagnini (about the book by Michal Kuran "Marcin

- Paszkowski-Poeta okolichnościowy i moralista z pervoi polovy XVII veku") / / *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Metropolitana*. 2014. No. 1. P. 193–205.
36. Prohorenkov I. A. Pavel Vlodkovits. The conflict between Poland and the German Order at the Constance Cathedral [Electronic resource] // *Problems of history and culture of medieval society. Materials of the XXXIII All-Russian conference of students, postgraduates and young scientists "Kurbatov readings" (November 26–29, 2013)* / Edited by A. Y. Prokopiev. St. Petersburg, 2013. P. 103–110.
 37. Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian literary propaganda of the Time of Troubles: to the issue of periodization // *The Slavic World: Community and Diversity. Theses of the conference of young scientists in the framework of the Days of Slavic Script and Culture. May 24–25, 2022* / Edited by E. S. Uzenyova, O. V. Khavanova. Moscow, 2022. P. 43–47.
 38. Prohorenkov I. A. Polish-Lithuanian political propaganda and its figurative series (on the example of rare editions of panegyric poetry of the era of the first Demetriades in the collections of the National Library of the Russian Federation) // *Book Antiquity*. Issue 4. 2018. P. 41–56.
 39. Prohorenkov I. A. The project of the Polish-Russian Union and the embassy of Lev Ivanovich Sapieha in 1600 on the pages of the rhymed diariush Eliaz Pielgrzymowski // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. History*. 2018. No. 3. P. 702–717.
 40. Prohorenkov I. A. Gathering the Old Russian heritage: discourses of history and geography of Russian lands in the chronographs of the 16th – first quarter of the 17th century and in the East European historical narrative // *Vestnik NNGU named after N.I. Lobachevsky*. 2017. № 2. P. 63–71.
 41. Prohorenkov I. A., Eilbart N. V. Military and political agitation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth against Ivan the Terrible: based on the materials of various literary monuments of the Livonian War era // *Scientific Dialogue*. 2023. Vol. 12. No. 6. P. 432–448.

42. Rogov A. I. Russian-Polish cultural relations in the Renaissance (Strykovsky and his chronicle). Moscow: Nauka, 1966. 311 p.
43. Selin A. A. The Time of Troubles in the historiography of recent years // The time of Troubles in Russia: conflict and dialogue of cultures. Materials of the scientific conference. St. Petersburg, October 12-14, 2012. St. Petersburg, 2012. P. 223–227.
44. Skrynnikov R. G. Russia at the beginning of the XVII century. Smuta. Moscow: Mysl, 1988. 283 p.
45. Skrynnikov R. G. Socio-political struggle in the Russian state at the beginning of the XVII century. Leningrad: LSU Publishing House, 1985. 327 p.
46. Filyushkin A. I. Inventing the first war of Russia and Europe: The Baltic wars of the second half of the XVI century through the eyes of contemporaries and descendants. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. 881 p.
47. Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the Baltic question at the end of the XVI – beginning of the XVII century. M.: Nauka, 1973. 224 p.
48. Florya B. N. The Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia and Russian society. Moscow: Indrik, 2005. 416 p.
49. Florya B. N. Russian-Polish relations and the political development of Eastern Europe in the second half of the XVI – early XVII centuries. Moscow: Nauka, 1978. 302 p.
50. Tsvetaev D. V. Tsar Vasily Shuisky with his brothers at the Warsaw Sejm. Warsaw: Printing House of the Warsaw School District, 1905. 43 p.
51. Shamin S. M. Foreign "pamphlets" and "curiosities" in Russia of the XVI – early XVIII century. Moscow: Publishing house "The Whole World", 2020. 391 p.
52. Eilbart N. V. "Horace for Marina Mnishek": heroes of the Time of Troubles in the poetry of Sebastian Petritsi // Scientific dialogue. 2017. No. 2. P. 216–233.
53. Eilbart N. V. The moral aspect of the Polish nobility's support of Russian impostors of the early XVII century: according to sources of Polish-Lithuanian origin // Scientific Dialogue. 2017. No. 1. P. 204–214.

54. Yusim M. A. Machiavelli. Morality, politics, fortune. The ethics of Machiavelli. Machiavelli in Russia. Moscow: CANON+, 2011. 580 p.
55. Balbuza K. Triumfator. Triumf i ideologia zwycięstwa w starożytnym Rzymie epoki cesarstwa. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2005. 358 s.
56. Bandtkie J. S. Wiadomość krótka o Gazetach Polskich, czytana na posiedzeniu Towarz. 15 Maia 1817 // Rocznik Towarzystwa Naukowego z Uniwersytetem Krakowskim Połączonego. T. 4. Kraków, 1819. S. 205–224.
57. Baranowski B. Znajomość Wshodu w dawnej Polsce do XVIII wieku. Łódź: Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1950. 256 s.
58. Bardach J. Historia państwa i prawa Polski. T. 1: Do połowy XV wieku. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964. 600 s.
59. Barłowska M. „Bo przystoi, by mężne tak wieziono ciała”. Mowy przy wyprowadzeniu ciała rycerza z obozu // Wschodni Rocznik Humanistyczny. T. 7. 2010–2011. S. 57–69.
60. Barłowska M. Słowo na theatrum wojny, czyli mowy pozostałe po czasach Dymitriad. Epizod smoleński // Napis. Seria XII. 2006. S. 209–229.
61. Bąkowski K. Dziennikarstwo krakowskie do roku 1848 // Rocznik Krakowski. T. 8. Kraków, 1906. S. 129–188.
62. Bentkowski F. Historya literatury polskiej. T. 2. Warszawa: Drukarnia Rządowa, 1814. 830 s.
63. Borek P. Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski w poezji rokoszowej z lat 1606–1608 // Napis. 2006. Seria XII. S. 49–62.
64. Buchwald-Pelcowa, P. Emblematy w drukach polskich i Polski dotyczących XVI–XVIII wieku. Bibliografia. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1981. 307 s.
65. Budzyńska-Daca A. O cudownym rozmnożeniu Dymitrów, czyli retoryka wielkiej mistyfikacji // Napis. Seria XII. 2006. S. 157–169.
66. Byliński J. Sejm z 1611 roku: w nowum opracowaniu. Wrocław: E-Wydawnictwo, 2016. 252 s.

67. Chłędowski A.T. O początkowych pismach periodycznych w języku polskim // *Pamiętnik Lwowski*. T.1, № 2. Lwow, 1816. S. 122–133.
68. Chrościcki J. A. Sztuka i polityka: funkcje propagandowe sztuki w epoce Wazów 1587–1668. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1983. 278 s.
69. Ciszewska M. Tulusz domowy: świeckie oratorstwo szlacheckie kręgu rodzinnego (XVII–XVIII wiek). Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2016. 579 s.
70. Czajewski W. Warszawa ilustrowana. T. IV: Czasopiśmiennictwo. Warszawa: Drukarnia Estetyczna Sierpińskiego, 1896. 160 s.
71. Czapliński W. O Polsce Siedemnastowiecznej. Problemy i sprawy. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1966. 291 s.
72. Czekańska A. Drugi etap rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego (X 1606 – VI 1608) w świetle wybranych druków ulotnych // *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia historica*, 96. 2016. S. 19–41.
73. Czwółek A. Lew Sapieha, dyplomata w służbie Zygmunta III // *Lev Sapieha (1557–1633) and his time*. Grodno: GrSU, 2007. S. 123–139.
74. Drob J. A. Obieg informacji w Europie w połowie XVII wieku. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993. 282 s.
75. Dziechcińska H. Zabawa jako komponent życia literackiego w dawnej Polsce // *Z dziejów życia literackiego w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku*. Praca zbiorowa pod red. H. Dziechcińskiej. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1980. S. 71–77.
76. Ehrlich L. Polski wykład prawa wojny XV wieku. Kazanie Stanisława ze Skarbimierza „De bellis iustis”. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Prawnicze, 1955. 266 s.
77. *Europa triumphans: court and civic festivals in early modern Europe* / edit. J.R. Mulryne, H. Watanabe-O'Kelly, M. Shewring, E. Goldring, S. Knight. Vol. 1–2. Aldershot-Burlington, 2004. 602, 471 s.

78. Gajda M. Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehy w Moskwie w latach 1600-1601 w świetle polskich relacji dyplomatycznych oraz relacji Izaaka Massy i Jacques'a Margereta // *Piotrkowskie Zeszyty Historyczne*. 2001. № 12/1. S. 124–144.
79. Gansiniec R. „Metrificale” Marka z Opatowca i traktaty gramatyczne XIV i XV wieku. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1960. 332 s.
80. Gorski K. Z dziejów walki o pokój i sprawiedliwość międzynarodową. Ostatnie słowo Pawła Włodkowica o Zakonie krzyżackim. Toruń: PWN, 1964. 44 s.
81. Gorski S. Dziennikarstwo polskie: zarys historyczny. Warszawa: nakładem i drukiem M. Arcta, 1905. 134 s.
82. Homa T. Rzeczpospolita. Wybrane zagadnienia myśli obywatelskiej Piotra Skargi SI. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Ignatianum, 2020. 224 s.
83. Jarczykowa M. Sponsorowana pochwała. Funeralia Radziwiłłowskie z XVII wieku napisane na zamówieni // *Napis*. 2019. Seria XXV. S. 19–36.
84. Jarczykowa M. Szturm Smoleński (13 VI 1611) w siedemnastowiecznych drukach okolicznościowych // *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. Knyga 32. 2011. S. 81–101.
85. Kersten A. W sprawie badań nad początkami prasy polskiej // *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1963. Z. 1. S. 69–83.
86. Kowalczyk J. Triumf i sława wojenna „all'antica” w Polsce XVI w. // *Renesans. Sztuka i ideologia*, red. T. Jaroszewski. Warszawa, 1976. S. 293–349.
87. Kozłowski S. Elekcja królewicza Władysława Wazy na tron moskiewski (1609–1612) // *Przegląd Powszechny*. R. 6. T. XXII. 1889. S. 20–39, 207–226.
88. Kraushar A. Z dziejów Warszawy: grobowiec carów Szujskich. Kraków: nakł. i druk W. L. Anczyca i Spółki, 1984. 29 s.
89. Krzysztofik M. Siedemnastowieczne kalendarzowe poglądy na temat problemów zewnętrznych i wewnętrznych Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 7–20.

90. Krzywy R. Adama Władysławiusza lamente „moskiewskie” w imieniu kobiet pisane // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 197–207.
91. Kulicka E. Legenda o rzymskim pochodzeniu Litwinów i jej stosunek do mitu sarmackiego // *Przegląd Historyczny*. 1980. T. 71, nr 1. S. 1–21.
92. Kuran M. Marcin Paszkowski — poeta okolicznościowy i moralista z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku. Łódź: Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2012. 664 s.
93. Kuran M. Moskiewska trylogia Jana Żabczyca // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 109–126.
94. Kuran M. Pamięć o heroicznym czynach i cnotach rycerskich sławnych obrońców ojczyzny utrwalona w kazaniach funeralnych Fabiana Birkowskiego OP // *Napis*. 2019. Seria XXV. S. 37–63.
95. Kuran M. Relacje o zdobyciu Smoleńska w 1611 roku – konwencje literackie i funkcje komunikacyjne // *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. Kn. 32. 2011. S. 57–80.
96. Lasswell G. D. *Propaganda Technique in the World War*. New York: Peter Smith, 1938. 233 p.
97. Lisichenok E. A., Prohorenkov I. A. The Oriental discourse in the anti-Moscow Posiłek Bellony Słowieńskiej by Marcin Paszkowski // *Res Historica*. № 40. 2015. P. 115–125.
98. Maciejowski W. A. *Piśmiennictwo polskie od czasów najdawniejszych aż do roku 1830*. T. 2. Warszawa: S. Orgelbrand, 1852. 986 s.
99. Maciszewski J. *Polska a Moskwa 1603-1618: opinie i stanowiska szlachty polskiej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968. 326 s.
100. Maciszewski J. *Szlachecka opinia publiczna w Polsce wobec interwencji Moskwy (1604–1609)* // *Kwartalnik Historyczny. Studia Sławistyczne*. Warszawa, 1963. T. 72. Z. 2. s. 363–386.
101. Maciszewski J. *Szlachta polska i jej Państwo*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1986. 305 s.
102. Maciszewski J. *Wojna domowa w Polsce (1606-1609): studium z dziejów walki przeciw kontrreformacji. Część I. Od Stężycy do Janowca*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1960. 342 s.

103. Majeranowski K. Wiadomość historyczno-krytyczna o pismach periodycznych najdawniejszych czasów aż do roku 1826 alfabetycznie zebrane // *Flora Polska*. T. 5. 1826. S. 34–64.
104. Markowska W. *Literatura Polska epoki Odrodzenia*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1956. 237 s.
105. Miakiszew W. They found wonderful and terrible animals... The World of Bizarre Animals in the Russian translation of the *Chronicles of the Whole World* by Martin Belsky // *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis*. No 3792, *Slavica Wratislaviensia CLXV*. Wrocław, 2017. S. 287–296.
106. Niedzielski K. *Pod Smoleńskiem i Moskwą lat temu trzysta. Kartka z dziejów. 1609–1612*. Warszawa, 1911. 190 s.
107. Niedźwiedź J. How did Virgil help forge Lithuanian identity in the sixteenth century? // *Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: its Impact on the Development of Identities*. Ed. G. Siedina. Firenze, 2014. P. 35–48.
108. Niedźwiedź J. *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655). Retoryczna organizacja miasta*. Kraków: Universitas, 2012. 502 s.
109. Niedźwiedź J. Polska i szwedzka epika propagandowa w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku // *Napis*. 2006. Seria XII. S. 319–330.
110. Niewolak-Krzywda A. Moralista, wizjoner czy towarzysz „frantowskiego cechu”? – Jan Jurkowski // *Pisarze staropolscy. Sylwetki*. T. 2. Warszawa, 1997. S. 576–608.
111. Nieznanowski S. *Staropolska epopeja historyczna. Kształtowanie się pojęcia, drogi rozwoju* // *Problemy literatury staropolskiej*. Seria 1. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1972. S. 391–426.
112. Nowak T. M. Zagadnienie wojny sprawiedliwej w polskiej literaturze prawnej XV i XVI wieku // *Napis*. Seria 7. 2001. S. 39–44.
113. Nowak-Dłużewski J. *Okolicznościowa poezja polityczna w Polsce*. [T. 4]. *Zygmunt III*. Warszawa: Instytut wydawniczy „Pax”, 1971. 440 s.

114. Nowicka-Jeżowa A. Sarmaci i śmierć. O staropolskiej poezji żałobnej. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1992. 339 s.
115. Nowicka-Jeżowa A. Siedemnastowieczna poezja funeralna w kręgu tradycji renesansowej. Przekształcenia i przewartościowanie // Przełom wieków XVI i XVII w literaturze i kulturze polskiej. Red. B. Otwinowska, J. Pelc. Wrocław, 1984. S. 193–210.
116. Oszczęda A. Mała Iliada – Nemezis kraju północnego Jakuba Duszy Podhoreckiego // Napis. Seria VII. 2001. S. 135–142.
117. Osterrieder M. Das wehrhafte Friedensreich: Bilder von Krieg und Frieden in Polen-Litauen (1505–1595). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2005. 330 p.
118. Oszczęda A. Tryumfy smoleńskie. Propagandowe treści wierszy triumfalnych z 1611 roku // Hołd carów Szujskich, pod red. J. A. Chrościckiego i M. Nagielskiego. Warszawa: Neriton, 2012. S. 69–92.
119. Oszczęda A. Poeta Wazów : studia o okolicznościowej poezji Stanisława Grochowskiego (1542–1612). Wrocław: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polonistyki Wrocławskiej, 1999. 202 s.
120. Oźlański A. Dwie mowy Wojciecha Miaskowskiego wygłoszone na pogrzebie Wojciecha Gajewskiego – edycja krytyczna // Meluzyna. № 2 (9). 2018. S. 71–94.
121. Pelc J. Renesans w literaturze polskiej. Początki i rozwój // Problemy literatury staropolskiej. Seria pierwsza / red. J. Pelc. Wrocław, 1972. S. 29–37.
122. Pfeiffer B. Caelum et regnum: studia nad symboliką państwa i władcy w polskiej literaturze i sztuce XVI i XVII stulecia. Zielona Góra: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego, 2002. 374 s.
123. Pirożyński J. Z dziejów obiegu informacji w Europie XVI wieku. Nowiny z Polski w kolekcji Jana Jakuba Wicka w Zurychu z lat 1560–1587. Kraków: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1995. 361 s.
124. Polak W. O Kreml i Smoleńszczyznę. Polityka Rzeczypospolitej wobec Moskwy w latach 1607–1612. Toruń: Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu, 1995. 486 s.

125. Poplatek J. Studia z dziejów jezuickiego teatru szkolnego w Polsce. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1957. 225 s.
126. Prochaska A. Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski. Warszawa: Wydawn. Kasy im. J. Mianowskiego Instytutu Popierania Nauki, 1927. 419 s.
127. Siarczyński F. Obraz wieku panowania Zygmunta III, króla polskiego i szwedzkiego, czyli obraz stanu, narodu i kraju. T. 1. Poznań: Księgarnia Nowa, 1843. 337 s.
128. Siarczyński F. Obraz wieku panowania Zygmunta III, króla polskiego i szwedzkiego, zawierający opis osób żyjących pod jego panowaniem. T. 2. Lwów: Józef Schnayder, 1828. 533 s.
129. Skwarczyńska S. O pojęcie literatury stosowanej // Pamiętnik Literacki : czasopismo kwartalne poświęcone historii i krytyce literatury polskiej. T. 28. № 1/4. S. 1–24.
130. Skwarczyńska S. Teoria listu. Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe we Lwowie, 1937. 373 s.
131. Sobieski W. Żółkiewski na Kremlu. Warszawa: nakładem Gebethnera i Wolffa, [1920]. 217 s.
132. Targosz K. Oprawa artystyczno-ideowa wjazdów weselnych trzech sióstr Habsburżanek (Kraków 1592 i 1605, Florencja 1608) // *Theatrum ceremoniale na dworze książąt i królów polskich. Materiały konferencji naukowej zorganizowanej przez Zamek Królewski na Wawelu i Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w dniach 23–25 marca 1998*, red. M. Markiewicz, R. Skowron. Kraków, 1999. S. 207–224.
133. Tatkiewicz W. Historia estetyki. T.3: Estetyka nowożytna. Wrocław–Warszawa: Zakł. Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1967. 570 s.
134. Taylor P. M. *Munitions of the mind. A history of propaganda from the ancient world to the present day*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1995. 324 p.
135. Tazbir J. Europa środkowowschodnia wobec „odkrycia Ameryki” // *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. № 4. 1991. S. 21–40.

136. Tazbir J. Szlachta a konkwistadorzy. Opinia staropolska wobec podboju Ameryki przez Hiszpanie. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawn. Naukowe, 1969. 170 s.
137. Trościński G. "Wiek naprawdę stracony". Poezja Sebastiana Petrycego jako świadectwo klęski wyprawy moskiewskiej // Napis. Seria XII. 2006. S. 139–155.
138. Trzej poetyccy świadkowie pierwszej dymitriady / opr. J. Wójcicki. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum, 2008. 203 s.
139. Tyszkowski K. Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehi w Moskwie 1600 r. Lwow: Nakł. Tow. Naukowego, 1927. 88 s.
140. Wielgus S. Polska średniowieczna doktryna „ius gentium”. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, 1996. 84 s.
141. Wiszniewski M. Historia literatury polskiej. T. VIII. Kraków: nakł. Akademii Umiejętności, 1851. 503 s.
142. Wojciechowski K. Piotr Skarga. Lwów: Macierz Polska, 1912. 116 s.
143. Woronczak J. Polskość i europejskość literatury naszego średniowiecza // Problemy literatury staropolskiej. Seria pierwsza / red. J. Pelc. Wrocław, 1972. S. 7–28.
144. Załęski S. Jezuici w Polsce. Lwów: Ludowej, 1901. T. 2. 851 s.
145. Zamoyski A. Polska. Opowieść o dziejach niezwykłego narodu 966–2008. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2011. 585 s.
146. Zawadzki K. Początki prasy polskiej: gazety ulotne i seryjne XVI–XVIII wieku. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa, 2002. 437 s.
147. Zawadzki K. Szesnastowieczne gazety ulotne polskie i Polski dotyczące. Terminologia. Definicja. Charakterystyka. Zagadnienia edytorskie i topograficzne // Rocznik Historii Czasopiśmiennictwa Polskiego. T. 11, z. 1. 1972. S. 5–37.
148. Żydek-Bednarczuk U. Typy, odmiany, klasy... tekstów. W poszukiwaniu kryteriów // Stylistyka a pragmatyka, red. B. Witosz. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2001. S. 114–125.