Endre SASHALMI, H-7624 Pécs, Rókus u. 2., Hungary, sashalmie@gmail.com

*ENDRE SASHALMI*

# The Image of the Enemy: Poles and Lithuanians in Russian Literary and Chancery Sources of the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries[*]

ॐ⳨

*Abstract*
The paper intends to highlight what the learned Muscovite perception of Russia's Western neighbour, Poland-Lithuania was in an era of intensive conflict represented by the Livonian War (1558-1583) and the Time of Troubles (1598-1613). The sources analysed convey the message that the wars waged by Russia were religious wars. The paper gives the outlines of the emergence of the anti-Latin attitude in Russia from the 13th century on and explores the appearance of the stereotype, the "Polish-Lithuanian people" common in the sources of early 17th-century Muscovy.

*Key words*
anti-Latin attitude, Latin heresy, "Polish-Lithuanian people",  Orthodox faith, Stephen Bathory, Confirmation Charter

In my paper I would like to highlight what the learned Muscovite perception of Russia's Western neighbour, Poland-Lithuania (1569) was in an era of intensive conflict represented by the Livonian War (1558-1582) and the Time of Troubles (1598-1613), known as the *smuta* in Russian historiography.

For the presentation of the first issue I will quote the relevant passages of two Russian narrative sources describing the campaign of Stephen Bathory against Pskov (1581-1582). The longer source bears the title, *The tale of the coming of Stephen, the Lithuanian king with a great and proud army against the great, glorious town of Pskov, which was saved by God …* and was written by an eyewitness of the siege of Pskov.[1] The much shorter narrative source is the relevan entry in the *Chronicle on the Pskovko-Pecherskij Monastery* for which the *Tale* served as a "raw material."[2] (This monastery, located 56 *verst*s from Pskov, was also attacked during the siege of Pskov.[3])

---

[*] This article is part of the research project supported by the Hungarian fund OTKA (reference number: T S 049775) and the academic research group hosted by the Centre for Russian Studies at ELTE (reference number: 2006 TK 1194).

[1] V. I. MALYSHEVA (ed.), *Povest' o prikhozhenii Stefana Batoriya na grad Pskov*, (Moscow-Leningrad: 1952) (hereafter: MALYSHEVA 1952) Introduction: 5-31; text: 35-106; Appendix: 109-113.

[2] MALYSHEVA 1952, Introduction, 27. The text of the entry is in the Appendix: 109-111.

[3] MALYSHEVA 1952, Introduction, 18.

What concerns the *smuta*, for the most part I will rely on the Confirmation Charter of Mikhail Romanov's election, a lengthy document composed in 1613, which can be considered the official interpretation of the *smuta*. The adjective *official* does not mean, of course, that it gave the most authentic description of events. It was, so to say, the official commentary of the *smuta* and Mikhail Romanov's election. In addition to that I have consulted other chancery sources written before and after 1613, in which references to the events of the *smuta* or its aftermath were made.

What dominates the sources is the religious perception of the enemy. Therefore the message of the sources is that the wars waged by Russia against her enemies, Christians and non-Christians alike, were religious wars. Indeed, in the 16th century Russians prayed the tsar to save them from "the Latin and Muslim world."[4] And when the question of ransoming Russian captives caught by the Tartars was raised during Ivan IV, it was enacted that only those should be ransomed, "who fought the Muslims for the orthodox Christian faith and for our *state* (*gosudarstvo*)".[5] These are clear proofs of a religious self-image and the religious perception of the enemy.

To understand the emergence of the term, "Polish and Lithuanian people", a term occurring as a stereotype in the sources of the *smuta* (including Mikhail Romanov's Confirmation Charter) the origins of the so-called anti-Latin attitude of the Russians should be dealt with. For "Polish and Lithuanian people" were identified by Russian sources of the early 17th century variably as representatives of "Latin heresy" and "Lutheran heresy". To be sure, "Latin heresy" (*latynskaya eres*), unlike "Lutheran heresy", had long been a commonplace by then.

Because of the time gap between the conversion of the King of Poland, and the Grand Duke of Lithuania, Poland was to be for centuries the "easternmost bastion" of the Latin Church. Hence, it was the Poles who represented the Latin Church for the people of the *Rus'*. It must be noted, however, that the anti-Latin attitude, despite of the presence of some anti-Latin polemical literature (predominantly of Byzantine origin), was not a dominant feature at all during the Kievan period in the lands of the *Rus'*, as one would hastily assume. From the recent literature on this issue the conclusions drawn by J. Fennell and S. Franklin should be quoted. Fennell devotes a whole chapter[6] to the problem in his book, *A History of the Russian Church to 1448* and concludes: "The little what we know

---

[4] J. H. BILLINGTON, *The Icon and the Axe. An Interpretive History of Russian Culture*, (New York: 1966) (hereafter: BILLINGTON 1966) 96.

[5] *Rossijskoe zakonodatel'stvo X-XX vekov*, (Moscow: 1985) Vol. II. 484.

[6] J. FENNELL, *A History of the Russian Church to 1448*, (London - New York: 1995) (hereafter: FENNELL 1995) chapter: 'Orthodox and Latins', 91-104.

about relations between the Russians and the Latins from 1054 to 1240 (or at any rate to 1204) shows a curious mixture of tolerance and moderation and an almost entire absence of hostile attitudes on either sides".[7] Franklin claims that the "lack of interest in Constantinopolitan cultural fashion and in the niceties of theological debate" allowed the people of the *Rus'* "to remain admirably ecumenical in outlook, able, for example to regard «Latins» amicably as fellow-Christians despite the best efforts of Byzantine churchmen to propagate polemics after the schism between Constantinople and Rome in 1054".[8]

From the 13th century on, however, latent anti-Latinism was strengthening and eventually turned into hostility and xenophobia: the reasons for this were the sack of Constantinople by the Crusaders (1204), and the armed conflicts with the Swedes (1240) and the Teutonic Knights (1242).[9] In the 13th-14th centuries translations of Byzantine anti-Latin polemical writings were mushrooming in Russia, and from the end of the 14th century collections containing exclusively anti-Latin polemical writings appeared.[10] In the 16th and 17th centuries collections of this kind became widespread in Russia.[11] The first of these above-mentioned collections bears a long title referring to its purpose. "This book is written against *Latin heresy*", reads the beginning of the title, and it is also mentioned that the aim of the book is "to make the Poles (*lyakhi*) and other Latins ashamed".[12] The wording, "Poles and other Latins" is a clear proof of the above contention that at the end of the 14th century the Latin Church was associated with the Poles in Russia. Due to the combination of contemporary and later events, the Lithuanians were to join the Poles.

One reason was the conversion of the pagan Lithuanians to Catholicism following the personal union between Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania concluded in Krewo in 1385. By then, however, a great number of principalities of the disintegrated *Rus'* came under the rule of the Grand Duke of Lithuania, which meant that these Orthodox princes "developed a distinct political consciousness and tradition".[13] The gap between the Orthodox lands of Lithuania and the Orthodox lands of Great Russia (Muscovy) was widening

---

[7] Ibid, 97.

[8] S. FRANKLIN - J. SHEPARD, *The Emergence of Rus', 750-1200*, (London - New York: 1996) 316.

[9] A. PAVLOV, *Kriticheskie opiti po istorii drevnejshej greko-russkoj polemiki protiv latinyan*, (Sanktpeterburg: 1878) (hereafter: PAVLOV 1878) 68; FENNELL 1995. 103.

[10] PAVLOV 1878. 68, 76.

[11] Ibid, 77.

[12] Ibid, 77.

[13] S. PLOKHY, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*, (Oxford: 2001) (hereafter: PLOKHY 2001)147.

from the mid-15th century on, in the aftermath of the Union of Florence (1439). The rejection of the union by Muscovy finally led to the rejection of the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople – that is *de facto* independence of the metropolitan (1448) who held the title *metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'*, but actually resided in Moscow, as it had been the unbroken tradition from 1328.

The appointment of a loyal metropolitan by the patriarch of Constantinople for the Orthodox Church in Lithuania with Kiev as a centre had the consequence of splitting the former Kievan metropolia into two parts. As a countermeasure, the metropolitan of the Great Russian Orthodox lands residing in Moscow dropped reference to Kiev from his title. S. Plokhy has summarized the consequences as follows: "With the ultimate partition of the Kyivan metropolia in the fifteenth century, a new boundary defining ecclesiastical jurisdiction was superimposed on the political border between the two parts of the formerly united *Rus'*."[14]

The Union of Lublin (1569) furthered the political integration of Poland and Lithuania, and at the same time enhanced the separation of the Lithuanian Orthodox lands from Muscovy. The gap widened considerably with the establishment of the Uniate Church by the Union of Brest (1596). In the eyes of Muscovites the acceptance of the pope's jurisdiction meant that their former brothers fell in Latin heresy. Hence the homogenization of people of different denominations living in (Poland-) Lithuania was complete from the Muscovite Orthodox viewpoint.

During the course of the 16th century Muscovites were becoming aware of the divisive impact of the Reformation: the designation "Latins" was often restricted to the Catholics, while all the Protestants were subsumed under the designation "Germans" (*nemtsy*). And while on the whole the Muscovites were more tolerant with the Protestants, the occurrence of the term, "Papist-Calvinist-Lutheran faith"[15] in the early 17th century implies that in the last resort non-Orthodox Christians (and what is more, even non-Christians, as the term "German-Muslim faith" shows) were of the same folk for the Orthodox Russians.

It was necessary to give this background to be able to place the religious perception of wars waged by Russia against Poland-Lithuania in European context. Because of the Reformation, religion was the main element in the rivalry of the European dynastic states from the mid-16th to the mid-17th century: "The universal claims of revived Catholicism and of Calvinism especially knew of no

---

[14] Ibid 147.
[15] D. TSCHIZEWSKIJ, *Russian Intellectual History*, (Ann Arbor: 1978) 113.

bounds." [16] Paradoxically, the Reformation could have not only a disruptive impact on national loyalty, but also contribute to the sharpening of the "sense of ethnic identity" in both religious camps.[17] One aspect of this was the belief developing in the 16th century both in England and Castile concerning their "unique place in God's providential design".[18] The English were the champions of Protestantism and their ruler was the Defender of the Faith. (The paradox of this title is well-known, for originally it had been given to Henry VIII in 1521, in return for his writing against Luther, but as an official title it was adopted by the king in the early 1540s only, i.e. after the breach (1534) with Rome.) At the same time, Castilians considered themselves the spearheads of Catholicism and their king bore the title, "Catholic King" from 1494.

It is clear that the religious perception of wars in the period under consideration was not a phenomenon unique to Russia despite of the fact that Russia did not experience a Reformation in the sense we know the phenomenon in Western Christianity. Nevertheless, there was some similarity in the causes: for the Reformation, on the one hand, and the "great schism" of 1054, on the other, had a divisive impact on Christianity. The age-old hostility towards the Latins and the identification of the destiny of Orthodoxy with the Russian people, had been well developed by the 16th century. Finally, the profoundly religious world-view of Russians *eo ipso* determined the interpretation of Russia's wars with her Christian (and non-Christian) neighbours. Muscovite Russia knew no issues serving purely secular purpose. As N. S. Kollmann noted: Muscovite national consciousness was "religious, rather than social – elite writers depict society as the Godly Christian community, not as a cohesive political unity of a common people".[19] In the West, however, as the case of England clearly shows, despite of the strength of a religious-ethnic consciousness, the idea of the political nation was well developed in the 16th century and it was articulated in the concept of *the king's two bodies* (consisting of the *body natural* and the *body politic*)[20] under Elisabeth. In the West the strength of religious sentiments notwithstanding, the duality of the secular and the spiritual was always present in the 16th-17th centuries.

After these preliminary remarks let us move to the analysis of sources.

---

[16] D. GERHARD, *Old Europe: A Study of Continuity*, (New York: 1981) 104.

[17] J. H. ELLIOTT, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', in: *Past and Present* 137 (November 1992: 48-72.) 58.

[18] Ibid, 59.

[19] N. S. KOLLMANN, 'Concepts of Society and Social Identity in Early Modern Russia', in: S. H. BARON – N. S. KOLLMANN (eds.), *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Russia and Ukraine*, (DeKalb: 1997: 34-51) 39.

[20] For this see: E. H. KANTOROWICZ, *The King's Two Bodies*, (Princeton: 1957)

My contention that the Livonian War was conceived as a religious war, is apparent in the narrative sources on the Pskov campaign. The *Tale* begins as follows:

> "And in the year of 7085 (1577), during the reign of our dear and Christ-loving ruler, tsar and grand prince Ivan Vasilevich, the autocrat of All Russia […] the Orthodox Christian Russian Tsardom was besieged and suppressed by all the neighbouring infidel tsars, and kings, and all kind of leaders […] Indeed, it was for the holy churches and the saintly monasteries, and for the Orthodox Christian faith (*za pravoslavnuyu khrest'yanskuyu veru*) that we stood against and fought the enemy."[21]

And this motif recurs in the *Tale* from time to time.[22]

The author identifies the struggle as a religious war, starting his story not with the description of the siege itself, but by giving a short account of events from 1577, mentioning briefly Bathory's former two campaigns against Polock (1579) and Velikie Luki (1580). On the occasion of the Polock campaign he writes of Bathory:

> "[…] the Lithuanian king Stephen, this furious snake and insatiable viper, fighter of his Lutheran faith (*lyuterskiya very*), who is always glad to shed blood and initiate fighting."[23]

In connection with the expression *Lutheran faith* an interesting detail is worth mentioning, which is helpful in the analysis of sources. This is Ivan IV's claim that the name of Luther (*Lyuter*) was derived from the Russian adjective *lyutyj*, meaning "ferocious".[24] As if to underline the supposed relationship between the name of Luther and the Russian adjective *lyutyj* advocated by Ivan's etymology, Bathory is described in the next sentence of the Tale as a "*lyutyj i sveripyj zmeinyj yad* (ferocious and merciless snake poison)" who led his army against Polock.[25]

It is easy to note the author's preference for the snake as the symbol of evil! What is odd, however, is his reference to Bathory's "Lutheran faith", for he was a Catholic. Was it simply a mistake committed by the author, or a consciously employed term?

The clue to the understanding of Bathory's "Lutheran faith" might be a passage referring to an event dealt with by the author on a very distant page. In

---

[21] MALYSHEVA 1952. 35
[22] Ibid, 56, 75.
[23] Ibid, 41.
[24] BILLINGTON 1966. 97.
[25] MALYSHEVA 1952. 41.

connection with Antonio Possevino, the legate of the pope who managed to make an armistice between Bathory and the tsar, the text reads:

> "That time arrived to him Antonyj, professing also of his Lutheran faith, the archpriest of the Roman Latin pope (*rimskogo latynskogo papy protopop*)".[26]

Since the pope of Rome is explicitly mentioned, the term "Lutheran faith" can hardly be a miswriting in a reference to his legate. Though it must be added, that in another version of the *Tale* instead of "Lutheran faith", "Latin faith" is written on this occasion.[27] Having excluded the possibility of a miswriting, we can conclude that a plausible explanation must be the identification of all Christian denominations, save Orthodoxy, with heresy. The term "Papist-Calvinist- Lutheran faith", mentioned previously, allows such an interpretation.

This view is supported by another contemporary source, also related to Bathory and the Livonian War, a letter written by Ivan IV to Bathory in 1579:

> "And you lived in a Muslim state, but your faith is Latin, which is half-Christian(ity) (*polukhristianstvo*), and your magnates believe in the iconoclastic Lutheran heresy."[28] In his analysis of this letter V. Lepakhin raised the following question: Why did Ivan point out precisely iconoclasm among the many differences between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy as the main distinguishing feature? The author claims, that the reason was not only the importance of icons in Orthodoxy, but also the resolution of the 7th ecumenical council which declared that iconoclasm "in its theological teachings repeated all the preceding heresies from arianism to monophysitism".[29] Therefore, Lutheranism as the first iconoclastic heresy in the West was not only one among the heresies, but also a *pars pro toto* collective term subsuming other heresies, Latin heresy included.

The plausibility of the interpretation that all denominations except Orthodoxy are treated as heresies is confirmed by a passage in Mikhail Romanov's Confirmation Charter where the followings are written of the First False Dmitrij:

> "Then that same son of the Devil sent […] plenty of gold and silver and other wonderful things in innumerable quantity to the

---

[26] Ibid, 91.

[27] Ibid, 105. (e.n. 53.)

[28] Quoted by V. LEPAHIN, 'Dva poslaniya Ivana Groznogo Stefanu Batoriyu', in: GY. SZVÁK (ed.), *Mesto Rossii v Evrope/ The Place of Russia in Europe*, (Budapest: 2000: 130-138) 131.

[29] Ibid, 132.

king of Poland and the magnates. And he brought with himself a lot of Latin teachers not only from Poland, but also from Rome, the pope, in order to ruin our true, immaculate, orthodox Christian faith of Greek canons, and establish firmly the delusive (*prelestnye*) Latin teachings [in the other version: teachings of Latin heresy] […] *and he took a lot of evil heretics to the temple of the Mother of God, Calvinists and anabaptists and arians [i.e. antitrinitarians] and Lutherans and Romans* […]"[30]

On another occasion the charter writes that the popular militia took arms because the people

"did not want to see the whole Orthodox Christianity in final perdition, and the orthodox true Christian faith of Greek canons cursed by the Latin and Lutheran and other Godless faiths".[31]

Returning to the *Tale* it is also striking that the author consistently calls Bathory a "Lithuanian king."[32] The term "Polish king" is used only in those contexts, where the king refers to himself,[33] or when the author gives words to the mouth of the people of Pskov.[34] On one occasion Bathory is called the "Lithuanian godless king".[35] Furthermore, the term "Lithuanian people" can be found in the text.[36] Finally, an entry bears the title, "*The boldness of Christians over Lithuania*",[37] in which the courage of Pskovians is described. The author writes that the defenders broke out in a cry, saying:

"«Oh, friends, let us die together from Lithuanian hands for the faith of Christ and our Orthodox ruler, but not give Pskov, the town of our ruler to the Polish king, Stephen» […] and the whole *Christian host* […] rushed upon the Lithuanian force mounting the town wall at the broken part […] and thus, by the grace of God […] the Lithuanian force was beaten back from the broken part".[38]

---

[30] S. A. BELOKUROV (ed.), *Utverzhennaya gramota ob izbranii na Moskovskoe gosudarstvo Mikhaila Fedorovicha Romanova*, (Moscow: 1906) (hereafter: BELOKUROV 1906) 31.

[31] BELOKUROV 1906. 42.

[32] See the title itself and elsewhere, MALYSHEVA 1952. 40-42, 51,53, 56, 57, 64, 67, 80, 91, 94, 98.

[33] Ibid, 49.

[34] Ibid, 75.

[35] Ibid, 55.

[36] Ibid, 59, 97.

[37] Ibid, 75.

[38] Ibid, 76.

And towards the end of the *Tale* the victory is referred to as a "*Christian victory over Lithuania*."[39] All these point to the complete identification of Poles and Lithuanians: the latter are equally enemies, and not even Christians! This attitude became the basis for the emergence of the collective identification, "Polish and Lithuanian people", encountered in the sources of the *smuta*.

Turning to the corresponding entry in the *Chronicle on the Pskovko-Pecherskij Monastery*, here Bathory is called not a "Lithuanian", but a "Polish king". Furthermore, in contrast to the author of the *Tale*, the chronicle-writer thinks important to mention that Bathory was a Hungarian:

> "There happened in the August of the year of 7089 [1581], that the Polish King, Stepan Obatur, this Hungarian (*ugryanin*), professing the Latin faith, came with a great pride against the Pskovian land (*na Pskovskuyu zemlyu*) with a multitude of army of the Lithuanian land."[40]

Of the beginning of the siege the chronicle writes:

> "[…] the shameless Latins, the Poles (*lyakhi*) and the Hungarians (*ugrove*) and the Germans (*nemtsy*), on the 7th of September in the year of 7090 [1581], began to break the town wall at the Great river […] and the Pskovians fought these shameless Latins […] And the Lord […] defended and helped us against the *Latin world (latynstvo)* and did not give the town and us […] to the hands of the enemy […] and the most cunning king, full of Latin temptation (*prelest*)."[41]

Thus, the chronicle employs not only the archaic *lyakh* but also the term "Latin world".

Now let us take a look at the description of the enemy in the sources of the *smuta*, let us take a closer look at Mikhail's Confirmation Charter. When the text describes the events from 1606 until 1612, a collective designation of the enemy, a stereotype, namely "the Polish and Lithuanian people" recurs frequently. In this section of the source we are also given the official version of Filaret's political role. Filaret was the newly elected tsar's, Mikhail's father, and the captive of Sigismund, King of Poland-Lithuania when the charter was written. In fact, Filaret was one of those leading men who originally had allied themselves with the Second False Dmitrij, but later offered the Russian throne to Sigismund's son, Wladislaw. As the events went on, Filaret became one of the envoys sent to

---

[39] Ibid, 94.

[40] Opisanie osada Pskova v "Povesti o Pskovko-Pecherskom monastyre" MALYSHEVA 1952. Appendix 109.

[41] Ibid, 110.

the Poles in 1610 to negotiate Wladislaw's succession. This mission, however, was not at all against Filaret's will as the charter and many other sources after 1613, i.e. after the election of his son tsar of Russia, would claim. For these sources suffering from selective memory, so to say, completely reinterpreted Filaret's political role, and constructed the image of a captive Russian prelate fighting for the Muscovite state and Orthodoxy.

The words given to the mouth of Filaret by the charter are eloquent. For in this official version it was Filaret who warned the people of Moscow about the real intentions of Sigismund, King of Poland-Lithuania after the king had sent his sealed letter to Moscow (to accomplish the succession of his son, Wladislaw) in which he promised "not to make any harm in any way to our true orthodox faith of Greek canons".[42]

Filaret's role is presented as follows:

> "And his Grace, Filaret, metropolitan of Rostov and Yaroslav
> [...] said: do not be enchanted by the evil and delusive (*prelestnye*)
> letters of the king, for no way can they be true! I genuinely know
> that he has an evil intention concerning the Muscovite state (*nad
> Moskovskim gosudarstvom*) aiming to take the Muscovite state *in
> possession of Poland and Lithuania* through his son (*s synom k Pol'she i
> k Litve zavladeti*), and to ruin our true immaculate Orthodox
> Christian faith and establish firmly his Latin faith in the whole
> Muscovite state. But the boyars and the military governors and
> the military servitors and people of all ranks did not obey his
> Grace, Filaret, metropolitan of Rostov and Yaroslav, and elected
> to the Muscovite state prince Wladislaw, the son of Sigismund,
> King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania (*korolya Pol'skogo i
> velikogo knyazya Litovskogo*)."[43]

The wording *in possesssion of Poland and Lithuania*, the title *King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania* deserve attention, because it is in this section that the term "Polish-Lithuanian people" is used with a great frequency. According to the charter everything happened in the way as Filaret had predicted: the troops of the king entered Moscow as a result of treachery and "the Polish and Lithuanian people" did all kind of evil things. They began

> "to curse at our Orthodox faith of Greek canons, profane the
> churches of God, shoot at the holy icons from arquebuses, and

---

[42] BELOKUROV 1906. 35.
[43] Ibid, 36.

in order to desecrate the honorable icons began to stab their eyes
and do all kinds of desecrations […] and spread and establish
firmly their evil Latin heresy."[44]

The result was:

"a final ruin of the great, glorious Muscovite state, done by
Sigismund, the Polish king (*korolya Pol'skogo*) and by his Polish and
Lithuanian people and desecration to the Orthodox Christian
faith."[45]

Those who compiled the Confirmation Charter obviously used existing
stereotypes, for the term "Polish and Lithuanian people" together with the image
of a final destruction and the idea of a religious war can be found in those
sources of the *smuta*, which were written earlier than the Confirmation Charter.[46]
But in case of the charter we are facing not simply the adoption of stereotypes.
What is more, the charter itself is a compilation of several earlier sources and the
part where the examples (with one exception) are quoted from, comes from a
book (*Posolskaya kniga*) of the *prikaz* of Foreign Affairs.[47]

Another eloquent example of the stereotypes mentioned is the proclamation
issued in 1612 in Nizhnij Novgorod on the occasion of the recruitment of the
second popular militia.

"Because of the increase of sins of the whole Orthodox
Christendom there came upon us the true wrath of God and it
has not ceased for a long time, even up until now; in accordance
with the words of Christ (*po khristovu slovesi*) there appeared many
Anti-Christs (*lzhekhristi*) and all our land (*zemlya*) got confused by
their delusions (*prelesti*) and became desolated […] and deserted
by the evil machinations of the all-cunning devil (*kozniyu lukavogo
dyavola*) […]; the thieves of our salvation, the Polish and
Lithuanian people thought to destroy the Muscovite state
(*Moskovskoe gosudarstvo*) and to covert our brightly-shining
*uncorrupted Christian faith* to their Lutheran faith (*v lyuturskuyu veru*)
hated by God."[48]

These motives, often in the same wording, can also be found in the sources
written *after* the *smuta*: in the orders of 1616 or 1619 for example, which were

---

[44] Ibid, 37.

[45] Ibid, 39.

[46] *Rossijskoe zakonodatel'stvo*, (Moscow: 1986) vol. III. pp. 43-46.

[47] BELOKUROV 1906. 6.

[48] 'Gramota iz Nizhnego na Vychegdu 7120. g', in: P. G. LYUBOMIROV, *Ocherk istorii Nizhegorodskogo
opolcheniya 1611-1613*, (Moscow: 1939: 233-237) 233-234.

sent to military governors ordering them to organise local elections to the so-called *zemskij sobor*.[49] In the 1619 source we read that Filaret, having returned from "Poland and Lithuania (*iz Pol'shi i Litvy*)" and eventually made patriarch consulted the church council and the tsar on the matter that "the Muscovite state was ruined and became desolated by the Polish and Lithuanian people and by the felons because of the sins of the whole Orthodox Christendom."[50]

Even as late as 1627 we read in a formulary (concerning the inheritance of service and family estates) which was composed for those who had performed great service during the 1617-18 campaign of Wladislaw against Moscow:

> "the person (who is named) rewarded for his true service rendered to us and to the whole Muscovite state, for when… the son of the Lithuanian king Sigismund, Wladislaw came […] under Moscow […] and wanted to take the Muscovite state, and ruin it to the ground, and pollute the churches of God, and trample upon our holy, true, pure, Orthodox Christian faith, and establish firmly his damned heretic Latin faith…, he [i.e. the named person] remembering God…and the orthodox Christian faith and the oath taken to us…stood strongly for the Orthodox Christian faith, and for the holy churches of God, and for us […] against Wladislaw and the Polish and Lithuanian and the German people, and fought manly in the fights…showed much of his service and justice to us and to the whole Muscovite state."[51]

Although using different sources, we have come to the same conclusion as Serhii Plokhy in his book entitled *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*: "During the Time of Troubles, the view was propagated in Muscovy that opponents of the regime in power, whether Orthodox or not, were enemies of the Orthodox faith. The close association in the minds of contemporaries between spiritual and temporal authorities made it possible to treat the tsar's opponents as enemies of the Orthodox faith in general."[52] The source we just mentioned is a good illustration of these statements, and also of the long lasting influence of the *smuta*.

Furthermore, our exploration of the history of the stereotype, *the Polish and Lithuanain people* (which was a standard term in Muscovite documents and

---

[49] *Rossijskoe zakonodatel'stvo*, (Moscow: 1986) III. 62-63, 67-68.

[50] Ibid, 67-68.

[51] N. B. MYULLER – N. E. NOSOVA (eds.), *Zakonodatel'nye akty Russkogo gosudarstva vtoroj polovini XVI – pervoj polovini XVII veka*, (Leningrad: 1986) 135-136.

[52] PLOKHY 2001. 292.

defined people in political terms[53]) helps to explain why the "idea of the religious
and ethnic affinity of Polish-Lithuanian Rus' with Muscovite Rus' ", was not
welcomed at all in Muscovy when it was put forward after the restoration of the
Kievan metropolia (1620) in the writings of bishops, consecrated by
Theophanes, the patriarch of Jerusalem.[54] The Muscovite opinion was as
follows: "In effect, only those who lived in a purely Orthodox state and were not
corrupted by contact with non-Orthodox could claim to be true Christians. The
only such state was the Tsardom of Muscovy, hence the Muscovite vocabulary
of the day (in which the word «Christian» became synonymous with
«Orthodox») reflected the prevailing view of the outside world, which held that
there was no Christianity outside the bounds of Muscovite Orthodoxy."[55]

S. Plohky wrote these in connection with the 1620 Moscow Church Council
headed by Filaret, which took place before the restoration of the Kievan
metropolia. But precisely this view was expressed in the *Tale* on the Pskov
campaign and in the Nizhnij Novgorod proclamation.

The Moscow Church Council of 1620 required second baptism from those
Orthodox who wished to settle in Muscovy, and the situation did not improve
after the restoration of the Kievan orthodox metropolia.[56] Everything or
everybody, even Orthodox, coming from Poland-Lithuania were suspicious both
in spiritual and temporal terms. In 1632 Tsar Mikhail prohibited the Pskov
merchants from importing hops from Lithuania, for (as it was claimed) "in the
Lithuanian towns there are witches, who cast spells on hops which are to be
brought into our towns so that by means of these hops they can spread plague
among the people".[57]

It is also eloquent how the intermarriage between Muscovites and others was
refuted in 1635:

> "Polish and Lithuanian people in the Muscovite state formerly
> had not taken Russian wives, because the great Russian state is
> of orthodox faith, whereas in Poland and Lithuania there are
> people of different faith and such a [copulative] conjunction […]
> should not be allowed to exist."[58]

---

[53] Ibid, 295. Plokhy in fact writes «"Polish" or "Lithuanian" people», and «"Polish" and
"Lithuanian" people». 295, 298. The stereotype we analysed, the "Polish and Lithuanian people",
treats Poles and Lithuanians *not separately, but rather collectively.*

[54] Ibid, 291.

[55] Ibid, 296.

[56] Ibid, 296-297.

[57] Quoted in: P. DUKES, *The Making of Russian Absolutism 1613-1801*, (London - New York: 1982) 24.

[58] S. M. SOLOVEV, *Istoriya Rossii*, (Moskva: 1961.) vol. V. 187.

To draw the conclusion: "Polish and Lithuanian people", that is people living outside the boundaries of Muscovite Russia were enemies not only of the immortal soul of Orthodox Russians, but also of their mortal bodies. No wonder that it took time for Muscovite authorities to support the rebellious *cossacks* as fighters for the Orthodox faith.[59]

All that said, one question can be raised immediately: What was the Polish perception of the Time of Troubles? This issue was fortunately studied by a young Russian historian V. Kowaliow whose research complements mine in this field. I will quote his results very briefly based on his paper delivered at a workshop in Budapest, in 2004.[60] In his paper ("*Political and confessional elements in the Polish opinion of 'Moscow' Russians in the epoch of the 'Trouble'. After the materials of the Polish propagandist works of the early seventeenth century*") Kowaliow argued: "attentive study of sources left by direct participants of those events allows to think that the Polish opinion of the foes was in a very small degree determined by religious intolerance towards the Orthodox Church. It can be noted that two models of the perception of their adversaries by the Poles existed. In the first case the confessional factor did not play any role. This was the characteristic feature of soldier's diaries, memoirs and military reports where indication of the creed of the enemies and such terms as 'heretic' or 'schismatic' are practically absent. […] The elements of confessional argumentation are typical for another model which is represented however by a very close circle of sources. These are mainly reports of ecclesiastics (for instance, Polish Jesuits) […] Therefore, if even a confessional argumentation took place, it was addressed to a very strict circle of persons."

These conclusions underline the major difference between the Russian and the Polish worldview from the other side.

<center>⊂ℨℬ⊃</center>

---

[59] For this see Chapter 8. of Plokhy's book. (PLOKHY 2001. 274-334.)
[60] Budapest, CEU 2004 Spring.