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corrigenda:
p. 9, n. 14, line 6 Türken in place of Turken
p. 19, first line below diagram Russian in place of Russians
p. 34, last line Österreichische in place of Österreiches
On the Origin of the "Correspondence" between the Sultan and the Cossacks

The apocryphal "Correspondence" between the Cossacks and the Ottoman sultan—commonly known as the "Lystuvannja zaporožciv"—has fascinated those with an interest in the Ukrainian past since the letters' discovery in the middle of the last century. The threatening letter of the Great Turk and the insulting—even vulgar—reply of the rough and fearless Cossacks reflected for many what they felt the Cossacks surely were like. Sadly, this romanticization, so vividly rendered in Repin's painting of the Zaporozhians penning their "Reply," has continued to influence even the most serious scholars who have undertaken to determine the origin and literary history of these "pearls" of belles-lettres humor. I shall review briefly here the contributions to this study—including two recent publications in the Ukrainian SSR—and then at some length examine both the old and some new evidence regarding the origins of the "Correspondence."

Those who published texts of the "Correspondence" in the nineteenth century almost without exception gave no information on the manuscripts from which the letters were taken and made no effort to determine their origin. However, in his pioneering but now outdated study of the Russian Chronographs, Andrej Popov indicated the important connection of the "Correspondence" with a series of other apocryphal letters of the sultan found in seventeenth-century Muscovite manuscripts. Popov erred, however, in attributing all the apocryphal letters to a single Muscovite author writing during the various wars against the Ottomans in the last quarter of that century.

Subsequent studies of the "Correspondence" have argued that its original

1Andreu Popov, Opzor xronografov russkoj redakcii, vyp. 2, Moscow, 1869, pp. 227-228. One should note that at long last a major new examination of the seventeenth-century Russian chronographs is underway; see O. V. Tvorogov, "O Xronografie redakcii 1617 г.," Pamjatniki russkoj literature X-XVII vv. (= Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literature Instituta russkoj literature AN SSSR, hereafter abbreviated TORDR, Vol. XXV), Moscow-Leningrad, 1970, pp. 162-177.
was Polish, with Russian and Ukrainian versions secondary, or, conversely, that the Ukrainian version was primary. Academician Konstantyn Xarlampovyč was the first to undertake a thorough analysis of the "Correspondence," and he concluded that its original was Polish, even though he had not found any Polish texts. Xarlampovyč not only discussed the letters in the context of what he correctly saw as translated pamphlets--the apocrypha published by Popov--but he provided the first and, to this day, the only textological analysis of the "Correspondence." He distinguished two basic groups of texts--one containing the short, Russian version known to Popov, in which the letters are connected with the Cossacks at Čyhyryn, and the other including all the Ukrainian versions, which mention specifically the Zaporozhians and have a number of other elements not found in the Russian texts. He further divided the "Ukrainian redaction" into two groups. Xarlampovyč noted factual discrepancies in the Ukrainian texts which made a seventeenth-century origin of them among the Cossacks extremely implausible. It will be clear from the subsequent discussion that Xarlampovyč's basic scheme and arguments are correct; unfortunately, since his article of half a century ago, there has been only one significant supplement to his analysis.

This is the recent article by two Polish scholars, Maria Eustachiewicz and Mieczysław Inglot, which appeared in the Ukrajins'kyj istorycznyj Žurnal. They publish in the article a number of Polish versions of the "Correspondence" (which, for inexplicable "technical reasons," the editors chose to render in Cyrillic); with one exception these texts correspond to the "Ukrainian redaction" of the letters. Moreover, the authors cite considerable evidence that there was a tradition of such literature in seventeenth-century Poland which might well have given rise to the "Correspondence." While confining themselves

---


3M. Jevstaxeyvč and M. Inhl'ot, "Pol's'ki versiji 'lystuvannja zaporiz'kyx kozakiv z tureç'kym sultanom'," Ukrajins'kyj istorycznyj Žurnal (Kiev), 1966, No. 8, pp. 116-120, No. 10, pp. 132-137.
to discussing the dating and origin of the Polish texts, not the Ukrainian ones, the authors curiously fail to indicate clearly which of these versions came first.

The argument that the "Correspondence" is Ukrainian in origin is most forcefully stated by Hryhorij Antonovyč Nud'ha in a small naukovo-populjarna book published in Kiev by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. In genre the book is more like the works it purports to study—populjarna, rather than naukova. Its main virtues are the assembling of many previously published texts of the "Correspondence," and the publication of a formerly unknown Polish text of both the sultan's letter and the "Reply." Nud'ha traces the literary history of the "Correspondence" beginning in the seventeenth century and ending with the reworking of the letters during the Civil War and World War II. In spite of his disparaging remarks about the acumen of the nineteenth-century publishers of the texts and the pernicious influence of romanticizations, clearly Nud'ha is still under the spell of Repin's painting. He not only "establishes" a Ukrainian origin for the "Correspondence" early in the seventeenth century, but he concludes that the other apocryphal letters published by Popov were all based on a Ukrainian model, with the Russian versions of them being the work of a single Muscovite author. Strict textual analysis and more thoughtful consideration of the manuscript traditions might have prevented him from reaching such untenable conclusions.

Some textual analysis is provided by Mme. M. D. Kagan-Tarkovskaja in her articles devoted to the Russian versions of the "Correspondence." But even her reasonably cautious work begins with a priori assumptions about what the Cossacks should have written. Consequently, her conclusion on the primacy of the Ukrainian and secondary nature of the Russian versions is precisely


the reverse of what the facts adduced below will demonstrate. In her second article on the "Correspondence" she qualifies her earlier conclusion by indicating that in the absence of manuscript evidence the Ukrainian origin of the letters cannot be proved conclusively. Her alternative though would appear to be that the letters originated in Muscovy with the Russian version. Mme. Kagan does correctly place the Russian version in the milieu of the Diplomatic Chanceller, where translations were made from foreign pamphlets and newspapers; she has located a number of manuscripts containing copies of the Russian texts. In the second of her articles, she publishes the previously unknown eighteenth-century Russian versions of the "Correspondence," texts which need not be considered in the subsequent discussion because of their very late origin.

One additional comment is à propos regarding the scholarship reviewed here. The subject of these studies, the "Correspondence," apparently circulated more widely in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries among those who spoke different languages than does modern scholarship. Xarlampovych's seminal article was ignored in two of the later studies;° Nud'ha, Eustachiewicz, and Inglott for some inexplicable reason are not aware of the most important publication on old Russian literature—the Trudy of the Sector of Old Russian Literature in the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Russian Literature. Had Nud'ha in particular read the Trudy, he would have profited not only from Mme. Kagan's first article on the "Correspondence" but also from her pioneering work on documentary belles lettres in Muscovy. 7

6Namely by Kagan, TODRL, XIV, with amends in TODRL, XXI, where she gives a good summary of Xarlampovych, and by Élie Borschak, "La lettre des zaporogues au sultan," Revue des Études slaves, Vol. 26 (1950), pp. 99-105. The argumentation and conclusions of Borschak's article coincide so closely with those of Xarlampovych that one wonders whether the oversight was not a deliberate one.

My analysis of the origin of the "Correspondence" contains two sections: an examination of traditions and an examination of the texts. The first tradition to be considered is that of European pamphlet turcica—widespread publication in pamphlet form in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of news, descriptions, fables, prophecies, and other curiosa about the Ottoman Turks. A conspicuous example of this literature is a series of apocryphal letters of the sultan, often accompanied by the replies of those to whom he allegedly addressed his threatening missives. A group of such manifestos of the sultan originated during the Ottoman-Habsburg wars of the sixteenth century. The text of a single apocryphal letter, with only minor changes, was published, translated and republished during each of these conflicts and the subsequent ones for a period of more than two centuries. The sixteenth-century editions include many in German, some in Dutch and French, and even one in Danish. The Danish pamphlet of 1593—probably a translation from German—is reproduced in the Appendix below as an example of the genre. The Russian version of the seventeenth century mentioned by Xarlampovych and published by Kagan as the "Letter to the German Princes" is simply a later variant of the same text, translated apparently from a German pamphlet of 1663.

---

8 A detailed analysis of these letters will be found in my dissertation "Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlet Literature about the Turk," nearing completion in the Department of History, Harvard University. The material summarized here will be expanded in a future article.

9 See, for example, the items listed by Carl Göllner, Turcica: Die europäischen Türkendrucke des XVI Jahrhunderts, 2 vols., Berlin and Bucharest, 1961-1968, Nos. 948, 1054, 1751, 1886, 1913, etc.

10 See Kagan, TODRL, XV, pp. 245-246; a German pamphlet with a text very close to that which the Muscovite translator must have used is Des Tuerckischen Kaeysers der gantzen Chriheit [sic] und aller die sich Christen nennen ewigen abgesagten Erbfeinds-Briefe So er durch den Legaten dem Roemischen Kaeyser zugesendet haben sol. Im Jahr 1663, n.p. (copy in Harvard College Library—hereafter abbreviated HCL—Ott. 358.18). A good idea of the kind of minor textual change that occurred in the reedition of such letters may be gained from comparison of this text with the same letter in Latin, accompanied by a German translation from this text, in Fortsetzung dieser Hungarischen Chronik; inhaltend alle denkwürdige Sachen welche seitdem der Tuerkische Gross-Vezier wider die Christenheit in Hungarn zu Feld gezogen beydeseits vorgegangen.
A second group of these apocrypha encompasses a number of distinct but textually connected variants, including the "Correspondence." Although eventually this second group may be traced farther back, its origin in 1612 seems at present most reasonable. A German version of the sultan's letter to the Polish king is dated 1612, and German, French, and English versions of that letter and the king's reply were known in 1613, as the English pamphlet of that year indicates. In the same year, French and Italian versions of the king's reply were published. The letters took on a second life in the period 1619-1621, when open war with the Turks, culminating in the successful defense of Khotyn by the Poles and the Cossacks, renewed interest in such works (see below). Similarly in a period of war with the Ottomans in 1637, a new, expanded version of the sultan's letter appeared in several languages. From the 1650's


The German version is that quoted by Konrad Bussow in his Verwirrter Zustand des Russischen Reichs (Konrad Bussov, Moskovskaja xronika 1598-1613, Moscow-Leningrad, 1961, pp. 315-316); the English version is The Great Turkes Defiance; or his letter denuntiatorio to Sigismund the Third, now King of Polonia, as it hath beene truly advertised out of Germany, this present yeare, 1613. With the King of Poland his replie, Englished according to the French copie..., London, 1613 (Copy in the British Museum, 9135.aaa.29).

Responce à la lettre denonciatoire du grand Turc. Par Sigismond, Roy de Pologne, & de Suede; grand Duc de Lituanie, Russie, & Podolie, &c., A Paris, Par Fleury Bourriquant, 1613, and a second edition (with identical title) taken from the Paris one, printed in Lyon by Jean Poyet in 1613 (copies in Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Kraków--hereafter abbreviated BCz--6257/I and 12179/I respectively); Risposta alla Lettera Denonciatoria del Gran Turco Pota da Sigismondo Re di Polonia, & di Sueda, Gran Duca di Lituania, Rossia & Podolia, &c., In Milano, Per Pandolfo Malatesta, 1613 (copy in the Osolineum, Wroclaw, XVII-892-II). The Italian version varies only minutely from the French texts and undoubtedly was translated from one of them.

These include an English pamphlet, A Vaunting, Daring, and a Menacing Letter, Sent from Sultan Morat the great Turke, from his Court at Constantinople, by his Embassadour Gobem, to Vladislaus King of Polond, &c....as by many Copies whereof, may appeare, as it was sent out of Polond..., London, Printed by I. Okes, 1638; a second edition with the same title appeared in 1645, printed for James Williams in London (Copies respectively in HCL, STC 18286, and BCz, 6619/I). See below regarding the other versions.
through the 1680's numerous other versions were printed or circulated in manuscript. Many of these contain a basic change in the sultan's letter, whereby it was addressed to the Habsburg emperor instead of the Polish king. This change was particularly appropriate to the times when the relevant editions appeared—the period of Ottoman-Habsburg war in the 1660's and the siege of Vienna in 1683.

Both Polish and Russian versions of the letters in this second group of apocrypha are known. It is a reasonable assumption that the original of 1612 was Polish, although proof of this awaits discovery of a Polish text. Otherwise a German original may be assumed. Polish reworkings of the sultan's letter are known in manuscripts where it is dated 1619, and in a printed pamphlet of 1621, which contains the reply as well. The 1637 letter apparently originated in Poland; see the Appendix below for what is, to the best of my knowledge, the

---

14 A manuscript Russian version of the letter to Emperor Leopold has been published several times; see the critical text of that and the reply in Kagan, TODRL, XV, pp. 247-249. A slightly different version of the letter to Leopold is among the apocryphal letters of 1683: Schrecklicher und Gantz grausamer Absage-Brief Welchen Der Tuerckische Kaiser An den Romischen Kaiser uberschicket In diesem 1683 Jahr, n.p. (facsimile in pocket of Die Turk en vor Wien in Augenzeugenberichten, ed. and introd. by Walter Stur minger, 2nd ed., Dusseldorf, 1968).

15 On the manuscript Polish versions, see Jevstakovsky and Inhl'ot, "Poi's'ki versjyi," pp. 134-135. The published version, of which they were not aware, is in Grzegorz Czaradzk'i, Pobudka na Wyzne tureek'A Rycerskim ludziom Polskim ku pociesze z listy Tureckimi y Constituyvami tegorocznych o rzadzie Wojennym przydanymi Napisana, W Poznaniu, W Drukarni Jana Rossowskiego, Roku 1621 (copy in BCZ, MN 1235), ff. 4-4v, 5v-6v. The Czaradzk'i texts are nearly identical with those in the English version of 1613 cited above in note 11 and its reworking in another English pamphlet: True Copies of the Insolent, Cruell, Barbarous, and blasphemous Letter lately written by the Great Turke, for denouncing of Warre against the King of Poland: and of the Magnanimous, and most Christian Answers made by the said King thenceunto..., London, Printed for William Lee, 1621 (copy in HCL, Ott. 385.10*). A later reworking of the Polish text of the sultan's letter was brought to Kiev in 1674 by a Pole and has been published from the manuscript copy found among the Malorossijskie dela; see Sinbirskij sbornik, Moscow, 1844, final pagination, pp. 123-124. This version of the letter was addressed to the Archbishop of Gniezno.
first Polish text of this letter to have been discovered. Clearly a short
Polish variant of the 1637 letter existed in 1678, and Polish texts of the
sultan's letter to the emperor in 1683 are also known.16

Russian texts of the letters are secondary to the Polish and other
known versions. The earliest Russian text (1621) is closest to a Dutch one
published the same year and probably derives from either the Dutch version or
its presumed German source.17 The Russian version of the 1637 letter is a
translation from German; the German was based in turn on the Polish text.18
The shortened Polish variant of this letter, dated 1678, was the source for a
Russian translation of that year. Probably the sultan's correspondence with
the emperor of 1663 and surely that of 1683 became known in Muscovy from German
pamphlets.19

16 The Russian version of 1678 (published by Kagan, TODRL, XV, p. 244) cites a
Polish original ("perevod polskogo pisma"); the example of the 1683 Polish text,
in a late manuscript codex, with many obvious "foreignisms," is that in L'viv's
derzavna naukova biblioteka AN URSR, fond Oleolins'kyx, No. 644/1, pp. 154-155.
See below regarding other copies of what is probably this same Polish version
in earlier variants.

17 The Russian text is in Kagan, TODRL, XV, pp. 249-250. The Dutch pamphlet is
known to me in two editions: Ontsegh-Brief Van den Turckschien Keyser aen den
Coningh van Polen, Tot Delf, Ghedruct by Jan Andriesz, 1621; Oorlogs-Brief,
van Mahometh de IV. Turkse Keyser, Trotselijk toegesonden aen den Koninck van
Polen, To Amsterdam by Albart van Panhuysen, n.d. (copies in HCL, Ott. 376.2
and Ott. 395.1* respectively). K. Esterhoffer (Bibliografia polska, Vol. XXII,
Kraków, 1908, p. 39), tentatively dates the latter 1672.

18 The heading of the work reads in part: "a perevedena byla s turskago jazyka
v polskuju rec, a iz polskoj v nemeckuju rec, a iz nemeckoj v nasu slavenskiju
rec."

19 The Russian version of 1683, accompanied by the Emperor's reply, is known in
one manuscript copy, Leningradskoe otdelenie Instituta istorii AN SSSR, Sobranie
Arxeograficheskoy kommissii, No. 44, ff. 481-484v. The immediate convoy of the
letters includes two items probably from the same pamphlet original: a copy
of the treaty between Jan Sobieski and Emperor Leopold, and what purports to
be an oath of the sultan and his pashas to exterminate all Christians. The close-
ness of the Russian text to the German one of 1683 cited above in note 14 and
readings that clearly must derive from a misunderstanding of a German text
suggest that the original was German.
Some Russian copies of these apocrypha contain headings which indicate that the works were translated from another language. Such headings follow standard chancellery formulae found in other translated pamphlets and newspapers of the period, from which were compiled regularly the kuranty—summaries of foreign news for the tsar and high court officials.\textsuperscript{20} There is absolutely no reason to believe, as does Mme. Kagan, that the headings in the apocryphal letters were added by a Russian "author" simply to imitate those of the kuranty. However, there is ample additional evidence—especially in the inventories of the tsar's Privy Chancellery and in manuscript traditions—to confirm the origin of the Russian translated apocrypha in the chancellery milieu where the kuranty were produced and circulated.\textsuperscript{21}

So much for West European, Polish, and Russian traditions. What about a Ukrainian one? Here it is necessary to spread the net beyond the apocryphal letters of the sultan (a fact in itself indicative) and to include other letters in which a certain amount of sarcasm toward one's enemies would appear to parallel that found in the "Correspondence" of the Cossacks. Nud'ha and Kagan rely on a number of examples to make a case for a Ukrainian tradition of such literature; none of them, in my opinion, is valid.

The most important example is a variant of the apocryphal correspondence between the sultan and the Polish king that textually belongs with the second group of letters discussed above. The texts in question, dated 1620, were


\textsuperscript{21}The Russian letter of 1621 mentioned above is found in the kuranty; among other evidence is the convoy of the works accompanying the apocryphal letters in MS, Gosudarstvennaja publičnaja biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Schedrina (Leningrad; hereafter abbreviated GPB), Sobranie Russkogo arxeologičeskogo občestva, No. 43. See Kagan, \textit{ibid.}, and my description in Appendix I to Edward L. Keenan, \textit{The Kurbaskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Tsar Ivan IV and Prince A. M. Kurbškij}, to be published by Harvard University Press in November 1971.
appended by Samijlo Velyčko to the chronicle which he compiled in the second decade of the eighteenth century. He cites as his source for the letters a Cossack chronicle of 1636 that has since been lost. There exist separate Polish versions of the sultan's letter in Velyčko's variant; in fact the language of his texts would seem to be Polish with at best a veneer of Ukrainian. As Velyčko's facts and sources are in many cases suspect or invented, the origin of these texts remains to be elucidated properly. In any event, the apocryphal correspondence that he cites does not prove a Ukrainian origin of these letters, much less that all or even any of the other versions of the apocryphal letters derive from a Ukrainian model, as Ndu'ha would have us believe.

Second chronologically among the letters mentioned as examples of a Ukrainian tradition is one allegedly sent by Bohdan Xmeli'nyc'kyj to Jarema Wiśniowiecki in 1649 demanding that the latter surrender Zbaraž. From this example, Mme. Kagan concludes that "mocking letters to an enemy were customary in the seventeenth century among the Cossacks." The key passage of the letter reads, "And why don't you crawl out of your hole and throw yourself into the same heap with the king?" That is hardly reminiscent of the mockery in the Cossack "Reply" nor generically are the letters the same, the one apparently being real and the other apocryphal. Xmeli'nyc'kyj's letter, written in Polish, tells us nothing about a tradition from which the Cossack "Corres-

25"A czemuż sam nie wychodzisz z norki, a do króla j. m. w jednę kupę się nie garnicie?" Dokumenty Bohdana Xmeli'nyc'koho, 1648-1657, ed. I. Kryp'jakevc and I. Butyc, Kiev, 1961, p. 122.
"Correspondence." Moreover, the Sirko letter is a long, windy piece with classical allusions and a review of Cossack history—a far cry from the "Correspondence." The threats of Sirko are no more than what one normally might expect in correspondence with a threatening neighbor. Sirko's letter itself may not be genuine; the earliest citation of it that I know is by Velyčko.26 Markevych, who cited archival sources for the other letters he published in his appendices, gave no source for his version of Sirko's.27 And Murzakevych, when he published the text, remarked appropriately that "from the historico-rhetorical quality one cannot assume the contemporaneity of writing which is attributed to the artfully-composed epistle, as though it were written in Zaporizhzhia."28 Of course, that proves nothing, but one would expect that those who have subsequently cited the letter might have treated it with greater caution and even investigated its origin, precisely for the reason Murzakevych mentions.

The lack of such caution in dealing with sources is nowhere more striking than in the treatment of the final example cited as proof that Ukrainian versions of the "Correspondence" derive from a seventeenth-century Ukrainian tradition. In 1697, while besieging Tavanch, the Turks and Tatars demanded that the Cossacks surrender the fort. According to one account of the events, the Cossacks composed an insulting letter in reply—a letter which is one of the Ukrainian versions of the "Reply" found in the "Correspondence." It is instructive to examine how this account came into being, as none of those who cite it as fact have done so.

The factually inaccurate Istorija Rusov, a polemical work composed no earlier than the end of the eighteenth century, mentions that during the siege


of Tavan' the Turkish vizir dispatched a letter urging the Cossacks to accept a bribe and surrender the fort. The Cossacks sent a refusal in which they "declared proudly that they had their honor and conscience even though all hetmans and vizirs did not possess them at all, and that the hostile cities built on their Russian lands, which had been conquered by their blood, could not be yielded other than for the same price."\textsuperscript{29} This obviously is not the "Reply" in the "Correspondence."

M. Bantyš-Kamens'kyj recounts a similar tale in his \textit{Istorija Maloj Rossii}. He cites from archival materials what purport to be both the vizir's letter demanding surrender and threatening to take the city by force, and the Cossacks' reply asserting their faith in God, their refusal to surrender, and their expectation of the arrival of a relief force.\textsuperscript{30}

Mykola Markevič, who used both accounts, exercised remarkable discretion and merely combined them, reserving for a footnote the following:

I have inserted these letters as they have been transmitted to us by our Chronicles; but recently I received from Grodno, from a certain archive, through my son-in-law General Xelms'kyj, a copy which he personally made in the archive. I cannot vouch for the truth and authenticity of this reply of the Little Russians to the sultan; however, I do not feel it right for me to conceal it.

He then quotes a Ukrainian version of the Cossacks' "Reply" to the sultan in the "Correspondence," and adds:

\begin{quote}
This is very like the character of the rather turbulent Zaporozhians of old. But I do not imagine that the obščestvo permitted the sending of such a letter to the addressee. \textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Istorija Rusov ili Maloj Rossii}. Sočinenie Georgija Koniskogo, Arxiepiskopa Beloruskogo, Moscow, 1846, p. 195.

\textsuperscript{30}M. Bantyš-Kamenskij, \textit{Istorija Maloj Rossii}, 3rd ed., pt. 3, Moscow, 1842, pp. 27-28. One should note some independent evidence that the Cossacks hoped to be able to mock and curse the attackers even if not in writing. See the letter from the ataman Jasko Fedorenkoto Hetman Mazepa of September 13, 1697, requesting aid so that the fort could hold out and so that "the enemy would again be subject to laughter and profanation from us" (opjet' onie neprijatele iz nas amex i poruganie meli) (D. N. Evarnickij, \textit{Istocniki dlja istorii Zaporozskix kozakov}, Vol. I, Vladimir, 1903, p. 717).

\textsuperscript{31}Markevič, \textit{Istorija}, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1843, pp. 74-75.
The final chapter in the nineteenth-century history of this episode was written by A. A. Tuhán-Mirza-Baranovs'kyj in 1873, following the publication of a somewhat different variant of the Cossack "Reply" in the previous year by Mykola Kostomarov. Without citing any source, Baranovs'kyj reproduced unchanged Markevyč's account of the vizir's letter to the besieged and added in his own words: "The Cossacks and elders gathered in council. Aroused by the suggestion about treason, they heatedly composed an answer." Baranovs'kyj then quoted the answer—the apocryphal "Reply" found in Markevyč's footnote—and continued:

The similarity with the letter communicated by N. I. Kostomarov is immediately obvious; in all probability the compiler was guided by it in composing his reply. But this letter was not sent; instead of it, the following answer was composed.32

And what follows is the letter quoted by Markevyč in his main text. Schematically the origin of the 1697 Tavan' tale can be summarized as in Figure I.

**Figure I**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Istorija Rusov</th>
<th>Bantyš-Kamens'kyj's Istorija</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Xelms'kyj's copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markevyč's Istorija - Markevyč's footnote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirza-Baranovs'kyj's article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Such is the sad story of how recent scholars have come to cite a letter copied from an unknown manuscript in a provincial archive by the son-in-law of Markevyč—a letter of unknown date and origin and no apparent connection with the events of 1697 as attested in other sources—as evidence for the currency of the Cossacks' "Reply" in seventeenth-century

---

Ukraine. Markevych at least was circumspect in his use of the letter; would that those who followed him had been likewise.\textsuperscript{33} Despite the efforts of scholars since Markevych, it should be clear that unlike in the Polish and Russian cases, no evidence has been adduced for the existence of a Ukrainian tradition in the seventeenth century which would have produced the "Correspondence."

What evidence is there regarding the origins and early textual history of these letters? One should properly begin by determining which copies are oldest and then by examining their texts. There are, first of all, German and Russian copies which unquestionably date to the seventeenth century. At least one of the seventeenth-century Russian manuscripts contains the following heading for the "Correspondence": "Translated from Polish. Copy of a letter of the Turkish sultan written to the Cossacks at Cyhyryn, July 7, 1678."\textsuperscript{34} This copy of the "Correspondence" is accompanied in its manuscript by several extracts from kuranty and several other apocryphal letters, among them the ones discussed above. The same Russian text, in a copy which can be dated between 1683 and 1687, is also accompanied by one of the other sets of apocryphal letters and by documentary material that must have come from the Muscovite Diplomatic Chancellery.\textsuperscript{35}

A hitherto unknown German pamphlet containing the "Correspondence" (reproduced below in the Appendix) was published in 1683; its place of publication may eventually be learned from the figure of the winged Mercury on the cover and other elements of decoration. The first part of each letter in German is textually extremely close to the Russian counterpart,

\textsuperscript{33}Nud'ha, Lystuvannja, p. 27, even goes so far as to accept Baranovs'kyj verbatim and consider that Markevych's account is a secondary rendering in comparison.

\textsuperscript{34}See the text as published by Kagan, TODRL, XIV, p. 311, from the Leningrad manuscript cited above in note 21.

\textsuperscript{35}This MS is Codex Ad 10 of the Stifts- och Lands-Biblioteket in Västerås, Sweden, described in Staffan Dahl, Codex Ad 10 der Västeråser Gymnasialbibliothek, Uppsala, 1949.
but in the German, a large section has been added at the end of each letter. This means that the first group distinguished by Xarlampovych—who had only the Russian text—must be divided into "short" and "long" versions.

The German pamphlet enables us to establish a seventeenth-century date for one of the published Polish texts of the "Correspondence." This text—only the sultan's letter—appeared in Lwowianin in 1840, with no information about the manuscript from which it was taken.36 One can, I believe, suggest with some confidence that the text is that found in manuscript No. 603/III of the Ossolineum which contains a "List tegoż [cara turskiego] do Kozaków do Czebryny." Another of the Ossolineum manuscripts, No. 289/II, contains apparently the same letter and a "Respons. Dat. w Czechryniu 1683." Both copies of the Cossack letters are preceded by a declaration of the sultan to the Emperor Leopold—clearly a Polish version of the apocryphal letter of 1683 known in Russian translation and a published German pamphlet of that year.37 The 1683 German version of the "Correspondence" derives from a Slavic original;38 we know, moreover, that many German pamphlets of this type were translations from Polish. Textually, the letter published in Lwowianin is unique among known Polish versions of the "Correspondence" because it contains the long version of the text known otherwise only in the German pamphlet. The evidence therefore suggests that the text of Lwowianin must derive from a protograph of 1683 or earlier.

36 The text is republished in Cyrillic transcription by Jevstalovych and Inhl'ot, "Pol's'ki versii," p. 120.

37 My information on both manuscripts (which date from the eighteenth century) and the citations derive from Wojciech Kutrzebiski, Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki zakłdu nar. im. Ossolińskich, Vol. II, Lwów, 1886, pp. 229-236, and Vol. III, Lwów, 1888, pp. 80-81. I have been informed that the manuscripts are not in that portion of the collection still in L'viv; one assumes that they are now in Wrocław.

38 For example, note the words "Bojar," "Sobaka," "Kolbake," and the phrase "Ein Engel des hellesischen Teuffels," in which the word "Engel" of the latter corresponds to the "ynuk" of the Slavic versions—in German "ynuk" translates as "Engel," which would make better sense in the context. Perhaps the last example is merely a printing error, but it may have been
As we do not yet have the Polish "Reply" to the letter of the sultan in this "1683 redaction," we shall concentrate on the sultan's letter alone. This procedure is dictated also by the fact that the "Reply" is keyed to the sultan's letter—the Cossacks list a parodied title for every title of the sultan—and hence cannot antedate it.

Dating the appearance of the first half of the "Correspondence" establishes a probable date, or at very least, a terminus a quo for the appearance of the "Reply."

Table I gives in parallel the texts of the Russian, German, and Polish versions of the sultan's letter from the copies just discussed.39

| Table I |
|------------------|------------------|
| Sultan syn oświeconego ces- | Sultan syn oświeconego ces- |
| area tureckiego, Mahomet IV. | area tureckiego, Mahomet IV. |
| cesarz Tureckie, Macedońscy, | cesarz Tureckie, Macedońscy, |
| Babilońscy, Jerusalemski, | Babilońscy, Jerusalemski, |
| Bejrutscy, Wielkie i Małe | Bejrutscy, Wielkie i Małe |
| Egiptu, król Ormiański, | Egiptu, król Ormiański, |
| wszystkich na świecie | wszystkich na świecie |
| mieszkających książeń | mieszkających książeń |
| nad książyty ziemią, opieku | nad książyty ziemią, opieku |
| ukryciaowego Boga, pan | ukryciaowego Boga, pan |
| wielki i dziedzic na ziemi i pod | wielki i dziedzic na ziemi i pod |
| ziemią, pociecha biorumonów, | ziemią, pociecha biorumonów, |
| chrześcijanów upadek i smutek. | chrześcijanów upadek i smutek. |

Wir gebieten euch damit ihr- | Rozkazujemy, abyście się ze |
mit aller deiner Mannschaft | wszystkim ludem swoim poddali |
euch gutwillig uns demuthiget | dobrovolnie i na wojnę wy- |
und ergeben, und vider unsere | chodzili, a tego chęta pol- |
Feinde in den Krieg ziehet, | skięgo nie szukali, gdy nie |
dem Polnischen Kral kein Ge- | zał, jeżeli tego nie uczyn- |
boren leisten massen in | cie, tak wy, jako i on, w oku- |
kurzer Zeit wo ihr das nichts | wach bójcie się żegni, dzieci |
thun verdet so soll ihr alle | i long tak wazne, jako i tego |
gesellt werden mit euem | chęta polskiego, że wszyst- |
Weltbern und Kindern wie auch | kątka podbijamy i wszystko w |
den Polnischen Kral mit sein- | poddanych naszych braci. |
em guzten land will ich | |
The variant readings suggest the schematic relationship of Figure II.

Figure II

(A) Short Polish version

[Russian]

(B) Long Polish version

[German]

[Polish as rendered in Lwowianin]

The Russians and, to some extent, the German versions reflect the protograph A more closely than does the Polish text of the late copy we have. For example "kreceskoj" and "korol' aleksandrijskoj" appear in the Russian text and in earlier pamphlet apocrypha in the group we discussed above as originating in 1612. Probably the German letter derived from a text that had inadvertently omitted the same phrases from its protograph (e.g., the one reflected in the Polish text which we have); the German "Reply" contains the appropriate parodies, "Fussscheme der Griechen" and "dess Alexander Kolbake." Similarly, "vnik Bożij, xrabryj vojn, navetnik xristjanskij" are in the Russian and German texts (but not the Polish) and are found in earlier pamphlet apocrypha. The "pasa assirijskoj" of the Russian is more "correct" than either the German or Polish renderings ("Bassa in Silistrien"/"Basza Sylistryjski"), as it is listed in the context of the sultan's Asian possessions. The "Assprer" of the German "Reply" is probably a misprint for "Assyrer," which would correspond to the correct "asirijskoj" of the Russian "Reply."

On the other hand, the Polish and Russian texts have some common readings not found in the German text. Despite some variance, the two Slavic texts are so close in many readings that a Russian translation from
Polish is indeed likely, as the heading in the Russian manuscript tells us. The omissions and one addition ("i pod ziemiq") in the Polish version reflect the fact that it is a "second redaction" (produced by the addition of the lengthy section at the end) and has come down to us from what may have been a late copy.

Eustachiewicz and Inglot suggest that the Polish text could not be from the seventeenth century because of the added passage which mocks the Polish king.\(^{40}\) But given the above information and the fact that the letter undoubtedly was intended to be accompanied by the "Reply" mocking the sultan and praising the king, there can be little doubt of the origin of this Polish text in the seventeenth century. Probably the portion of it not found in the short Russian version was added in 1683 during the events surrounding the rescue of Vienna from the Turks by Jan Sobieski. The copying of the "Correspondence" in the two Ossolineum manuscripts along with the declaration of the sultan to Emperor Leopold, which we know circulated in pamphlet form in that year, is additional evidence for this dating of the "long" version.

The Russian short version is a translation produced in the Diplomatic Chancellery in Moscow from a Polish original probably written in 1678 in connection with the second Turkish campaign against Cyhypryn.\(^{41}\) Given what we know about the rapidity with which current pamphlets and newspapers were received in Moscow for the compilation of kuranty, it is most reasonable to date the translation to the same year or the beginning of the following one. We know of a number of other pamphlets that

---

\(^{40}\) Jevstaxeuyv and Inhl'ot, "Pol's'ki versi{i}," p. 133. I am inclined, however, to accept their explanation of the date assigned the letter in its heading (1667) as the addition of a later copyist or the nineteenth-century editor. While they show that events of 1667 could have inspired the composition of the "Correspondence" then, until further evidence is adduced, that date must remain suspect.

\(^{41}\) This dating for the Russian variant is accepted by other scholars; see, for example, Kagan, TODRL, XIV, p. 312.
appeared first in Polish in connection with the Czyhyryn war and then were translated into German or Russian. A previously unpublished example of such a Russian translation, describing the fighting and destruction of the city in August 1678, is reproduced in the Appendix below. That translation is accompanied in its manuscript by the sultan’s apocryphal letter of 1678 to the Polish king. The pamphlet "Correspondence" is clearly to be numbered among such works. Its place of origin—whether

42 Among them, Aussfuehrliche Nachricht wie die Tuercken Czechryn belaegert und was von Tag zu Tage in selbiger Belaegerung biss zu deren Ubergang an die Tuercken passiret und vorgelaufen, Gedruckt im 1676sten Jahre, n. p. (copy in HCL, Ott. 395.5), in which the heading preceding the text reads (f. 2): "Extract-Schreiben des Polnischen Residenten Prosky bey dem Gross-Vezir aus dem Tuerckischen Lager vom 24. Augusti 1678"; and the diary-like entries beginning on f. 2v are headed: "Muendliche Relation vom 1. August biss 23. ejusdem dess aus dem Tuerckischen Læger vom Koeniglichen Residenten Herrn Prosky den 24. Augusti abgefertigten und bey Ihrer Koeniglichen Maiestat allhier in Jaworow den 4. Sept. zuruecke angelangten Expressen mit Namen Mytko." The text differs from the Russian one reproduced below. A second example is the virsi published by Kagan in her "Virši ob obrone Cigirina ot turok", TODRL, XVII (1961), pp. 435-444. While she correctly indicates their Ukrainian origin, she failed to note that these verses are listed in their seventeenth-century manuscript as "virši Boronovića" (GFB, Sobranie Pogodina, No. 1604, f. 1). In response to an inquiry from me, Sokrat Aleksandrović Klepikov, the leading authority on the publications of the press in Novgorod-Sverskij directed by the Archbishop of Černihiv Lazar Baranovć, suggested that these verses probably come from a pamphlet published in 1678 by the Baranovć press: A. Buczyński, Czyhirin pograniczne miasto w cięskim oblężeniu Tureckim roku 1677 za szczęściem Jeho Czarskiego...Wieliczestwa triumfujące, W. Nowogrodzk Siewierskim 1678 (40, 25pp.). The erroneous attribution to Baranovć might have occurred because, as we know from other editions of that press, his name usually was prominent on the title page, and the author's name might appear only on the second page. Apparently no copies of the pamphlet have survived that would confirm this identification. Dr. Klepikov has not located any in the Soviet Union (see his "Izdaniya novgorod-severskoj tipografii i loznočernigovskie izdaniya 1674-1679 gg.", Kniga. Issledovanija i materiały, Vol. VIII [1963], p. 269), nor are any known in Polish repositories. Prof. Dr. Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa of the Zakład Starych Druków in the Biblioteka Narodowa, Warsaw, graciously informed me that the only known copy, which had been in the Biblioteka Krasinskiach, perished during the Second World War.

21
Ukraine or Poland—may never be known. A Ukrainian origin, but in Polish, is possible, as the short version of the "Correspondence" does not contain the factual contradictions found in the "expanded" Polish and Ukrainian texts known only from later copies.

What about the source and inspiration for the "Correspondence"? We discover all the phrases of the short version of the sultan's letter in the apocryphal letters of the group which originated in 1612. A careful comparison of the numerous texts in this group reveals that the intitulatio varies somewhat from one version to the next. Yet it can hardly be a coincidence that among these letters, the one closest to the sultan's letter to the Cossacks is a Polish text that dates also from the 1670's:

To The Cossacks (1678)

Соłтан сын салтана тур-ског̆о, цесарь турск̆ои, греческ̆ои, македонск̆ои, вавилонск̆ои, иерусалимск̆ои, паша асийск̆ои, Велик̆ои и Малого Егип-та, король александрийск̆ои, армениск̆ои и всех на свете обитающих, князь над князами, внук божий, храбрый воин, наследник царства, правде и истине борющийся, глас оправдателем, глас истинного послевременника, христианского, храброго и мудрого, мир и благодать во всем мире.

To The Archbishop of Gniezno (1674)

Солтан сын освященый цесаря тур-ског̆о, Божи внук, цесарь тур-ског̆и, греческ̆и, македонск̆и, бабий-донск̆и, европейск̆и, бала адриатическ̆и, сандинск̆и, сандинск̆и, анатолийск̆и, памаренск̆и, македонск̆и, величк̆и и малого Египта, король александрийск̆и, урмениск̆и, и вилярных панов пан на тьм свяще мешкалоных в радо земном, страж мяста жилнского, и вилярных панов пан на тьм свеъ мешкалоных, коими над кошеньнетве. Бог равны и вилярных бендоных на свище вилярных, бок древа жизн̞и, внук Божи, межны инститор хри-ст̞яан и опекун укрывдаожного, пан и даждзич на земли, надзев и поцеха бесмореьска а христианом упадек и смутек.

43The Polish letter is given here in the Cyrillic transcription of Sinbirskij sbornik, p. 124. Its editors hesitated to translate it because of the sizeable number of unclear passages (the original, which may still be among the papers of the Malorossijskie dela, appears to have been a poor copy). For the same reason and because the rules used in the transcription of the 1840's are not entirely clear, it seemed best to avoid further distortion by retranscription into Latin letters.
Aside from what seem to be simply contractions by the author of the letter to the Cossacks, the variants are sufficient to indicate that precisely this 1674 letter was not the source for that of 1678. Other letters in the same group contain readings corresponding to "ierusalimskoj" and "khranitel' raspolzowego Boga" and indicate a number of other distorted readings in the letter of 1674.\footnote{\textsuperscript{44}} Nevertheless, the textual connection of the 1678 letter with one very like that of 1674 is indisputable. Unknown copies of the apocryphal letters of the sultan keep turning up; there can be little doubt that the source for the letter to the Cossacks will be found among them.

The message, or dispositio, of the "Correspondence" in the short version is confined to one line: "We order you to submit [to us] willingly with all your people."\footnote{\textsuperscript{45}} In one other apocryphal letter (dated 1678) the sultan accuses the Polish king of breaking his promise to "submit to us willingly."\footnote{\textsuperscript{46}} The similarity in phrasing suggests some connection between these two letters of the same year, even though they differ considerably in the intitulatio. The dispositio of the long version of the "Correspondence" does not correspond closely with that in any of the other apocrypha, but its contents suggest the possibility that it was inspired by a reading of one of the other letters containing the threats and insults of the sultan.

The "Reply" of the Cossacks derives directly from the sultan's letter to them. Most of the other seventeenth-century apocryphal letters

\footnote{\textsuperscript{44}}Note especially Czaradzki, Pobudka, f. 4, and Kurtzer Bericht und Absag-Brief, Was der Tuerckische Sultan ihrer Koeniglichen Majestet in Polen Anno 1652 den 10 Decembris in der Koeniglichen Residentz-Stadt Warschaw durch einen eylenden Curier ueberbracht zugeschrieben..., Gedruckt im Jahr Eintausent Sechshundert und drey und Funffitzig (copy in the Ossoleineum, XVII-6697-III), f. lv. Another edition of this German text, which refers to "Relat. Franfurct von anno 1652," is found in Tuerckischen Staats und Regiments Beschreibungen..., n. p., 1664 (copy in HCL, Ott. 142.2.5), ff. Bii-Biiiv.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{45}}"Povelevaju vam, ctob este dobrovol'no poddalis' [nam] so vsemi ljudmi."

\footnote{\textsuperscript{46}}"Nam poddatisja dobrovolno" (Kagan, TODRL, XV, p. 244).
of the sultan appear alone; none of the replies which do exist coincide with that of the Cossacks. In some cases the other replies attempt a phrase-by-phrase parody of the sultan's letter, but only in the "Correspondence" is this carried through consistently both in the intitulatio and dispositio. In view of the brevity and relative lack of interest of the sultan's letter to the Cossacks in contrast to his letters to the Polish king, it is most probable that both parts of the "Correspondence" were conceived at the same time. While an apocryphal letter of the sultan must have served as the textual source for the first half of the "Correspondence," a reply, if one existed, probably was no more than the inspiration for the "Reply" of the Cossacks.

Textually the remaining, "expanded" versions of the "Correspondence" --including all those in the "Ukrainian redaction" and all but one of the Polish texts--are quite different from the seventeenth-century redaction we have been examining. Before investigating the relationship between these seventeenth-century texts and the others, it is desirable to establish the interrelationship of the latter. Xarlampovyc attempted to do so for the "Ukrainian redaction," and Bustachiewicz and Inglot sorted the Polish texts to determine the oldest version. In neither case, though, was the work complete, nor in either case was the relationship between the expanded Polish and Ukrainian texts established: Xarlampovyc did not know about any of the former, and the two Polish scholars, perhaps out of politeness to their readers, simply chose not to treat the latter.

The textual analysis which follows must be considered at best a preliminary treatment, since there are a number of problems which prevent one from attaining more conclusive results. Common to all of the texts is the fact that they are all quite far removed from the protograph: no one text is free from omissions and reworking. The texts of the "Ukrainian redaction" present two additional problems: in almost every instance, we know nothing about the provenance and date of the manuscripts from which they were published, nor can we be certain about the language of the original texts, since it would appear that some of them were
Russianized by their editors. Moreover, a good many of the texts of the "Ukrainian redaction" contain only the "Reply," but not the letter of the sultan. This is to be expected, since the Cossacks' reply understandably would have been the more popular of the two.

We will examine each half of the "Correspondence" separately because of the number of cases where only one half is available. Where we have both the sultan's letter and the "Reply," the stemma of interrelationships for each half should be identical. For the sultan's letter we obtain the schema of Figure III where the Roman numerals represent the Polish texts and the Arabic numerals the texts of the "Ukrainian redaction" (according to the numeration assigned them by Eustachiewicz and Inglot and by Nud'ha respectively). 47

![Figure III](image)

47 The texts are published by Nud'ha, Lystuvannja, pp. 59-65, and by Jevstaxeyc and Inhl'ot, "Pol's'ki versiji," pp. 118-120. Citations from text No. II follow Nud'ha's rendering in the Latin alphabet (pp. 36-37) and extracts from the remaining Polish texts have been transcribed into the Latin alphabet from the phonetic Cyrillic transcription of their publication. In the cases of Nud'ha's texts Nos. 1-6, I transliterate from the original publications on which he relied and do not "Ukrainianize" the transliteration. No attempt has been made to normalize orthography, although it should be noted that the transcription in Jevstaxeyc and Inhl'ot seems to represent something of a normalization of the original texts.
The basic feature distinguishing the right half of the stemma from the left is the phrase "syn Mahometa...brat słońca i miesiąca" ("syn Magometa, brat--słońca i lury") in the former. Other distinctive features of the texts on the right are the close variants "cesarz nad cesarzami"/"cear' nad carjami" but the absence of "książe nad księżą" and its variants as found on the left. Text No. IIIa does contain certain readings that connect it with the left half of the stemma: "Turbowali" (in Nos. 2 and IVa), "Bram," which is probably a distortion of the "braci" of Nos. Ia and IVa, and "potentat nad potentatami," which is precisely the simple rendering of No. Ia, without the (presumably) secondary accretions and changes of the other versions. Text No. 7 need not be dwelt upon, since it obviously has a common protograph with No. 4 but contains a number of distorted readings.

In the left half of the diagram, Nos. IIA and 2 contain four very distinctive readings: "aleksandryjski król"/"Korol' Aleksandrijskij," "potentat nad wszystkimi na świecie zostającemi"/"Patent [sic] nad Patentami, nad wsem, na swěte obretajućimisja," "na wszystkiej ziemi dziedziczny pan"/"wseja zemli naslědnyj pan," and "Datowano w Konstantynopolie"/"Dawano v Konstantinopolu." The second of these phrases is also very close to that in text No. IVa ("potentat nad wszystkimi potentatami na ziemi będącymi"), which has in common also with Nos. IIA and 2 the reading "dobrowolnie." Text No. IVa has at least two readings found only in No. Ia among the other texts: "braci" and "smutek chrześcijański" (the "bojar" of No. IIA is unique but probably is a later distortion of "braci"; one expects parallelism in the epithets "smutek i upadek" to match "nadzieja i pociecha" referring to Muslims).

Finally a number of unique readings should be noted. Text No. Ia evidences later reworking and some distortion of the original, since in each of the two sets of epithets just mentioned it retains only one of the appellations. More important is the somewhat distorted phrase "nad wszystkimi na świecie dziedzicami pan nad panującymi," and the reworking of the ending with what appears to be an addition of phrases not found in the other texts: "z ziemiami, powiatami, miastami, zamkami i wszystkim
waszym państwem i jego wojskami." Text No. 2 omits entirely the phrase rendered in the other texts variously as "smutek i upadek chrześcijanom." Moreover, the reading "Straż Groba Raspjatoego" is incomplete and would seem to be a mixing of the phrases of the other texts: "struż groba bożego... opiekun Ukrzyżowanego Boga." In No. 4, the reading "smuśczenie i velikij zaścienik xristian" makes little sense compared to the dual epithet cited previously. It would appear that in the late text No. 7 an attempt was made to improve on the reading of No. 4 by the alteration to "a smuśceniiju..."

Turning now to the texts of the "Reply," we obtain the stemma of Figure IV.

Figure IV

A number of phrases distinguish the right half of the diagram from the left. On the right, in all of the texts except Nos. 1 and IIIb, following "sekrétar" is some other phrase (most commonly including "jaký ty do čerta lycar") instead of the listing of the place name epithets which come immediately after "sekrétar" on the left. In most of the texts on the right one finds the readings "sahajdak" (not in No. 1), "zlođij" (not in No. 8; cf. on the left, "hicle," except for No. 3), "nascho Bohaduren!" (except No. 1; cf. Nos. IVb and V), and "svynjača morda," etc. (not in Nos. 1 and 9). The phrase "he budeš ty hoděn syniv xyrstijans'kyx maty" is common to all but No. 9 on the right (in No. IIIb it is distorted). On the left side of the diagram, readings common to several of the texts
but not found on the right include: "szalejesz...po swity" (in Nos. Ib, IVb, and 3), "kobylinu warysz" (in Nos. Ib, IVb, V and 3), "z skory lupyt" (in Nos. Ib, IVb, V and 3; here the vulgarity in IIb brings it close to the readings of the right half of the stemma), "jak ryba z wodoju" (Nos. IIb, IVb, V, with simply "z wodoju" in Ib and 3; in contrast, on the right, the more logical "zemleju i wodoju"), and finally and most importantly (in all but No. IVb), the introductory phrases "slawnyi (w)atamany...my tobi...odpysujem" before the section containing the parodies of the sultan's titles.

On the right half of the stemma, we note the following: Nos. 8 I and 8 II clearly have a common source, but while 8 II contains the better readings, neither text by itself is complete. A number of common readings connect Nos. 8 and IIIb: the sequence "vavylons'kyj sljusar...makedons'kyj brovarnyk," "kozac'kyj shajdak" (found only in these texts), "ljuterans'ka...moskovs'ka...cyhans'ka" (but N.B., in No. IVb, "moskovskaja"). Nos. 5, 6, and 9 are a group which Xarlampovyč distinguished from the others because they place the dispositio somewhere in the middle of the intitulatio. Since this phenomenon is found neither in real nor apocryphal letters that might have any connection with the "Correspondence," it is clear indication of the secondary nature of these texts. In contrast, in Nos. IIIb and 8, the order of the parts is correct. Texts Nos. 5, 6, 8, and 9 contain a rhymed ditty on the end ("cysia ne znaem..."), which is not found in any other texts, and these same four texts contain the coarse epithet "nexitresencyi lob" and varying amounts of unprintable obscenity approached only by that in texts Nos. IVb and V on the left half of the stemma. Text No. 1 is unique in most respects—the parts that most closely coincide with the other variants on the right are clearly contracted. Several readings place it close to the group of Nos. 5, 6, and 9 (e.g., "Podol'skij zloj"), but it does not interrupt the intitulatio as does that group.

We note on the left side of the diagram: Nos. IIb, V, and 3 all contain "dobrymi," "za Porogami," "ormjanskaja" (in contrast to worse readings in No. Ib, which contains other bad readings as well). Nos. IIb
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and 3 have common readings in "ia tobie tak odpisuję","ja tobi tak odpisuję," "kolesnik assyrijski, browarnik Wielikoho i Mażoho Egiptu"/"Kolesnyk Asarijskij, Brovarčik Velikago i Malago Egipta," "honiec ukryżowanego Boha i niepryjatel'"/"na Raspjatago Boga gonitel' i neprijatel'," and very similar endings. Yet both texts contain readings that place them rather far from the protograph of all the texts: in No. 3, the misplaced "šališ' ty po svitu," "prorok" (instead of "smutek i upadek"), the omission of reference to Kamjanec'-Podil'skyj; in IIb, most notably the omission of the phrase that is the basis of the dispositio in the other texts, "ne poddamosja, a twogo...woyska ne boimosja." Texts IVb and V have close readings: the omission of "podnożek," the unusual "duren wołoski"/"durak wolyński," and similar vulgarity at the end. Finally, we note that text IIIb, as in the case of IIb, has some ties to the left half of the diagram (e.g., no additions after "sekrētar"), even though it has important readings connecting it with the right half.

Now it may be objected that including the Polish and Ukrainian texts in the same diagram is methodologically incorrect. Yet one notes that with a single exception in each case (Nos. III and 2/3), the right half of the diagram contains all of the Ukrainian and the left half all of the Polish texts. It is most reasonable to assume that the exceptions merely represent translations—Nos. 2 and 3 coming from the Polish and No. III coming primarily from a Ukrainian original, but with reference to a different (Polish?) variant. Any other explanation of the similarities of these texts with those closest to them is far less satisfactory. The question which remains, then, is that of the protograph at the head of the diagram. Comparison of the texts known in the seventeenth-century group (the Russian, Polish and German of 1678 and 1683) with the Ukrainian and remaining Polish ones reveals a distinctive pattern of variants:
Seventeenth-century Group

Sultan's letter
"greceskoj"
"assirijskoj"
"syn oswieconego cesarza"

Remaining Polish
"greckich"
(variants)
"syn oswieconego cesarza"

Ukrainian

"brat solnca i luny"

"ukrzyzowanego"
"kisiaz nad kisiezety"
"Reply"
"grecesko podnozie"
"asirijskoj"
"pes (Sobaka) tatarskoj"
"raspjatogo Boga vrag i gonitel' rabov ego"

"ukrzyzowanego"
"kisiazu nad kisiezety"

"podnozek grecki"

"asyryjski"

"sobaka tatarska"

"tatars'kyj sahajdek"

"goniec ukrzyzowanego Boga i nieprzyjaciel" "nasoho Boha duren"?

Ending: "ne poddadimsja tebe no bit'sja s toboju budem" Ending (in No. I): "ne poddamosja...i z toboju... bytysja budemo"

No text ending with "budem"; generally sizeable addition, notably "Cysia ne znaem..."

The variants adduced here should suffice to support the argument that the short seventeenth-century Polish version—which has been posited as the original for the other texts—undoubtedly was the source for the remaining Polish texts. Furthermore, since these Polish texts appear to be closer to the protograph than the Ukrainian, it is only reasonable to assume that a reworked Polish text of the original "Correspondence" was the source for the Ukrainian and "expanded" Polish ones. In other words, some additional evidence that might be weighed is the fact that one of
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the textual history of the "Correspondence" is that diagrammed in Figure V.

Figure V

Short Polish

Short Russian 1683 Polish

Expanded Polish 1683 German

Ukrainian

A comparison of the seventeenth-century texts of the "Correspondence" with the Ukrainian and "expanded" Polish versions reveals that elements common to the latter—elements that give them more color and seem to bring out the "narod" in them—are absent in the earlier texts. After making such a comparison and concluding that the "Ukrainian redaction" was primary, Mme. Kagan noted:

The letter of the Zaporozhians is original in its composition, while the letter of the Czhyryn Cossacks is more similar to a short reworking, stripped of the vitality and wit of the original. A significant part of the salutations of the Cossacks to the sultan ("jak by ty v corta lycar", "ottak tobi kozaky vidkazaly, pljuhavce"), the remarkable ending ("cysla ne znaem"), and all the obscene expressions from the answer of the Zaporozhians were

the "expanded" Polish texts—which seems to reflect the protograph more closely than the others in spite of a number of bad readings and changes—is known in a manuscript copied before the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century (Ossolineum, No. 5220/II; see Jevstasevych and Inhol't, "Pol's'ki versiija," p. 118). While there would seem to be insufficient evidence to date the text in this copy as early as the 1680's (cf. ibid., p. 134), it is, nevertheless, the oldest known copy of any Ukrainian or "expanded" Polish text. One notes as well the pattern of preservation of the texts, where most of the Polish ones contain the sultan's letter—which has to have existed at the inception of the "Correspondence"—but many of the Ukrainian texts include only the "Reply." The language of the texts may, on further examination, also be revealing. It would appear that the most purely Ukrainian portions of the texts are precisely those found only in the Ukrainian versions—which would seem to suggest "Ukrainianization" of a non-native original. Ukrainian elements found in the sultan's letter of the "Ukrainian redaction" are much less prominent than in the "Reply."
Yet as we have seen, the "Correspondence" was the product of a literary tradition of apocryphal letters in the seventeenth century—a tradition that had deep roots in Poland, became established in Muscovy, but, so far as we can tell, not in Ukraine among the Cossacks. In assessing the "vitality and wit of the original," this fact must be kept in mind, as the oldest versions of the letters textually are connected with the other apocrypha and were products of the same milieu. In this milieu and this tradition, the obscenity, wit and vitality of the Ukrainian versions of the "Correspondence" have no place.

To summarize: The "Correspondence" probably appeared first in 1678 as one of a number of pamphlets written in connection with the Çhyryyn war. While the "Correspondence" may have originated on the territory of what is today Ukraine, the original language of the letters was Polish. A Russian translation from the Polish appeared in the same year; in 1683, the letters were reworked in Polish and translated into German in connection with the Turkish campaign against Vienna. An expanded Polish reworking of the 1678 version appeared probably at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and it was from this text that the "Ukrainian redaction" ultimately derived. There is no evidence that this final stage in the evolution of the "Correspondence" occurred before the middle of the eighteenth century.

What remains to be done in studying the "Correspondence"? First, manuscript collections should be searched for yet unknown copies. It would be of particular importance to find some datable copies of the Ukrainian texts. More Polish copies undoubtedly will be found—Eustachiewicz and Inglot indicate that they searched only in the Ossolineum.

---

49 Kagan, TODRL, XIV, p. 315. Cf. the similar comments of Nud'ha in his comparison of the Ukrainian "Correspondence" with one of the seventeenth-century examples of the sultan's apocryphal correspondence with Emperor Leopold. Nud'ha found in the latter the "stamp of dry chancellery speech," and found that "it is dull...its humor is weak and in our day scarcely evokes a smile, whereas the Zaporozhian's letters in that respect have great superiority and vitality" (Lystuvannja, pp. 31-32).
but it is not clear how thoroughly. Possibly the original copy of the Russian translation of 1678 will be found among the kuranty, or in the Malorossijskie dela of the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts in Moscow. Second, further study of the seventeenth-century apocryphal letters of the sultan is needed, as we clearly are a long way from locating all the important variants. While a good many published versions are known, few manuscript ones have been sought outside of those in Muscovite sborniki carefully assembled by Mme. Kagan. Collections both in Poland and Western Europe should yield additional variants of these apocrypha. Finally, and this is perhaps the most important prerequisite for further advances in the study of the "Correspondence," we must no longer use as a criterion for analysis what would seem "very like the character of the rather turbulent Zaporozhians of old." Repin's "Zaporozhi" is, after all, a museum piece.

Daniel Clarke Waugh
Appendix

I. "List od Cesarza Tyurckiego do Krola Jego Młociwl Władysława Czwarłego...in anno 1637." Abbreviations have been expanded and punctuation added, but the orthography has not been normalized. The original, made available to me in a copy from a gracious colleague, is in MS L'viv'ska derzavna naukova biblioteka AN URSR, fond Oesolinų'kyx, No. 221/I (described by Kętrzynski, Katalog, Vol. I, pp. 590-594), pp. 75-77. The manuscript is a typical early eighteenth-century sylva rerum which includes a number of letters dealing with seventeenth-century Ottoman-Polish relations.

II. "Perevod s polskogo pisjma, kotoroe pisano v oboze tureckom, jaže be pot čigirinym leto ot rozestva xristova 1678-go." The text has been rendered according to the rules used by TODRL. The copy is from ff. 303v-309 of MS Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka SSSR im. V. I. Lenina, Sobranie I. D. Beljaeva, No. 12(1518), in 4ª, various hands of the last quarter of the seventeenth century (badly described by A. E. Viktorov, Sobranie rukopisj I. D. Beljaeva, Moscow, 1881, pp. 10-11; N.B. especially that he erroneously lists the Cossack "Correspondence" in the contents). The final portion of the MS (ff. 296-314) is in one hand—a typical prikaz cursive—which also added foliation beginning with f. 296 = l. Watermarks in this section include a complicated arms with the legend "Dieu et mon droit" and countermark DV in a frame (very similar to Edward Heawood, Watermarks Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries, Hilversum, 1950, No. 439 [1670]) and an Arms of Amsterdam with countermark PRMD in a frame (Heawood, No. 383 [1676, 1683], has that countermark but clearly a different Arms of Amsterdam). Beginning on f. 296 the MS contains: a letter of Tsar Mixail Fedorovič to Christian, King of Denmark (dated 1613); the 1637 and 1678 Russian versions of the sultan's apocryphal letter to the king of Poland (critical texts published by Kagan, TODRL, XV, pp. 240-244); the pamphlet about Čjimryn; and a work translated by Andrej Vinčus, the Muscovite postmaster of the last quarter of the seventeenth century—"Opisanie razstojaniju stolice..." (published in a critical edition by V. A. Petrov, "Geografičeskie spravočniki XVII v., "Istoricheskij arxiv, V [1950], pp. 149-158). The whole MS was assembled in its present form by the end of the seventeenth century, judging from the table of contents compiled then (ff. l-10v).


I

[p. 75] List od Cesarza Tureckiego do Króla Jego Miłości Władysława
Czwartego z wypowiedzeniem przymierza y ogłoszeniem wojny na Szym
terazniejszy in anno 1637.

Sąton, Syn oswiecony cesarza Wielkiego przemocnego, wnuk Bozy,
Cesarz nieprzestrzegł turecki, Grecki, Basylicki, Samoński, Chinski,
Zegraski, Boiecki, król wszystkich oswieconych na świecie, król mieszający w
Rein, Yiąże posiecone wszystkie Asyje, Afryki, Ameryki, Cesiey, Europ-
iedy, straz miasta Jerickego y Grodu Machometowego, Próbosc Raju Ziemskiego,
Stroz grobu Bozego mieszający, począwszy od Słonca wschodu az do zachodu,
Krol nad Krolni, Xiąże Swiata wszystkiego, Chrzeszczi utrapienie wielkie,

Tobie krolowi Polskiemu oznajmuję y powiedąm wielką możność naszą
przez Posia naszego Synagi Basze, iz Puncta ktones mia yıl wielmożności
maszyje rzucamy y wniwe stracamy y ciebie spólnie, iz ty przeciwsz się,
przeciwko mocy naszego mając contract z Moskwicinem z nimesz braterstwo
wzię, mocy naszy nie bojąc się, w nadzieje swojego y twojego potępy [sic]
stałes się naidumnym. Obaczywysz nam Poddaństwo dobrowolnie postąpią,
dla czego insi krolowie mocy naszy sprzeciwiając się sławjący moc y potęg
woj, co przeciwwo czynisz z Persem krolem, chcesz przypiąć. Iesli to
uczynisz, wieczimy czasy przymierza y pokój żadnego od Ord Tatarskich
nigdy nie byćdzesz. Zyczyłes y z nami sobie przymierza do tychczas
wszystkiego, a teraz rozmów nasze Panskie Monarskie, kozacki swe
ukrainiske jako wsiekię psy wpiszczasz, którzy pola plondruną y pustośa
Für ciebie, y przyjaźni twojej. Abasy Bazego Hetmana nam y Malestatowi
naszemu potrzebnego stracili, ze niez uważaš sobie tego łecz lekcesz sobie
przyjaźni y potęgi zawyś folgę takową ktoraś od nas miał, ze iuz więczy
miec nie będzesz. Ża to zes nie bał mocy naszych y przeciwsze się
ję, dopiero u nas będzesz prosił przymierza, gdy niezwykleone wyska
nasze od wschodu słonca na wasz postrachm idąc y Janczarni naszym
niezwykłenom, gdy ufce nasze tatarskie w polach dzikich wym się pokązą
okiem nieprzyznanym wielkimi kupami będą się walic do was żągony sw,
gdy wpuszczę moc y potęgę naszą pod strachem doznawasz będzesz y dopiero
pozwalat będziesz chcieli, iuz na ten czas wszystko świat przed mocę naszą
zadzry, przed ktorym ufce nasze ledwe strzymac będącies mogli. Morze
zaigra, gdyz galerami naszemi pody po morzu y odmieniac się będą dla
grcmow y grzmiot naszych, gdy z burzących działa wychodzić będą ognie
Straszne, pioruny z żyśkanem srogim dokucającym, pod takowy czas zadry
ziemia y strach w łasach będzie, drzewa walić się będą y przewracac się
muszą. A ty maży kroliku cóna ten czas rzeczcz y sąm z garscią ludzi
// [p. 77] muchy albo serszenie pusczę, gdy obaczyz możność naszą, która
naszej Monarchy y Panstw naszych od wschodu słonca az do zachodu trwa z
początku az do skonczenia. Będzie to wszystko nasze krolestwo Cesarsztwo
Xlięsto Chrzeszczynske Panstwo pod moc y władzą naszą wiecznie ie podbie

*"Nie" added later in a different hand.
więcę wam trwać nie będziesz, o przymierzach w żadnych contractach z wami nie myślię, boscie wy Gawrowie wszyscy dumni wyniesieli hardzi y uporni pisni naszey tak wielkie potęgie sprzeciwiać sie. O co was Bog y Machomet na was się gniewa y brzydzi się wami y proznosić waszą, dla tego taką moc y potęgę muszę z Monarchie Panstwa naszego pusieć na was Wysoka nasze y posiemy pod Krakow, w którym ty masz wielką ufność y wszystkie swoje siły, nadzieje y potęgę pokładasz, y tam ukryzowanego Boga twego z Nazareth miasta naszego świętych y poświęconych swoich choszcz stopić twoich mieszczań, kopitami kwieskiem wniwcie potrę y podepcę. W zborach twoich konie y wielbłądy z toly [sic] Bisurmanskie stawiać będą. Ta jest Bog ziemski y bicz Bosy, nadzieja y pociecha Bisurmanska, Chrisean w wszystkich grzech y zasmuconie, nad którymi się msie y karac będą szablą Bisurmanską, y ogniem miasta y zamki twoje y mury rozwalię y w popioł obroczę, y w ten czas się donscieć twoiey wiary y ukryzowanego Boga twego, w którym ty masz nadzieję y ufność twoję przeciwc mocy naszey pokładasz y naszy wielomocni ty groziysz y odpowiedz z którego y wykorzucie y w was wszystkich Chrisean. Niech ze się twoi ukryzowani Bogowie, iako chęc na mnie gniewałę y pomocci tobie będzę. Z Constantino- poła Miesiąca Manassessa 1637.

II

[ł. 303ob.] przevod z polskiego pisama, które pisanio w oboze tureckim, jako be pot Chigirynym leto od roжества Хristova 1678-го //
[ł. 304] Cide же писмо написатся от резьбьедента Corолевства полскаго, бывшаго тогда у взявра в обозе туреckом.
От оного дня войн же приходжа турки под Чигирин. Без всякого споможения и покроения иных боронаюся токмо сами люди бывшие в Чигирине, яко через четыре недели толико му жественно, яко турки множественными потопами и непрестанны ми из верховых пушах гранатным метанием ниже протих пушах бешчылымъ стреляниемъ, не воспоминая из мелького ручья оружия тягченымъ стреляниемъ, паче же ниже самыхъ огнемъ воз могопа граду и посадомъ ничто же или малую некоторую беду со деят. Больство же московское бывшее тогда во граде и казацы велию и знаменитую победу же и погибель турскому чин или толки же велику, яко в тридцять дней больши тряцати тысячъ [ł. 304ob.] раненыхъ и больныхъ турокъ вкупе у взявра обретется. Во время же облежания того не быть им ёдинаго дня такового войн же бы заменить храбрости и безчислень ного мужественного держования онихъ чигирынското крепко сер дечьни воини над турками показали еже в велике подвигение и самымъ туркомъ бысть делясь ихъ и уменье в стрельбо огненномъ и в обороне града ихъ же не болезненнымъ сердцъ выхвалити сами турци не возмогаху. Рокдовской же вождь московскаго воин ства со всемъ великимъ безчисленьнымъ множествомъ воинства мос ковското столица под Вужниномъ ничто же к ратному устроению и
промыслову попечения измеше и потом же в пятую неделю, тогда уже даже до половины град отнем позже. бьсть, рушимся отобежать Чигирину от обложения сего. "Аль мне, о Крите Боже, яко на этом месте еще не постовал в начатии, убо послужила им счастие, яко вана крьмского со всею ордого и везири и князь-лям пашу со воему // [л. 305.] иными пашами на горах стоящих, храбростью полковников особенно же надворных с пехотою московскою тако победили, яко не токмо обоих но и пятидесят шести пущен полковых взяла, а под ней же до пущкою по четыре коня впряжены бяха, пачеже и от всего туркою отбилися и всех их пехота московская с поля онаого прогнала, и аще бы Ромодановская только тысяча полковников в погоню за ним послал, то бы их множайшую часть в Тяме потопил велели, бо нато от пехоты помышлялись турки и побежали, аще бо и на четыре моста бежаша к аще никого московского конного воинства во след их женуш, обаче они сами между собою в переровдах до шти тысяча человек покололся и того в два часа до тридесетъ тысяча турков на свою сторону перебрались. Не бысть уже тогда в воинстве турецком ни единого человека, иже бы бежаше не помышлял. Еси бо уже коней взычали тяжнее все мечище и пушки оставляше тогда и сам везир приострен велели, // [л. 305б.] обаче и з десяти советники своими не отступати от града но избра себе лучший погибнути под Чигирином, неходя главу свою к салтуну со срамом показати. По сем везир повелев все мосты разметати и поплати. Вздуще переровды от сил московских, их же тогда ниже мало показался пред очима его.

Последи же в неделю прииде все оное со Ромодановским воинство же поступивше во ополнении и обозом под град Чигирином при рече Тяме положивше и сей своею срамоты не возмогаша поднять. Турцы начаша к явственному великому приступу уготовляться, обаче приступать помышляющих, конем же своих небольшо готомиться не отложком последи же размотрения, яко оное счасствие на зло нача воинству московскому изменяться, пами над градом начаша промышляти и в пяти местах под град потоку уготовя. Их же казавше четыре обретались разорища, тогда пами до толика отчалия воинство турецкое приведено, яко уже // [л. 306] и не помышляющих, о пристуле ко граду держатся же точно советоваху, по закону своему четырехдесетъ круг града обхождения и потом оборонной руюко от воинства московского и уходя помышляющих, зане всих в великим отчаливании и в бользи быща. Точию един везиръ от вся сим креплящеся под градом и сто мешков между енчаров и другое сто мешков между татаров злата и сребра рассыя и великия чести грамотами тискатом и цаулом и енчаром вечно раздаваше и десять булав пашей страха ради иных подави и старых а синерей времени и новых постави. По сем несчасный случай учинися над воинством чигиринским и в неделю от полудня яко слышашеся от полудня градских, вергоша от турков гранат в Чигирин и тое убива моводу градского околичного Ивана Ивановича Ржевского. По смерти же его толмы люди градские смешашася, яко вскоре нижней град оставаше,
великим тиском вонь побогоша // [л. 306об.] и град сами запалиша. Везирь же видел сие, недомышляясь, яковый тобь у граждан умьс и в то ж время и питья поток взорвало. Той же еще вспыхив и воста, стретущий же по тону того, турки вскочив в потопльное место, идже ни единого человека сиделца обретаешь иже бы малое во граде промышление учинил.

Обаче из верхняго города избегоша пехоты московские пот четрыя знаменны и у подъюна оного стреты жестоко опор сотвориша туркий, казаши же тиснуша и бежаша на мост и многийшая их часть пребогоша на пески за оный мост и овни в леса, друзья же в таборы побогоша. Турки же тогда начало изо всех пушек жестоко велли и крепко по граду бити и во многих местах нижней и верхней град запаливше, на карысть обративше и в плен обаче много полону взяша, за наказание едва не вси участъ [л. 307] прочно же вснедь оружию предани быша. Не спасеся их ниже итти сот человек; множи бо в рече истополна. Прибысть же той крзавый и огненны бегать от полудни до пятиго часа ночи. По сем убравшись со всем из обоих градов за мост пехота московская, запалища в Чигирине вся порохи и гранаты и вся рады указны, ибо стрельна и укса стрети яко подныся от оных порохов, место оно востреся и бо зажья средному дню подобивше. Время оно турков самых во огн сего по гиб къ третицати тысячь человечь, град же и дома бывши в нем до основания взорвало и все огнем поедено явишась, а сей слоев срамоту ни когда может Ромодановской покрыти, яко имеющий под справою своею толико избранное и в силах украшеньна а устроенье воинство, ничтоже благого сотвори, не того бо браны с турецким воинством // [л. 307об.] не составли, но еще к величалику неподякную срамоту своего дела, яко во очах своих погуби град Чигирин, и сам ножко со срамом бего предадесь с токовым великим воинством и пушкаш. Бяше бо в полну том кроме казащих 50 пушек в семнатицати приказах стрелецких по 12 пушак, кроме иных особных яже в различных поясьх бяху воинство же, бяху с ними кнзь набардинский, имея с собою третище тысячь воинов, сын ево князь Михаила Ромодановской четвердесеть тысяч, Григорий Касагов четвердесеть тысяч, первой генерал Федених Змеев 30 тысяч, второй генерал Агеи Шепелев 25 тысяч, третьей генерал Матвей Кривков 10 тысяч, еще астраханских стрельцов и казаков с татарскими и Кузма Козлов с колымскими их же 3 тысячи быты. Поведают о счислении же сил турецких немощию // [л. 308] есть подлинно писати, аще он и не ведае их, аще бо со вса Азии и Еуropy собирахуся а в же вси пани послани быща и хан крымский со ордую, обаче всех их бе 360 тысяч. Ины же воины их народы токуемо обоз держали и заглушали поря покрывашше, исходя же из обозу точию корсты ради, нежели по брации и приступом. Причиною погибели чигиринской никто же их точию Ромодановской един, первье, яко бегущих турок к Тисмину не повелево воинству ударить и ниже ведае о победе и о поступках пехоты надворной на горы всходящих и турок крепко сердечно и дерзосно убивающих, второе уреза турцы и познана, яко не бяше
против света, Ромодановской целую бо неделью стояще под градом, въ едино гопожене граду ниже над ними промышли творище, третие лакомства ради, яко слух древних воинов знаменитых, потребным им не удовольствовавше не во избранным же и не искусным благ быть, который въ светлы дни болши пили нежели ся били особному божию изволению. Не токмо мы бо и сами турки ни изложение Чигиря признают быти. Эрику бо на самом разорении обой градов в них же бо множество припасов воинских и градских и хлебных, величество же бо и воинов, их же храбрость и мужество вихрех зело предпочьную, яко о сем и глаголати видитца дело не удобно, аще бы не испущен был на град той гнев божий, то не б тако веселиося от того сердца оных поганцов, занеже и сами они не домышаляса еже бо творити.

Высть же тогда под Чигиряным турском вахтанге пашей: 1. Шаитан // [л. 309] паша, 2. Обрея паша, 3. Мусин паша, 4. Ахмет паша, 5. Магамет паша, 6. Али паша, 7. Арап паша, 8. Аравмамет паша, 9. Асам паша, 10. Еницарга паша, 11. Тотарган паша, 12. Каллан паша, а сильы с ними у всякого паши било бо 30,000 оприч мятыня и серпия и колюх и ерд, а над всеми ими был вазер турецкий да хан крымский с ордой.
Undsigelse Bref

Som den Tyrckiske Kengiser nu nylige haffuer tilskreffuit den Kommerste Kengisler Maiesiat Rudolphus, Oft armie Christine førsteligt og yndekligt at høre.

Med en Christelig paamindelse til de Christine.


Prentet i Köbenhavnssv Aft Matz Vingaard. 1593.
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Undsigelige Værf

Fra den Tyrekiske Keyser / som hand nylige
haffuer tillkrefvuit den Kommerstke Keyserlige
Majestat Rudolpho.

[Illustration of a sword and a helmet]

J Soldan Soliman / Gud paa Jorden/
den store oc Allmectige Gud paa Jorden. En wa
offueruindelig Keyser oc Regerendis Konning off-
uer alle Konger paa Jorden / fra Solens opgang
til hendis nedgang. Keyser oc Soldan i Babylion/
Hertug i den gamle Slevt/ Arabsia oc Armonia.
En baaren Förste oc Herre offuer den tørre Beck/oc offuer den Beck
Aris. Baade de Buders Mahometes oc Louis store oc veldige Hiels
pere. En Seperuindere oc Triumphator i Jerusalem. En Herre oc
Regentere offuer din Grefuse din Kaarsfeste Jesum Chrissum.
Den gantfte Chrissendoms oc deris som kaldis Chrise/ Forsyrrere
oc affagde Fiende. Tilbage dig Keyser i Behmen oc Ungern / oc
alle dine Förster oc Herrer / Distigiste Pawen oc Cardinaler/ Bischo-
per/
per/oc dine metføjde Sletter/ vnder vor Kronis oc Kongerigis/ oc dere
gantse Lands indtagelsis fortableste. De gissue dig Keyser her me
at rvide/ at wi met 13. Kongerigers Fole/ nogle hundre tusinde fisterk/
til Heff oc Frog/met egne oc Tykkefse Krigerustung/ Ja met all vor
Fyfstelige Herrs maec/ som du oc dine aldrig haffue seet/hore eller
forsfarit/i en kaart tid attt at moffe for Wien din Hoffuitstad/oc be
synderlig besyge dig Keyser hiem/De ville fordersfue dig/dine Hiels
peris Hielpere oc Anheng/met Bror oc Pile/Ja met all vor Krig
rustung/met Brand/Naoc Mord/oc lade dig omkomme/oc hem-
rettis met den ydeligste Dyd/som wi kunde optenke: De dine
fangne Christine somme myrde/somme holde euig sange i elendig-
hed/lige som Hunde/ at dine Börm (ihuor ynge de end ere) skul
stringis paa Staffre/dig oc dine Christine til spoet oc haanhed: Om
komme de sugglige Quinder met deris Börm i Moders lisse/lige som
Hunde. Thi wi haffue abdelis set off/ at tuinge dig Keyser/ som
fudder i de ringfiste Land/oc vinde dig dic Kongerige auff met Suerd/
De at nedtrycke oc atsprede den Stol wi Rom/met den Guld Spir/
De ville see om din Kaarffeste JEsus Christus skal hielpe dig/De
lade wi sige dig oc dine/ Troer du hannom/da see til/huoreldis hand
haffuer hulpis fine Legater/som haffue sigad troit paa hannom/huil
setn wi icke tro/ev heller wiore saadane vdegribelige ting/at der
skulde hielpe dig/som er dyd mange Aar siden/oc haffuer icke fundit
hipel sig selff. Wi haffue huldit hans Land oc Eyedom/oc hans Fren-
der/ nogle hundre Aar/ wi vor maec oc Regering/ Saadane vilde
wi tilforn gissue eder tilskinde/At du oc dine kunde vide at rette eber
der efster. Datum i vor veldige Stad Constantinopel/huede fere
forundrede haffue vundit fra dine met stor Herrs kraft/ Oddressuit/
Hancit oc Thielslagit dem/ ia myrd oc thielslagit Quinder oc Börm/
efster vor villie huldit mange i Elendighed/ til spaet oc haanhed ind
sil deris Ende. Alle saadane skal snarlige vederfaris dig oc dine aff
off. Efter vor Fydsel vdi det 28. De vor veldige Regering vdi
det Aar 92.

A is

Forma
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Formaning til de Christine.
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