

400 YEARS AFTER THE BATTLE OF HUMENNÉ A POLISH SOURCE ON THE SIEGE OF VIENNA AND ITS AFTERMATH (1619-21)

RADOSŁAW SZTYBER

University of Zielona Góra (Poland)

ORCID Id. 0000-0003-2955-1597

r.sztyber@ifp.uz.zgora.pl

The article is an attempt to present *The exploits of Polish elears, who were formerly called Lisovchiks (Przewagi elearów polskich, co ich niegdy lisowczykami zwano)* by Wojciech Dembołęcki. The book's form varies between that of a chronicle, a memoir, and a detailed diary. Nevertheless, the report contains an abundance of valuable and interesting data on the Battle of Humenné and its immediate consequences, particularly the pacification actions led by Polish mercenary troops. Dembołęcki's *Exploits* can be thought of as, for many reasons, a unique source of knowledge on several historical episodes of the initial stage of the Thirty Years' War. Its convention, however, is to show the Lisovchiks as an army of God, and therefore the publication (printed in Poznań in 1623) is also evidence of propaganda-motivated glorification of the notorious *elears* who supported Ferdinand II's forces twice (in 1619-21 and in 1622). Despite the exaggerated written praise, these soldiers were soon outlawed (in 1623) because of their conduct, especially during peaceful periods. The diary gives the reader a chance to get acquainted with authentic documents, such as correspondence addressed to Poles and signed by imperial authorities. The article mainly recalls selected facts (war tactics specificity, battles, marches, negotiations, etc.) in the chronological order on the basis of the account, but some examples of Dembołęcki's comments are also cited, paraphrased, or discussed to give a better idea of the nature of the original memoir. In the concluding part of the study there are some remarks on Dembołęcki's other work, enriched with a short description of a Latin manuscript (preserved in Prague) and a pair of booklets, the first of which was issued in Vienna and the second somewhat later in Poland (the precise place of publication is unknown).

Keywords: Battle of Humenné, Lisovchiks, Polish writings, Wojciech Dembołęcki, national megalomania

Introduction

The primary purpose of this article is to present a Polish book about the past events mentioned in the title. The sections of the book chosen for citation (in the form of paraphrase, as well as a few extracts) allow us to demonstrate this

exceptional account of the events, as well as the author's special point of view. The historical method applied seems to be adequate to reconstruct all features of the piece of prose under scrutiny with the special purpose of assessing the limits of its credibility. Because the narration itself is obviously not objective, it was necessary to explain such a condition by highlighting various aspects of the background of the text. Therefore this article offers a whole line of remarks on the source's origin and reception, its textual analysis, a range of indispensable data from the past which substantiate the truth about the book in question – a book full of reliable information but also of retouches, overstatement, suppositions or even plainly fictitious theories. These facets altogether determine the structure of the present sketch, divided into several sections (marked with subtitles) describing the circumstances of the book's genesis (a); particularly as regards its main figures (b); their history (c); and especially their poor reputation (d); and a brief explanation of the writer's admitted attempts to modify this image (e). As it appears, only an approach of this kind can offer us a comprehensive understanding of this old text, as it stands before us as a monument of (Polish) national megalomania. The central and most essential segment reconstructs the Battle of Humenné and its aftermath in the light of the surviving written records (f). The final paragraphs are devoted to the author and his other works (g) and to drawing conclusions (h). The 400th anniversary of this battle is an excellent occasion for commemorating this source, despite its high level of partiality, as it has been almost completely neglected in European historiography concerning the Thirty Years' War. Perhaps in future it may be considered worth notice as a source of some value in itself (somewhat in the vein of postcolonial literature).

The source (its origin and specificity); the author's motivations and intentions particularly in the light of being characteristic of the mercenary regiment

Wojciech Dembołęcki¹ published his first-ever book in Poznań in 1623. Its original title – *Przewagi elearów polskich, co ich niegdy lisowczykami zwano* [*The exploits of Polish elears, formerly called Lisovchiks*]² – announces an account of the regiment's history, covering the years 1619-22. The last pages concern the events that took place in December 1622, while the first part reconstructs the Defenestration of Prague. The book does not read like a typical memoir: scholars point out a few narrative traits which render the form of the text closer to a diary or even a chronicle.³ When reading *The exploits*, one will find mostly sentences written in the third person singular or plural, but there are also some in the first plural and, rather seldom, in the first person singular. There are plenty of personal observations, comments, and explanations in the book, whose author was the

chaplain of an army squad. This means the account comes from an eyewitness to the facts presented, although he was absent at Humienné, as he himself admits: “What I, the above-mentioned author of this little book, have written until now is based on nothing but accounts of reliable people, credible eyewitnesses. And everything from this point on – except for what happened in Walachia, also based on reliable accounts – I am writing as an eyewitness.” [226]⁴

The book appears to be strongly tendentious. The author’s aims are revealed even in the title, which suggests the superiority of Polish soldiers over others. Besides, Dembołęcki attempts to convince his readers that the Lisovchiks changed after they gained another name: ‘elcars’. Dembołęcki believed that the new name might have come from the Bible or the Hungarian language. According to him, Lisovchiks became an army of God because they were always called after their commander. The first and the best known was Aleksander Józef Lisowski (d. 1616), but the author assures that in new circumstances of the Thirty Years’ War, in its early stage (in 1619), a new leader of the regiment arose: God himself. It was, allegedly, after his name – *Elohy*m – that the Polish knights received theirs.⁵ This decision was related to a number of various impulses connected with the Lisovchiks’ reputation. “The bloom and scum of Polish valour”⁶ – remarked Władysław Łoziński,⁷ referring to the mercenary troops. The same researcher concluded,⁸ ‘In our motherland, *homo lissovianus* was a byword for a ruffian and an outcast of society; for killing him, an *infamis* could have his honour and rights restored as a reward.’⁹ Roman Krzywy has lately voiced a very strict and straightforward judgement, calling these people “drunken rabble.”¹⁰ Nineteenth-century historian Maurycy Dzieduszycki¹¹ presented the situation of these soldiers differently, ‘Where were they supposed to go? What were they to do? Where were they to seek shelter or protection? The executioner’s sword awaited them at home, soldiers’ swords were looking for them in every nook and cranny.’¹² Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski insisted on getting rid of the Lisovchiks from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.¹³

The Lisovchiks’ exploits in combat may have inspired a fascination with their efficiency, but their behaviour during peace involved a great deal of law-breaking. The unit was founded and established at the beginning of the 17th century by the previously mentioned Lisowski, who became its commander. The members of the squad were lightly armed horsemen and their activity involved military service in cases of necessity, but the soldiers were especially focused on obtaining war spoils because it rarely happened that they were paid for participation in various campaigns.¹⁴ They were equipped with bows and sabres, and some of them also used primitive handheld firearms; instead of heavy armour they wore a light armoured suit. Their horses were fast and agile, although rather small. What is more, the Lisovchiks did not have any carts. Consequently the regiment moved fast on the battlefield, and its tactics included sabotage (e.g. cutting the enemy

army off from supplies by operating at its rear), pacification, and of course effective combat in direct army clashes. These soldiers often carried out truly valuable military reconnaissance, providing essential information about the strength of the enemy force, its armament, location, etc. Sometimes they brought captives to the headquarters, but in most cases they killed the informants in order to remain unseen; for example Dembołęcki notes, ‘they cut off the peasant’s head’ [213].

All of this means that the Lisovchiks’ strategy can also be defined as guerrilla warfare. They were able to attack small units, which were caught by surprise and completely unready to fight. Such attacks were carried out in many different places at short intervals, which left the enemy with an impression of having been attacked by a very large force, though the regiment consisted of no more than 5,000 to 10,000 men (its size varied during the time of its activity). Dembołęcki reports,

In the evening just before the day when the heretics intended to storm Vienna with all their power and capture the emperor, they received information that 60,000 Poles (the actual army of 2,200 men appeared to number far more to the fear-stricken Hungarians) had stormed into Hungary and were making their way towards Vienna with fire and sword—that night, the heretics desisted from the attack and all of them escaped disgracefully. [189]¹⁵

The number of members in the squad fluctuated – new soldiers joined the unit freely. Injuries and deaths depleted their ranks, but new recruits filled the gaps. This was a continual process. In May 1622 the regiment left Poland for Western Europe 4,000 horsemen strong [250-251]. Lisovchiks were always followed by attendants or servants (Pol. *ciurowie obozowi* [e.g. 195]), who not only did typical daily work (providing supplies, cooking, taking care of weapons and horses, etc.), but also took part in the fighting. On 4 September 1621 Dembołęcki recorded, ‘Camp followers and servants, poor things (clears themselves were busy in the battlefield at the time), defended themselves with firebrands and pots [in a camp near Khotyn]. Don Cossacks joined this firebrand war and supported the servants, so that together they fended off the Tatars.’ [235]¹⁶

The structure of the regiment evolved with time and finally became a reflection of the social and political system of seventeenth-century Poland – in line with the often repeated and commonly applied rule: “*Tu Sem ora, Cham labora, Iaphet rege et protege*”¹⁷ (‘You Shem pray, Ham works, Japheth rules and protects’). The unit’s commander was a colonel chosen by representatives of the volunteers. The poll was held within a council of military elders who also appointed guards, judges, camp managers, chaplains, etc. The ranks of the Lisovchiks could be filled in only by noblemen, and the regiment was divided into several companies under various banners. The red and black soldiers were led by the command-

er himself, while the others were commandeered by cavalry captains (*rotmistrzowie*); each unit consisting of 200 to 300 horsemen [see 251-252]. The council appointed Dembołęcki (general) chaplain and (in February 1620) drew up the ‘elears’ articles’ (*artykuły elearskie*) – a military code introducing penalties to curb the unacceptable behaviour of mercenary soldiers [see 192]. The document has not survived but its later version was published in *The exploits* (see below), and afterwards (in June 1623) it was included in the municipal laws of Głogów.¹⁸ These instances of legislation also prove that the Lisovchiks themselves were aware of their poor reputation as ‘knights without fear and honour, heroes and scoundrels’¹⁹ and of the possible consequences of this reputation.

The above circumstances seriously influenced *The exploits*. The book opens with a description of the reasons for the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War. Dembołęcki discerned and presented only a few of them, connected with the devastation of the foundations of the Catholic faith, its monuments, customs and rules, and of the deep harm done to the emperor. He presents his point of view as follows:

For when in [...] the emperor’s lands imprudent citizens – infected with various heresies and puffed up by their poison, with swollen eyes blind to the truth – first opened their blasphemous mouths against the Holy Catholic Church [...], they raised their armed hand and threw the Catholics loyal to the emperor out of the window of the Prague Castle, slighting the Lord. Finally, damnably putting their trust in themselves, their armours and fortresses [...], they went so far in the rebellion they had started as to elect apparent rulers and, under their protection, violently to take over Catholic churches, dig up dead bodies from their graves and burn the relics of the saints of the Lord; at the altars they incited God’s wrath against the people with their blasphemies, they trampled on pictures of saints and even on crucifixes. Chalices, crosses, and other church silverware – sacred to God’s glory forever – were converted into money; bells were recast into cannons, priests and monks were tortured, monastic ladies – wedded to God – were raped, and Catholics were tormented and persecuted in various satanic ways. [166-168]²⁰

The passages quoted above come from the first chapter of *The exploits*. The next chapters – the second and the third – appear to be programmatic in purpose. The author’s attitude is to emphasize the great favour that the Lisovchiks rendered to the whole empire, to Christianity, the Catholic Church, and to Poland. He suggests the soldiers were brought there to fight by God himself, who allegedly had sent them a recruitment letter (*list przypowiedni*). It was a unique letter because it was not written on paper but in the hearts of the Lisovchiks, in a language different from any that is understood or spoken in the world. The tongue used was probably ‘heavenly’, and nobody could read it except the addressees

[see 171-176]. The idea of this suggestion combined actual common practice (a recruitment letter) and an extraordinary event involving God's intervention. Further pages of Dembołęcki's book show the desirable positive transformation of the compromised Lisovchiks into glorious *elcars*. As mentioned before, the name was based on a loose and fictitious association with *Elohym* but the writer broadens its context significantly by evoking more parallels. These are, in fact, groundless and tendentious usurpations hinged solely on the observation that some words sound similar. Dembołęcki insists the new name was borrowed from the Hungarian language; "*elu iaro*" – as we read in *The exploits* – meaning 'one who is moving in front [of the main force], and therefore the skirmisher attacking before others is called «*elu iaro*». Based on the Hungarian «*elu iaro*», Poles coined the word «*elcar*»." [178]²¹ It is worth mentioning that the etymological provenance of the noun was determined correctly,²² although Dembołęcki entered it in a misshapen form (instead of "elóharcos"),²³ what is more, the word '*elcar*' is still in common use in Polish.

The following section of the text enumerates a series of compliments to the military unit in question, starting with an observation which links *ele* with the participle used in the Latin verb *electi*: "What is meant by «*ele*» is that these Polish war leaders were «*electi*», which means chosen or select men of war, something more than Hungarians." [179]²⁴ This line of reasoning (with a clear reference to the biblical chosen people) became the foundation for subsequent assertions of strongly exaggerated praise, presenting the regiment's members as the best soldiers; what is more, their military achievements probably evidenced their superiority over the others.

For if anyone would like to say that the word «*elcar*» sounds similar to «*electus armis*», which means «select man-at-arms» [...] – this applies to a Lisovchik, for his horse and weapons are excellent. If it is «*electus ad arma*», which means «chosen for arms», this must be a Lisovchik, too, for each of them swore to God not to plough until they died. If it is «*electae armaturae vir*», which means «a man of select armament», this also points to a Lisovchik, because almost all Christendom follows the example of the [Lisovchiks'] regiment and chooses to fight in their light manner, using their tactics. If it is «*electus a robore vel re ipsa*», which means «chosen because of strength or the thing itself», this also refers to a Lisovchik, for the thing itself points to him as a chosen one, which must be truly admitted without flattery. If it is «*electus a ratione*», which means «chosen because of the mind» or common sense – this, too, must be duly admitted to be

* Translator's note: the correct Hungarian spelling is *előjáró*.

true about a Lisovchik, for [Lisovchiks] were wiser than others to roam the unknown world and give admirable proof of bravery in honour of God, which others did not [...]. If it is «*electus ante robustos*», which means «chosen over the strong», this is certainly a Lisovchik again, because [Lisovchiks] always moved in front of the iron-clad imperial army. If, finally, [one thinks of] «*electus ad resistendum*», or «*ruinandum*», or «*rectificandum*», or «*regnandum*», which means «chosen to resist», or «to ruin», or «to rectify», or «to reign», or any other appellation, it is obvious that nobody resisted during the emperor's hard time except the Lisovchik, nobody ruins the foundations of heretical factories better than the Lisovchik, nobody rectifies the unfaithful spirits of the emperor's subjects better than the Lisovchik, and nobody has been praised more in the languages of the whole of Christendom in recent years for various triumphant victories than the Lisovchiks. Therefore, let anyone say whatever and however he wishes, a Lisovchik (as shown at the beginning) is a true *elcar* and this is what he must be called. [181-182]²⁵

Each Latin phrase included in the above passage of *The exploits* contains the new name of the Lisovchiks, e.g. “*electus armis*”, “*electus a robore*”, “*electus a ratione*.” The matter has been thoroughly discussed by scholarship.²⁶ Of course, these coincidences were cleverly and deliberately fabricated; Dembołęcki's memoir can be thought of as a propaganda publication focused on defending the Lisovchiks against allegations and, above all, against the expected penalty of banishment. There is more evidence of this kind of approach on the author's part. The book was dedicated to Adam Sędziwój Czarnkowski (1555-1627), the general *starost* (*capitaneus*) of Wielkopolska (Greater Poland), who was responsible for “restraining brawlers (i.e. Lisovchiks plundering the land of Wielkopolska).”²⁷ Dembołęcki's courteous gesture towards a high government official does not seem to be casual or perfunctory; more probably, it stems from a well-considered decision with a clear purpose. The transparency of the main message of *The exploits* is revealed also by some historical accounts relating to the publication and writing processes. In a poem concluding the entire book, Dembołęcki confesses that while some sections were being printed, others were still being written. This took place at a guesthouse in Poznań [see 350]. These arguments were meant to be an excuse for the numerous errors noticed while still in Jan Wolrab's typographic workshop. All of those circumstances, as well as other details (found in the report in question) reveal the truth about Dembołęcki's way of working on his first-ever book. It was written in a hurry because it had an important aim: to restore the good reputation of the disgraced Lisovchiks. Significantly, the author apparently stole some copies of the first edition, and the typographer was im-

prisoned for printing a book without the mandatory episcopal approval required at the time.²⁸ Dembołęcki's determination draws attention and turns out to be meaningful. As Władysław Magnuszewski ascertained, the Franciscan ordered to pay him for preparing the publication of *The exploits*.²⁹ There is no doubt that the book was badly needed and finally reached the readers despite serious obstacles.³⁰ Unfortunately, the literary campaign for the Lisovchiks ended in a fiasco:³¹ the mercenaries were soon outlawed.³² All these observations are indispensable if one is to read *The exploits* wisely, separating the chaff from the grain and truth from falsehood. This applies to every page of the memoirs and particularly to comments that aim to give the Lisovchiks' activities an aura of the miraculous. Indeed, some of Dembołęcki's opinions and remarks even produce an impression that the soldiers' deeds had been predicted in the New Testament.³³ The curious character of this book has been highlighted by researchers for years.³⁴ However, *The exploits* still appears to be the weightiest source on the history of the Lisovchiks.³⁵

The battle, skirmishes and pacification

In fact, Dembołęcki has very little to say about the Siege of Vienna, since he did not accompany the regiment at the end of 1619; therefore, only a few chapters concern the autumn battle and some subsequent events that happened immediately after the major clash. Nevertheless, his report is supported by witness accounts, as has been mentioned. The mobilization and concentration of the mercenary troops took place in Brajlów near Bar (now Ukraine) in the first decade of November; it was from there that they left for Humenné under Walenty Rogawski's command [183]. The journey on horseback lasted less than two weeks, and the destination was quite a long distance away (well over 500 km). The Lisovchiks, Dembołęcki writes, were hired by György Drugeth de Homonna (Hommonai) on behalf of Ferdinand II. Their main task was to stop Gábor Bethlen's forces marching for Vienna. The fighting started with a bold attack of two Lisovchik units, led by Hieronim Kleczkowski and Stanisław Rusinowski. There is no detailed information about the battle itself to be found in *The exploits*, the author prefers to present its results only. He reports that the battlefield was covered with exactly '7 345' dead bodies of killed enemies and that the *elears'* triumph was still evidenced by the 'graves made over Hungarian corpses densely scattered across the mountains and hills near Humenné.' [185]³⁶ Obviously, the Polish troops also suffered losses; these included Stanisław Krupka, the guard of the regiment, as well as some other soldiers and thirty servants. Krupka was replaced by Stanisław Stroynowski (later a colonel of the Lisovchiks in 1622). Just after the clash, soldiers headed for Vienna, 'destroying everything on their way with

fire and sword,' [186]³⁷ but they actually reached only the vicinity of Košice. Thanks to a Polish intervention, the emperor's field marshal Duke Jindřich Duval Dampierre and his forces were able to chase the dispersed enemies and killed quite a few Czechs and Hungarians [see 189-190].

Further paragraphs of Dembołęcki's memoirs do not seem to offer much to be proud of. The first one, significantly, starts with: 'Here the cursed devil...', which is probably meant to suggest that the Lisovchiks were not guilty of the events described below. Nevertheless the problem concerns military insubordination, stemming from the regiment's structure and from the idea of (golden, Sarmatian) freedom cherished by its members (Polish noblemen). Certainly, some quarrels or at least misunderstandings arose among the soldiers that led to a division of the squad at this stage of the campaign. The unit was divided into four parts, at the beginning of the conflict Walenty Rogawski was deprived of power over the mercenaries and his role had to be taken over by the newly appointed 'hetman' Adam Lipski. The four groups into which the unit was divided were commanded by Rogawski, Kleczkowski, Stanisław Jędrzejowski, and Idzi Kalinowski. The factions led to the return of the weakened troops to Poland (through the Tatra Mountains in the direction of Krosno) because of the possible retaliation from George I Rákóczi's army [see 186-188]. However, the regiment arrived in Krosno around 10 December and received payment from György Drugeth de Homonna 'for the days and nights of hard toil in Hungary.' [191]³⁸ At the same time, Dembołęcki informs, Bethlen (with support from Frederick V of the Palatinate) scarcely stood on the streets of Košice at last.

In these circumstances, as a result of spontaneous dispersion, the Lisovchiks ceased to be a combat unit, but hope for earnings led some of them to gather in Nowy Żmigród (near Krosno), where they elected Kleczkowski to be their leader. After they moved to Bochnia to widen their ranks and increase their power, once again they held a council that established Kleczkowski as colonel of the newly formed regiment. Other officials (guard, judge, chaplain) of the troops were elected and a military code was adopted. On 3 February 1620 they left their motherland to 'announce their readiness to serve the Christian emperor'³⁹ in the city of Vienna, where they arrived five days later [see 192-193]. Their march was probably interrupted by some war incidents – if necessary, the Lisovchiks humiliated the rebels they encountered on their way, the chaplain claims. Immediately after reaching Vienna, the Lisovchiks sent emissaries to Ferdinand II but they were banned from entering the city by German guards, who did not believe that the Poles could have covered such a distance in such a short time. Moreover, the guards suggested it was against the customs and the principles of common courtesy not announce your 'visit' in advance. Everything happened too fast. The negotiations took long hours, from midday until well into the night on 9 February (Saturday), and finally the Lisovchiks' emissaries were allowed to enter the gates

of Vienna (prepared and still preparing for defence) in order to notify His Majesty the Emperor about their arrival.

On Sunday, during the mass, *Te Deum laudamus* was sung in every church in Vienna to praise God for the Lisovchiks' arrival, claims Dembołęcki. Anyway, on the same day a delegation was sent to the camp of the Lisovchiks headed by Dampierre with the mission to invite the elders to an audience at the Holy Roman Emperor's residence. On Dampierre's orders, motivated by the observation of well-trained soldiers, the Polish mercenary regiment was equipped, supplied with provisions, and sent to Encerzdorf to stay there in case of a battle. The duke took the Lisovchiks' elders back to Vienna to be officially greeted by the emperor, but at the same time this brought anarchy into the regiment, as others also wanted to leave the camp to see Vienna and its attractions. Many soldiers left the cantonment, except for two captains, some soldiers and servants. Regrettably, this was followed by a period of relaxation [see 194-195].

Dembołęcki remains silent about what was said, what happened, and what ceremonial was applied during the audience. The reader can only infer this based on comments provided in *The exploits*. The meeting must have been successful, seeing that the Lisovchiks' 'colonel and his captains were triumphant in Vienna after greeting the Emperor's Majesty, and almost all men [Lisovchiks] were getting acquainted with Vienna.' [196]⁴⁰ This somewhat enigmatic statement seems to be a very diplomatic and deceptively courteous way of referring to immoderate revelry. The camp, now weakened, was celebrating, too: 'All those who were staying at the camp were drinking the emperor's health.' [196]⁴¹ The fête arose spontaneously but it was certainly inspired by the Lisovchiks' arrival and hope for payments. Although Dembołęcki assures us that they had enlisted to fight of their own free will and at their own expense [see e.g. 161], he does mention wages being paid a few times in his book (as noted earlier; see also below).

The consequences of such recklessness in war conditions were easy to predict, and of course these occurred pretty soon. The camp was attacked at midnight by six thousand troopers under the command of Frederick Stamfol, colonel in the army of the Winter King (Frederick V of the Palatinate). The aggressors set fire to the camp and caught the mercenaries completely by surprise with their unexpected, sudden assault. The Poles were incapable of any defensive action, since they 'had been drinking and could hardly see one another' [197]⁴². This was not caused by smoke: they must have been simply drunk [see 196]. The only possible solution to the difficult situation was immediate escape, so they rode off in different directions looking for temporary shelter. For the moment this was a total defeat. We must also note their losses: a guard, two Lisovchiks, and more than thirty servants [see 197, 199] lost their lives. What is more, Dembołęcki was aware of the soldiers' ignorance of the area and the local language, which decreased their chance of saving their lives but demonstrates clearly the matters on hand, because

shortly after this the story is to receive – for the circumstances – quite a decisive turning point.

The only way to deal with the incursion was to gather the soldiers again and form an organized military unit, which fortunately did indeed take place, thanks to the Lisovchiks' excellent 'sense of smell' [see 197]: they were able to find one another in the new location at night, Dembołęcki reports, alluding to the odour of the liquors consumed that eventually helped the soldiers get together again. News of the mercenaries' defeat soon reached Vienna's inhabitants. Kleczkowski and Dampierre almost immediately decided to gain closer acquaintance with the situation and made for the mercenary regiment. On their way they met Stroynowski, the deputy colonel in charge, who directly reported the course of events to them. After the attack, he said, the soldiers did eventually regroup and started to pursue the enemies effectively. The truth of his words was confirmed when Stamford's younger brother and other captives were delivered to the emperor's headquarters [see 198-199]. So, apparently, everything ended happily: danger simply turned into security, despite all difficulties. The conclusion, much more complex in fact, is vividly illustrated by Dembołęcki's words:

This defeat brought about such odd and diverse changes in Vienna that it can be most aptly compared to a wuthering eclipse happening suddenly on a bright day and passing soon. For as on a cheerful-bright day a wuthering eclipse makes all pure-eyed creatures (happily praising God in bright sunlight) disperse and worry, and as it makes owls, bats, and other vermin of the night rejoice, so its cessation restores everything back to the original state. In this manner the Christian emperor and all his Catholics, exceedingly happy because of the splendid bright army of elears coming, were so terrified by the defeat (for the next morning brought tidings that all the Poles had been crushed) that nearly all the emperor's joy turned into grief, his hopes turned into sorrow, and triumphs turned into laments; and conversely, it made the distressed heretics so happy that, while previously they hardly dared to look at elears and stayed in their homes as animals hide in their burrows, they went out of the burrows like owls or bats and whispered their *The Daemonam laudamus* to one another when, on receiving the tidings, elears rushed off from the streets of Vienna to support their troops. [197-198]⁴³

The author of *The exploits* offers even more interesting comments on the event, but for now let us allow this single one, quoted above, to serve as an illustration. The successful action brought further diplomatic gestures – the Lisovchiks' camp in Encerzdorf was visited by Dampierre who congratulated the mercenaries on their fortunate defence. The commander also inspected the mercenaries' armament and witnessed their "efficiency in soldierly matters and their ready-quick willingness to serve the emperor," [201]⁴⁴ which resulted in enlistment and pay-

ments. A new guard was appointed, too, Cybulski by name (no further information is available about this Lisovchik).

Afterwards, the regiment was sent to a new place where it was to be stationed, near Krems. It was from there that Kleczkowski, supported by Stanisław Łagiewnicki's entire unit and ten men from other squads, left for an ambush. They found an enemy camp and burnt it, killing six hundred infantrymen and five hundred cavalymen. The author also mentions the war trophies captured: three infantry banners and one of a *reiter* cavalry unit [see 202]. Dembołęcki describes another sabotage action, started (on 4 March 1620) by the emperor's hetman (encouraged by the Lisovchiks' fresh success), who led his army to the region of Horn against Heinrich Mathias von Thurn's forces. Because of unfavourable topographic conditions and the small number of troops the attack failed and the soldiers returned to Krems. Some Lisovchiks and a few servants did not come back alive, and Kleczkowski himself was also shot dead. The colonel's funeral ceremony was organized in Krems by the emperor's officials at the expense of the monarchy. Attendees included an imperial commissioner (on behalf of Ferdinand II), Dampierre, Charles Bonaventure de Longueval, Count of Bucquoy, and other dignitaries [see 202-203].

The new commander of the mercenary regiment, Stanisław Rusinowski, was appointed still before Kleczkowski's funeral. The Lisovchiks were ordered to stay in the vicinity of Krems until the beginning of the second decade of April. During that period, some units ventured out for reconnaissance or ambushes, defeating ("almost every night") smaller enemy troops and capturing informants ("tongues"—*języki*). Only more important prisoners could expect to stay alive and were sent to imperial headquarters (these included the major guard of the enemies, thanks to Stroynowski's bravery). The scale of efficient raids made the enemy forces gather and concentrate again near Horn, where another battle took place on 12 April. The central position was taken by Dampierre, who led three thousand cavalymen supported by Lisovchiks placed in both wings of the imperial army. The fight was preceded by a duel: Dampierre challenged Heinrich Mathias von Thurn, who was not present with his soldiers just then and was substituted by a deputy. The duel ended happily for Dampierre—he was not hit at all and managed to respond with three accurate shots that knocked the rival off his horse. The short clash started; more than eight thousand enemy soldiers were killed in the battlefield, including 370 counts, as was documented by letters carried by a captured envoy according to Dembołęcki's report [see 204-205]. The next stage of the Lisovchiks' mission brought them to Czech Prachatic following the enemy troops. The town was ineffectively besieged by the empire's forces for five days, but the Poles' support ended the attack and led to the final victory. The attackers probably killed all the inhabitants (irrespective of sex or age) to show off the power of the empire. Five thousand infantry soldiers lost their lives,

too. When the danger was over (after the town had been filled with soldiers and supplies delivered), the mercenaries rode back to Krems again, as their command demanded [see 206].

The eleventh chapter of *The exploits* presents a relatively more quiet period of the war. This time (from Easter to September 1620) was spent resting, although Dembołęcki briefly notes that the Lisovchiks continued their guerrilla activities. The main part of this section of the book recalls especially the reinforcements received by the warring armies. The emperor's forces increased thanks to three Polish units, commanded by N. Jakuszewski, N. Iwanicki (unknown captains), and Stanisław Łahodowski. Additionally, Ambrogio Spinello (an Italian mercenary) and his Spanish 'excellent people' joined Dampierre in Krems. It seems, however, that the enemy army was much strengthened. After their losses at Horn and Prachatice the rebels moved back to Gabriel Bethlen's camp and another concentration took place; both Sebastian Monoki and Janusz Bornemissa are believed to have brought 8,000 men each, which makes a total of 16,000 [see 207-210].

Further pages of the report are devoted to the descriptions of two ambushes (quite dangerous and not entirely successful) carried out by Stroynowski and Rusinowski, but the author starts with information on an attempted attack of Dampierre's military garrison. The enemies, led by Heinrich Mathias von Thurn, set fire to the cantonment, but the attack failed in general, and Dembołęcki's explanation of this failure sounds a little like an anecdote. Allegedly, the commander of the attackers (disguised as a Pole) was accidentally trapped by an *elear* servant, who realized that the prisoner was not his compatriot and simply robbed him. Unfortunately, the bollard did not know whom he had caught and was not pleased with the idea of taking the imprisoned soldier to his master, who would certainly deprive the lucky servant of the money he had obtained. In this way, Heinrich Mathias von Thurn was released and regained his freedom. What is more, Dembołęcki suggests that this incident induced the Protestant commander to withdraw his army from the battle he had begun. The other interesting episode concerns Stroynowski's excursion; the troops stumbled upon a herd of cattle and managed to run it to their camp. On their way they encountered Spanish soldiers, who asked the Lisovchiks to sell some of the animals to them. The *elear* captain's response to the request was generous – he shook Spinello's hand, invited him for a ride through the herd, and then offered him half of it as a gift. As the writer concludes, this was an important gesture because 'from that time on, affection sprung up between the Polish and Spanish nations.' [see 211-215]⁴⁵

The account slowly comes closer and closer to the end of the Lisovchiks' campaign in the service of the Habsburg House in 1619-21, but there is still one more very significant battle to be presented – the Battle of White Mountain. Another mobilization started. Apart from the units mentioned before, Ferdinand II's

army was supported by troops of Elector Maximilian I of Bavaria (24 000 men). These allied forces followed the Winter Kings' forces that were retreating towards Prague. As we know, the major clash of this war effort was crowned with a victory of the Empire, symbolized by two commanders, Charles Bonaventure de Longueval, Count of Bucquoy, and Maximilian, entering the capital city of Bohemia. Of course, Dembołęcki places special emphasis on the Lisovchiks' deeds, as shown in the following extract below, stressing their valuable achievements and merits:

On the third day [on 12 November], when the units were presenting the captured banners, *elears* had more banners to present than other troops. They sent two of their captains with them: Stanisław Stroynowski and Wojcech Sulmirski. 38 Hungarian banners, 5 infantry banners, and 9 banners of reiter cavalry companies, or cornets. Among them there was a court flag made of yellow damask that belonged to the impostor king Friedrich himself, with a green knight's cross on it. [220]⁴⁶

The victory dashed Frederick V's hopes for the Czech throne; Wittelsbach was actually forced to escape because his army had almost ceased to exist [see 216-220]. The final paragraphs of the chaplain's book on the *elears*' mission are focused on their military tasks connected with pacification actions carried out in the lands of the Empire. Right after the battle the Lisovchiks stayed around Prague for four weeks; they 'were cleaning heretic blood from their sabres and gargling their throats to wash the dust of White Mountain'—Dembołęcki reports vividly [216].⁴⁷ Finally, the Polish mercenaries and other troops were sent to Brno, whose garrison surrendered immediately.

Then the next destination was set for the *elears*. They reached Strážnice at the beginning of 1621. A little later, on 25 February, the place became an arena of fierce, dramatic fighting. The Moravian town occupied by the Lisovchiks was suddenly assaulted at night – the 26.000 attackers represented a terrifying force. The defence of the completely unprepared soldiers was no more than a spontaneous reaction: some Poles and Germans 'wearing white clothes', meaning the pyjamas they wore to sleep, according to Dembołęcki, did actually put up a fight against the '17,000 Hungarians and 9,000 peasants miners'. [222]⁴⁸ The attackers very quickly seized the main square, but then a Lisovchik's well-aimed shot killed the soldier who was waving his banner on a roof of tenements. This was the turning point in the battle. The reader is provided with the relevant data: 'having lost over 3,000 dead and 150 others taken captive, and having lost 28 banners, they shamefully dispersed and fled, achieving nothing more.' [222]⁴⁹ Nevertheless, this was no pure victory; captain Łagiewnicki, three men, and 24 servants were killed and an ill Lisovchik was abducted. Furthermore, 6,000 horses were

lost; some of them died in a fire and the others were stolen [see 223]. Despite the losses, the author thanks God for the efficient defence, and the entire next chapter is filled with sentences highlighting the magnitude of the favour rendered by Lisovchiks to the Empire and its ruler [see 223-225]. The very last episode of the campaign concerns the termination of military service, payments, and arrival in the motherland [see 227-228]⁵⁰ just before the Battle of Khotyn.

The exploits very briefly describes the war between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Turkey (based on some diaries); however, Dembołęcki offers much more extensive and detailed information about another campaign in which the Lisovchiks were involved once again (in the service of Ferdinand II) in pacification actions in Western Europe in the second half of 1622. This is the most extensive section of the book, containing eyewitness accounts and authentic documents such as Latin letters to the elders or *elcars'* military code of law adopted on 19 June [see 274-282].

Afterword

As intended, the article mainly reconstructs episodes of the Battle of Humenné and its aftermath registered in the Polish source; the book discussed seems to be poorly known, in spite of the fact that it was re-issued twice in 19th century⁵¹ (to raise Poles' spirits during partitions of Poland) and once in 2005⁵² – each time only in the original language. Although the old print was translated into Czech in 1908⁵³, it is still a rarely read and consequently near-forgotten book. There may be another reason for such a situation – the author's reputation. Dembołęcki was often decried by scholars for his overly sophisticated style full of exaggeration and (above of all) for his spurious concepts and extensive theories. Some of them, recollected here briefly, appeared in *The exploits*, but others (some of them much more unbelievable) were fabricated in a later work mentioned in the next paragraph. However, thanks to overcoming the language barrier (fragments of the text and its description appear in English) the source may get a chance to enter the broader circulation of research – to be confronted, compared or interpreted again. *The exploits* certainly displays a great many traits of propaganda literature, nevertheless these should not veil from us the historical value of the source. Besides, its overstatement can also be interpreted as *signum temporis* – of the times when Dembołęcki was writing his peculiar prose.

Let us conclude this article with a few words on Dembołęcki and his output. He is certainly an extraordinary figure⁵⁴ and is much better known in Polish specialist literature as the author of a different book, released in Warsaw in 1633: *The treatise on the only true country in the world* [*Wywód jedynowłansego państwa świata*]. In this work he attempted to prove that the Polish language, or at any rate

a Slavic language, had been spoken in Paradise. This thesis alone (among other equally incredible and astonishing ideas or etymological associations⁵⁵) suggests the rather obvious assessment of the work and defines its position in the history of national thought. For many reasons, the memoir can be regarded as a glorifying written prelude and *The treatise* can be considered a symphony of applause. Both books, similar in volume and tone, are evidence of the author's megalomaniacal approach to the matters discussed. The former praises a group (the Lisovchiks) and the latter praises the whole nation (the Poles, unfailingly) or even a group of nations (the Slavs).⁵⁶

The final comment is devoted to another old Polish print (and to related artefacts), the *Declaration or clarification of Cossack playing cards* [*Deklaracja abo objaśnienie kart kozackich*], dedicated to Lisovchik commander Rusinowski and to his soldiers (sometimes called Lisowski's Cossacks, too). It was probably Dembołęcki who was responsible for the publication of this booklet in 1621. Its text is a rhymed Polish paraphrase of a Prague Latin manuscript written in prose (likely authored by the emperor's secretary Francis Gottfried Trolio, or only copied by him) and inspired by an older brochure issued in Vienna.⁵⁷ The Austrian booklet is a series of copperplate pictures representing a pack of playing cards (36 pieces); each of them became an allegorical interpretation of a selected episode of the initial stage of the Thirty Years War. Taken together, the three relics seem to be a very interesting and (due to the original form applied) quite unique document of the past; particularly of propaganda focused on the apotheosis of the Habsburg monarchy.⁵⁸ The book that has been thoroughly discussed here conforms to this pattern, although it is additionally an apology (*apologia*) for the Lisovchiks; however, it offers plenty of information about undeniable and variously confirmed facts, as well. And the absolutely final observation is this: the specificity of the *elcars'* deeds, or at least their unique, uncommon appearance (clothes, manners, etc.), drew the attention of Rembrandt, whose painting – *The Polish Rider* – actually represents a Lisovchik. The figure of a horseman can be seen in the mentioned original oil masterpiece and in its two later paraphrases by Juliusz Kossak, titled, simply, *Lisovchik*. The Polish artist recognized the figure in the Dutchman's portrait and reproduced it clearly with his brush and pencil.⁵⁹

Notes

- 1 For variations of the author's surname, see: *Nowy Korbut. Piśmiennictwo staropolskie* [*New Korbut. Old Polish writings*], ed. Pollak, Roman, 3 vols. (Warsaw, 1964), 2:123.
- 2 Dembołęcki, Wojciech, *Przewagi elarów polskich, co ich niegdy lisowczykami zwano* [*The exploits of Polish elcars, who were formerly called Lisovchiks*], ed. Szyber, Radosław (Toruń, 2005). All references will be made to this reissue of *The exploits*, and all quotations from or allusions to the book in the main text are followed by page numbers placed in square brackets.

- 3 See Szyber, Radosław, “Zróżnicowanie gatunkowe *Przewag elearów polskich* Wojciecha Dembołęckiego” [Genre diversity of *The exploits of Polish elears* by Wojciech Dembołęcki], *Pamiętnik Literacki* 1997, no. 4.
- 4 „Póty cokolwiek pisałem, wprzód pomieniony autor tej książeczki, to wszystko nie inaczej, tylko z relacyjej pewnych ludzi, świadków jako oczywistych, tak i wiary godnych. Ale od tego już czasu, prócz tego, co się w Wołoszech działo, także z pewnych relacyj wziętego, wszystko piszę oczywisty świadek”.
- 5 See Szyber, Radosław, „„Banialuki” i „ambaje”, czyli o pseudoetymologicznej pochwalie elearów (lisowczyków)” [“Drivel” and “nonsense”: On the pseudo-etymological praise of the elears (Lisovchiks)], in *Studia i Materiały Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Zielonej Górze. Filologia Polska* [Studies and materials of the Pedagogical University in Zielona Góra. Polish language and literature Studies], ed. Brzeziński, Jerzy, no. 10 (Zielona Góra, 1999).
- 6 „Kwiat i szumowina zarazem fantazji polskiej”.
- 7 Łoziński, Władysław, *Prawem i lewem* [With law and lawlessness], 2 vols. (Cracow, 1957), 1:171.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 „W ojczyźnie *homo lissovianus* był synonimem opryszka i wyrzutka społeczeństwa, którego gdy zabił *infamis*, w nagrodę za to powracał do czci”.
- 10 Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowic. „Utwory młodzieńcze” [Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowic. „Early works”], ed. Krzywy, Roman (Warsaw, 2016), 26.
- 11 Zieduszycki, Maurycy, *Krótki rys dziejów i spraw lisowczyków* [A short overview of the Lisovchiks' history and affairs], 2 vols. (Lviv, 1844), 2:275.
- 12 „Kędyż mieli się udać? Co przedsiębrać? Gdzie szukać przytułku i ochrony? Miecz katowski czekał ich w domu, miecz żołnierski szukał po wszystkich zakątkach”.
- 13 See Wisner, Henryk, *Lisowczycy* [Lisovchiks] (Warsaw, 1995), 68-74.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 „Gdy abowiem właśnie <w> wieczór przed tym dniem, w który już mieli kacerze wszytką mocą do Wiednia szturmować, cesarza dobywając, wiadomość przyszła do nich, iż 60 000 Polaków (tak się ich wiele Węgom od strachu ze 2 200 zdało) wpadszy do Węgier, ziemię ogniem i mieczem ku Wiedniowi przechodzą, teje nocy, zaniechawszy szturmowania, wszyscy sromotnie uciekli”.
- 16 „Ciurowie niebożęta (bo sami elearowie w polu w ten czas w sprawie stali) główniami się tylko a garnkami odgrzebali. Duńcy przypadszy na onę głowienną wojnę ciury posiłkowali, tak iż spólnie z nimi Tatarzy odparli”.
- 17 Puzynina, Jadwiga, „Ze staropolskich teorii pochodzenia narodu i języka polskiego (Wojciech Dembołęcki)” [“Selected Old Polish theories on the origins of the Polish nation and language (Wojciech Dembołęcki)”], *Poradnik Językowy* 1955, no. 10, 368.
- 18 See Magnuszewski, Władysław, *Z dziejów elearów. Stanisław Stroynowski—lisowski zagończyk, przywódca i legislator* [From the history of the elears. Stanisław Stroynowski—a Lisovchik raider, commander, and legislator] (Warsaw-Poznań, 1978), 186-192.
- 19 Łoziński, *Prawem i lewem*, 1:171.
- 20 „Gdy abowiem w [...] krajach cesarskich niebaczni poddani jego jadem wieloróżnych herezyzarażeni i nimi jako truciznami nadęci, zapuchłe oczy mając do obaczenia prawdy, naprzód na Kościół ś. katolicki bluźnierskie usta swoje wywarli [...], zbrojnowojenną rękę podnieśli, jemu wiernych katolików z zamku praskiego na pański despekt oknem powyrzucali i na ostatek przekłęci dla ufności w samych sobie, zbrojach, fortecach [...] swoich tak wysoko w zaczętej rebelii postąpili, iż mniemanych panów sobie naobierawszy pod ochroną ich kościoły katolikom gwałtem brali, ciała wiernych z grobów dobywali, relikwie świętych bożych palili, na ołtarzach bluźnierstw swemi gniew Boży na naród ludzki wzbudzali, obrazy świętych a na ostatek i

- krucyfiksy deptali, kielichy, krzyże i insze srebra kościelne wiecznymi czasy na chwałę Bożą oddane—na pieniądze przerabiali; dzwony na działa przelewali, kapłany i zakonniki męczyli, panienki zakonne, Bogu poświęcone, gwałcili i wszelkie katoliki według różnych inwencji szatańskich trapił i przenaśladował”.
- 21 „*«Elu iaro»* znaczy się wprzód idący i dlategoż wprzód następującego harcownika *«elu iarem»* zowią. Z tego tedy *«elu iaro»* węgierskiego uczynili sobie Polacy *«elear»*”.
- 22 See e.g. Kopaliński, Władysław, *Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych [Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases]* (Warsaw, 1983), 118; *Słownik języka polskiego [Dictionary of the Polish language]*, ed. Szymczak, Mieczysław, 3 vols. (Warsaw, 1994), 1:531; Szyber, „*„Banaluki” i „ambaje”*, czyli o pseudoetymologicznej pochwałce”, 130.
- 23 See Országh, László, Magay, Tamás, Lukácsné Láng, Ilona, *Hungarian-English dictionary*, 2 vols (Akadémiai Kiadó, 1963), 1:463.
- 24 „Przez *«ele»* wyraża się, iż tacy wojenni herstowie polscy są *«electi»*, to jest wybrani abo na wybór mężowie, coś więcej niż Węgrowie”.
- 25 „Bowiem choćby kto chciał rzec, że to słowo *«elear»* brzmi jakoby *«electus armis»*, to jest «wyborny orężem» [...]—służy lisowczykowi, bo u niego koń i broń na wybór. Jeśli *«electus ad arma»*, to jest «wybrany do oręża»—i to pewnie lisowczyk, bo się każdy z nich Bogu ofiarował do śmierci nie orać. Jeśli *«electae armaturae vir»*, to jest «wybornego uzbrojenia mąż»—i to lisowczyk, bo już wszystko prawie chrześcijaństwo na przykład tego wojska, ich sposobami, uchwała sobie lekko wojować. Jeśli *«electus a robore vel re ipsa»*, to jest «wyborny siłą abo rzeczą samą»—i to lisowczyka znaczy, bo temu bez pochlebstwa samą prawdę przyznawszy, rzecz sama wyborym go pokazuje. Jeżeli *«electus a ratione»*, to jest «wybrany z rozumu» abo rozsądku—i to się lisowczykowi przyznać musi, bo zto rozumu [lisowczycy] nad inszych mieli brodzić po nieznanym świecie i przedziwnych męstw na cześć Bogu, co się drugim nie zeszło [...]. Jeżeli *«electus ante robustos»*, to jest «wybrany przed silnymi»—i to pewnie lisowczyk, bo [lisowczycy] przed żelaznymi wojski cesarskimi zawsze wprzód chodzili. Jeżeli na ostatek *«electus ad resistendum»* abo *«ruinandum»* lubo *«rectificandum»* abo *«regnandum»*, to jest «wybrany do oparcia» się abo «do wywrócenia», lubo «do prostowania» abo «królowania» lubo jakokolwiek inaczej; jawna jest, iż się nikt nie oparł we zły czas cesarski—jeno lisowczyk, nikt z gruntu fabryk kacerskich lepiej nie wywraca—jako lisowczyk, nikt lepiej krzywowiernych animuszów poddanych cesarskich nie prostuje—jako lisowczyk i nikt w językach wszystkiego chrześcijaństwa tymi laty z różnych zwycięstw triumfami nie króluj—jako lisowczyk. Owo zgoła niech kto mówi co i jako chce, przecie lisowczyk (jako się na początku pokazało) jest elear prawdziwy i tak ma być zwany”.
- 26 Szyber, „*„Banaluki” i „ambaje”*, czyli o pseudoetymologicznej pochwałce”, 130-141.
- 27 Dobrowolska, Wanda, *Czarnkowski Adam Sędziwój*, in *Polski słownik biograficzny [Polish biographical dictionary]*, 51 vols. (Cracow, 1938), 4:214.
- 28 See Buchwald-Pelcowa, Paulina, „Promocje i zakazy. Trudne drogi idei w książkach w Polsce czasów baroku” [“Promotions and prohibitions. The difficult paths of ideas in books in Poland during the Baroque era”], in *Literatura polskiego baroku w kręgu idei [Ideas in Polish Baroque literature]*, eds. Nowicka-Jeżowa, Alina, Hanusiewicz, Mirosława and Karpiński, Adam (Lublin, 1995), 71-73.
- 29 See Magnuszewski, *Z dziejów elearów*, 156.
- 30 See Szyber, „*Ślady zapisów kaznodziei wojskowego z 1623 roku, czyli jak Dembołęcki pisał swoje Przewagi*” [“Following a military preacher’s notes from 1623, or how Dembołęcki wrote his *Exploits*], *Filologia Polska. Roczniki Naukowe Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego* 2018 (4).
- 31 Wojciechowska, Maria, *Z dziejów książki w Poznaniu w XVI w.* [From the history of the book in Poznań in the 16th c.] (Poznań, 1927), 63-64; Magnuszewski, *Z dziejów elearów*, 124.
- 32 Wisner, *Lisowczycy*, 118-126.

- 33 See Szyber, *Piórem, kropidłem i szablą. Wojciecha Dembołęckiego pisarska i kapelańska przygoda z lisowczykami (1619-1923)*. *Studia i szkice* [With pen, sabre, and aspergillum. Wojciech Dembołęcki's adventure with the Lisovchiks as a writer and chaplain (1619-1620). *Studies and sketches*] (Zielona Góra, 2005), 151-188.
- 34 See e.g. Bystroń, Jan Stanisław, *Megalomania narodowa* [National megalomania], in Jan Stanisław Bystroń, *Tematy, które mi odradzano* [Jan Stanisław Bystroń. The topics I have been advanced against], ed. Stomma, Leszek (Warsaw, 1980), 298; Hernas, Czesław, *Barok* [Baroque], 5th edition, changed and expanded (Warsaw, 1998), 168-169; Bauer, Marcin, *Z dziejów batalistyki polskiej. Studia nad pamiątkami wojennymi z XVII w.* [From the history of Polish battles. *Studies on 17th-century war memoirs*] (Cracow, 2007), 88-93; Jurewicz, Kamil, „Wojciech Dębołęcki i jego *Wýwód...*” [“Wojciech Dębołęcki and his *Treatise...*”], *Terminus* 2007, no. 1 (16), 279.
- 35 See Wisner, *Lisowczycy*; Magnuszewski, *Z dziejów elearów*.
- 36 „Mogily po górach i pagórkach około Humiennego nad trupem węgierskim gęsto sypane”.
- 37 „Wszystko wszędy ogniem a mieczem znosząc”.
- 38 „Za ciężkie w Węgrzech dniem i nocą prace otrzymali”.
- 39 „Oświadczenie gotowości swojej na posługę cesarza chrześcijańskiego”.
- 40 „Pułkownik w Wiedniu z rotmistrzami swemi po przywitaniu Cesarza Jego M triumfowali, towarzystwo też niemal wszystko z Wiedniem się oznawało”.
- 41 „Ci, co w kwarterze zostali, wszyscy przez zdrowie cesarskie pehnili”.
- 42 „Dopijając ledwie jeden drugiego widział”.
- 43 „Ten pogrom tak dziwnoróżne odmiany w Wiedniu porobił, iż się właśnie wichrowatemu zaćmieniu w jasny dzień nagle przypadłemu i prędko mijającemu, naraźniej mógł przyrównać. Bo jako w wesołojasny dzień wichrowate zaćmienie nastąpieniem swym wszelką rzecz czyste go a jasnego oka (Boga z jasności słonecznej wesoło chwalącą) zasmuconą rozpędza i trapi, a sowy, niedoperze i insze plugastwa nocne uwesela, tak zaś odstąpieniem swym wszystko do pierwszego stanu przywraca. Tym właśnie sposobem przedziwnie wesołego cesarza chrześcijańskiego i wszystkie z nim katoliki z przyszcia jasnoświatnego wojska elearów polskich ten pogrom (gdy nazajutrz rano przyszła nowina, iż wszystkie Polaki na głowę zbito) tak zasmucił, iż prawie wszystkie radość cesarską—w żal, pociechy—w smutek, a triumfy w lament obrócił; heretyki zaś, przeciwnym obyczajem—utrapienie tak rozweselił, iż co przedtym nie mogąc na eleary patrzeć, po domach jako w jamach siedzieli, skoro za tą nowiną z wiedeńskich się ulic elearowie na posiłek wysypali, dopiero też oni jak niedoperze albo sowy z jam się ukazawszy, swoje *Te Daemonem laudamus* jeden do drugiego szeptali”.
- 44 „W rzeczach rycerskich sprawność i gotowożartką na posługi cesarskie ochotę”.
- 45 „Od tego czasu zawarta zawsze miłość była narodów polskiego z hiszpańskim”.
- 46 „Trzeciego dnia potym, gdy wojska chorągwie oddawały, elearowie między inszymi w nie nabogatszy, odesłali przez dwóch rotmistrzów—Stanisława Stroynowskiego i Wojciecha Sulmierskiego—węgierskich 38, pieszych 5, kornetów, to jest rajtarskich chorągwi 9. Między którymi była dworska z złotego adamaszku, samego wrzkomokróla Frydrycha, a na niej zielony krzyż kawalerski”.
- 47 „Szable ze krwi kacerskiej ocierali, a gardła z kurzawy białogórskiej oplotkiwali”.
- 48 „17000 Węgrów i 9000 chłopstwa górników”.
- 49 „Trupów przez 3000 i więźniów do półtoruset straciwszy i 28 chorągwi zostawiwszy, sromotną rozsypką uciekali, nic więcej nie sprawiwszy”.
- 50 See also Wisner, *Lisowczycy*, 92, 97.
- 51 The first reissue: Puławy, 1830; the second one: Cracow, 1859, ed. Turowski, Kazimierz Jerzy. Some chosen sections of *The exploits* were published within columns of a monthly *Weteran Poznański* [Poznań Veteran] 1825 (January-May), no 1-5.

- 52 See above, endnote No. 2.
- 53 *Paměti o výpravách Lisovčiků proti odbojným Čechům a jejich spojencům v letech 1619-1622*, translated by Kotík, Antonín (Prague, 1908).
- 54 Kočańska, Maria, „Książd Wojciech Dembołęcki z Konojad” [“Father Wojciech Dembołęcki of Konojady”], *Prace Literackie* 1956, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, vol. I, Seria A, no. 2.
- 55 See e.g. Frick, David, “The uses of authority and the authority of use: Philological praise and blame in early modern Rus””, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1994 (June), vol. XVIII, ed. Flier, Michael S., no. 1/2, 83.
- 56 See Sztyber, „Skądże to zbłaźnienie świata?” *Wojciecha Dembołęckiego “Wywód jedynowłasnego państwa świata” (studium monograficzne i edycja krytyczna)* [“Why is the world fooled?” *Wojciech Dembołęcki’s “The treatise on the only true country in the world” (monographic study and critical reissue)*] (Zielona Góra, 2012).
- 57 See Bohatcová, Miriam, *Irrgarten der Shicksale-Einblattdrucke vom Anfang des Dreissigjährigen Krieges* (Prague, 1966), 19-20; Hoffmann Detlef, *Die Welt der Spielkarte*, 2nd edition (Leipzig, 1983), 44.
- 58 See Sztyber, *Tuz, kralka, wyżnik, niżnik i inne karty... Dwa barokowe zabytki literacko-plastyczne* [*Ace, Queen, Jack, and Other Cards... Two Relics of Baroque Literary and Plastic arts*] (Zielona Góra, 2009).
- 59 See Magnuszewski, *Z dziejów elearów*.