

MODERN THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE HISTORIOGRAPHY DEVOTED TO THE SMOLENSK WAR OF 1632-1634

*Pavel Yatsin
Minsk, NIHE*

The Smolensk war did not receive much attention in Russian historiography and is mentioned only in generalizing works. A completely different attitude has developed in Russian and Polish historical science, where much attention is paid to the issues of the Smolensk war.

Russian historiography places more emphasis on studying the creation of the regiments of the "new system" and the structure of the army of the Moscow state, while the Polish historians, in turn, focus on the description and the course of hostilities. As for the modern English-speaking historiography, it is unknown to a greater number of researchers. The aim of our study is to trace the conclusions made by the English-speaking researchers regarding the Smolensk war.

Material and methods. As well as in Belarusian historiography, there are no special monographic works dedicated to the Smolensk war. However, in works devoted to military affairs in Europe, one can find separate chapters relating to the Smolensk war among such researchers as: Fuller, Parker, Frost, Black, Kotilaine, Davis. The methods of our study are general scientific and special historical methods.

Results and their discussion. In Fullera's work on the Smolensk war, we can see the conclusions that were made by pre-revolutionary and Soviet historiography. Thus, the conclusion about the causes of the defeat of Russia in the war was almost a literal citation of Novoselsky, who identified the main cause of the invasion of the Tatars on the southern border of the Moscow State, which led to desertion from the army of B. Shein near Smolensk. Fuller laid this foundation in the subsequent English-speaking historiography [1, p. 6], which in modern Russian science is considered rather controversial.

Parker in his work focused on the military revolution that was taking place in Europe at that time, increasing the role of infantry and creating mercenary armies, and reducing the role of cavalry. Parker saw the events preceding the Smolensk war and the subsequent modernization of the armies of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Moscow State in a Western way, only as a reflection of the successes of the Swedish troops in Livonia, which influenced the structure of the armed forces in Eastern Europe and proved effective in the second phase of the Thirty Years' War [2, p. 37-38].

Frost paid more attention to the study of the strength of the armed forces of the Commonwealth and Moscow, and the related economic costs for the formation of mercenary armies. Frost came to the conclusion that the victory in the Smolensk campaign depended to a greater extent on the skills and qualities of using the regiments of the "foreign system", and as a result of the already available experience of recruiting mercenaries of the Commonwealth and decided the outcome of the war [3, p. 151]. Close to Frost's conclusions, Black also adheres: he, like Frost, saw the main reason for the defeat of Russian troops in the fact that the Moscow hired regiments were less trained than Polish ones. At the same time, he put forward a thesis about the logistics problem of the Moscow command, in connection with which the Russian artillery could not reach Smolensk in time, so as to delay the siege and give Vladislav IV time for the army [4, p.137-138]. Davis, on the outcome of the Smolensk war, accumulated everything that was already in the English-speaking historiography and brought to a more qualitatively new level. Davis identified three main reasons for the failure of the Smolensk campaign by the Moscow government. First, the inept use of the regiments of the "foreign system", as well as the quality of their filling. In addition to the Germans, people from free estates, such as Cossacks, Tatars, etc., also got there, who did not approach the service in the regiments formed in the Western manner. Unlike the Polish army, which also recruited hiring gentry, who had already fought in similar compounds. The second reason he highlighted the lack of experience in setting up logistics and providing large hired military formations. Thirdly, he saw the invasion of the Crimean Tatars on the southern borders of the Moscow state and the associated desertion from the camp of Boris Shein, who was near Smolensk, while referring to Parker, who in turn refers to Novoselsky [5, p.71-74] .

In addition to military history, the English historian Ktiline also touched upon economic history. He studied the trade relations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Moscow State after the Polyany world [6, p. 411].

Conclusion. Thus, English-language historiography focuses on studying the "military revolution" that occurred in the region in the context of European events and does not differ significantly in studying the history of the Smolensk war. It almost does not represent any interest for researchers who are interested in the Smolensk war as a subject of historical research. It gives a secondary nature against the background of Polish and Russian researchers. However, the experience of English-speaking researchers is of great importance for understanding the course of international relations that have developed in Europe, both during and after the Thirty Years War.

1. William, C. Fuller, Jr. *Strategy and power in Russia 1600 – 1914* / C. William Jr. Fuller. – New York: The free press, 1992. – 558 p.
2. Parker, G. *The military revolution. Military innovation and the rise of the West, 1500 – 1800* / G. Parker. – Second edition. – The Ohio State University: Cambridge University press, 1996. – 266 p.
3. Frost, R. *War, State and Society in Northeastern Europe, 1558 – 1721* / R. Frost. – London: Longman, 2000. – 401 p.
4. Black, J. *European warfare, 1494 – 1660* / J. Black. – London; New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2002. – 244 p.
5. Davies, B.L. *Warfare, State and Society on the Black Sea Steppe, 1500 – 1700* / B.L. Davies. – London; New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2007. – 256 p.
6. Kotilaine, J.T. *Russia's foreign trade and economic expansion in the seventeenth century* / J.T. Kotilaine. – Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005. – 614 p.