

Andrzej Stępnik

(Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2828-6691>








E-mail: a.stepnik@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl

**‘Free with the Free, Equal with the Equal’:
Poles and Ukrainians Against the Background
of the Conversion of the Jagiellonian Myth. Experience
of Polish Historiography at the Beginning
of the 20th Century**

‘Wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi’: Polacy i Ukraińcy w tle konwersji mitu jagiellońskiego. Doświadczenia historiografii polskiej początku XX wieku

ABSTRACT

The Jagiellonian myth is relatively well developed in Polish historiography. The exception is the first twenty years of the 20th century, when its successive conversions and accelerated migration from the discourse of historiography to the discourse of memory took place. In the background of these processes, a kind of advancement of Polish-Ukrainian issues was taking place (politically conditioned), which until now

PUBLICATION INFO			
			
e-ISSN: 2449-8467 ISSN: 2082-6060			
THE AUTHOR'S ADDRESS: Andrzej Stępnik, the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, 4A Maria Curie-Skłodowska Square, Lublin 20-031, Poland			
SOURCE OF FUNDING: Statutory Research of the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin			
SUBMITTED: 2020.01.28	ACCEPTED: 2020.07.07	PUBLISHED ONLINE: 2020.12.21	
WEBSITE OF THE JOURNAL: https://journals.umcs.pl/rh		EDITORIAL COMMITTEE E-mail: reshistorica@umcs.pl	

had been dominated by Polish-Lithuanian relations. This article is intended to expand on and document these issues. The subject of analysis and conclusion were works of a general nature (syntheses, parasyntheses, textbooks, compendia, etc.), which accumulate and 'reflect' current scientific, political, social, cultural and other trends, creating interesting research material. It allowed to establish that in 1900–1918, the symbol of the Union of Lublin, the idea of 'free with the free, equal with the equal' was a popular motif of historical narratives, which as a scientific construct, however, became more and more archaic. Its cultivation resulted in an indirect retreat from critical historiography. It can be seen that the Jagiellonian myth attracted neo-Romantics to a greater extent than Modernists who sought a closer link between historiography and social sciences. However, it cannot be said that there were no interesting attempts to reinterpret it. Such were the references to some of the then promising sociologising and psychologising directions that appeared in the West but also in Poland. Surprisingly, the greatest admirers of this idea at the beginning of the 20th century were historians identifying themselves with national democratic ideas, followed by conservatives (realists) and researchers associated with various factions of the independence camp. The Treaty of Riga of 18 March 1921, concluded between Poland, Soviet Russia and Ukraine, showed that the romantic spirit of the Union of Lublin survived and became part of the history of ideas.

Key words: Polish historiography, 20th century, Ukraine, Ukrainians, Union of Lublin, independence, narrative myths, collective memory

The phrase '**free with the free, equal with the equal**' appeared in public circulation in the 16th century. We find it, for example, in the privileges of Zygmunt August from 1569 restoring Volhynia and the Kyiv Duchy to the Crown¹. Almost a hundred years later, it was used in the text of the Treaty of Hadiach, concluded between the Commonwealth and the Ukrainian Cossacks. During the Enlightenment it was used in political disputes and journalism². Initially, the phrase was primarily a rhetorical figure (juxtaposed of two syntactically parallel parts, appropriately matched in terms of meaning), a solemn elocutionary form, and over time it became a slogan that contained a certain socio-political program. Many Polish concepts of independence and federalism drew from it³. This slogan

¹ *Unia Lubelska 1569 roku. Akta prawne*, introduction and ed. H. Litwin, Kijów 2019, pp. 29, 39; also cf. H. Litwin, *Równi do równych. Kijowska reprezentacja sejmowa 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2009. The slogan 'free with the free, equal with the equal' did not appear in the *Act of the Union of Lublin* itself.

² See: A.F. Grabski, *Historia a przemiany społeczno-polityczne w epoce Oświecenia*, in: idem, *Perspektywy przeszłości. Studia i szkice historiograficzne*, Lublin 1983, pp. 13–51.

³ *Od ugody hadziackiej do Unii Europejskiej*, vol. I, *Wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi, zacni z zacnymi*, eds. A. Kulczycki et al., Rzeszów–Iwano-Frankiów 2012, p. 5; M. Boruta, *Wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi. Polska i Polacy o niepodległości wschodnich sąsiadów Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków 2002, p. 12.

showed extraordinary carrying capacity and durability⁴. To this day, it is still a sign of heritage and a figure of memory⁵.

Its true 'career' started in the 19th century, when historians inscribed freedom, equality and nobility into the 'Polish soul'⁶. A clear praise for these values can be found in *Dzieje Potoczne* (1829) by Joachim Lelewel, who presented the Union of Lublin as a result of the 'idea of brotherhood' between Poland and its closest neighbor⁷. Without underestimating its political costs, he noted that it radiated 'equality of fraternal citizenship' and the light of Polish political solutions⁸.

The apologia of the Polish-Lithuanian monarchy was created mainly by Karol Szajnocha and Julian Klaczko. These Romantics brought to life the Jagiellonian idea in Polish historiography⁹. They presented the union of the two countries as a globally unprecedented voluntary union of nations, transforming over time into a family commonwealth, united in a spirit of love and harmony. Poles – in Szajnocha's opinion – thanks to the 'sword into ploughshares' strategy contributed to the expansion of the 'Christian balks', granting their neighbors their own 'civilizational honors' and protecting them from tyrants and infidels. The historian saw the importance of the union for the Ruthenian lands, which after 1569 began to deviate from the line of grand ducal despotism and entered the path towards democratic development and the shaping of new characteristics of their inhabitants.

Szajnocha's concept, built on the basis of Catholic providentialism¹⁰, was taken up and creatively developed by other authors of general works. Noting the growing national and state aspirations of Ruthenians (Ukrainians), as well as being aware of their territorial and population

⁴ See eg. R. Stobiecki, *Idea jagiellońska w środowisku polskich emigrantów politycznych po 1945 r.*, in: *Wspólne dziedzictwo. Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów w polskiej, litewskiej i ukraińskiej historiografii XIX–XXI wieku*, eds. M. Hoszowska et al., Rzeszów 2019, pp. 256–275.

⁵ A case of an inscription carved on a pedestrian route at the Litewski Square in Lublin, an exhibition organised at the Zoloti Vorota Kyiv metro station from 11 June to 15 July 2019 or an exhibition presented at the Central Scientific Library in Minsk from 23 to 24 May 2019.

⁶ A. Wierzbiński, *Spory o polską duszę. Z zagadnień charakterologii narodowej w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX wieku*, Warszawa 2010.

⁷ J. Lelewel, *Dzieje Polski potocznym sposobem opowiedziane*, in: idem, *Dzieła*, vol. 7, Warszawa 1961, p. 135.

⁸ Idem, *Obraz dziejów polskich*, in: idem, *Polska, dzieje i rzeczy jej*, vol. 1, Poznań 1858, p. 139.

⁹ More on this subject: J. Maternicki, *Początki mitu jagiellońskiego w historiografii i publicystyce polskiej XIX wieku: Karol Szajnocha i Julian Klaczko*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1988, 32, 11–12, pp. 33–48.

¹⁰ See: V. Julkowska, *Historia dla wyobraźni. Recepcja i interpretacja pisarstwa historycznego Karola Szajnochy*, Poznań 2010, p. 375.

potential, they began to pay more and more attention to them. The name of the Grand Principality of Ruthenia appeared more and more often next to the term 'Crown and Grand Duchy of Lithuania'¹¹. The tradition of the Union of Lublin was becoming increasingly useful. This was because, according to Jerzy Maternicki, an expert on this issue, the nation 'deprived of independence by violence, later often humiliated and persecuted, but not submissive, in almost every generation undertaking a heroic yet unequal fight for freedom, had to somehow compensate for its failures and the harm suffered. It turned to its centuries-old past, and it was in this past that it sought confirmation of its own value, as well as the right to independent existence. [...] The Jagiellonian myth – according to J. Maternicki, – not only served various temporary purposes, it was also an expression of longing for some better world'¹². In other words, it was a kind of utopia that had been carried over into the past¹³.

After the January Uprising, apart from the democratic community, the most frequent distancing was made from the view about the breakthrough significance of the union. Among the conservatives of Krakow, there was even an opinion that the Union swallowed us up¹⁴. Józef Szujski's revisionism, accepted by historians of such rank as Michał Bobrzyński, undermined the foundations of the Jagiellonian myth, although it did not deconstruct it completely¹⁵.

It was revived thanks to the events connected with the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Union of Lublin that had place in several

¹¹ H. Schmitt, *Dzieje narodu polskiego od najdawniejszych do najnowszych czasów*, vol. 1, Lwów 1863, p. 722.

¹² '[...] pozbawiony przemocą niepodległości, później często ponizany i prześladowany, ale nieuległy, w każdym niemal pokoleniu podejmujący heroiczną acz nierówną walkę o wolność, musiał w jakiś sposób kompensować sobie niepowodzenia i doznane krzywdy. Zwrócił się ku swej wielowiekowej przeszłości i w niej właśnie szukał potwierdzenia własnej wartości, a także prawa do niepodległego bytu. W ten sposób dzieje narodowe stały się nie tylko przedmiotem chłodnych dociekań naukowych, ile obiektem kultu, źródłem wiary i nadziei na lepszą przyszłość [...]. Mit jagielloński – w opinii J. Maternickiego – służył nie tylko różnym celom doraźnym, był także wyrazem tęsknoty za jakimś lepszym światem'. J. Maternicki, *Historia i wychowanie*, Warszawa 1990, p. 32.

¹³ This was not the leading view of this era. The Epigoni of the Enlightenment, authors of works written from the position of a monarchic concept of history, were not overly interested in the national transformations initiated in 1569. They treated Ukraine as a territorial bounty of the Jagiellonian monarchy, or a bargaining chip in disputes with their neighbours.

¹⁴ See: J. Maternicki, *Michał Bobrzyński wobec tzw. unii jagiellońskiej. Ewolucja poglądów i jej uwarunkowania*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1977, 21, 12, pp. 131–142.

¹⁵ K. Błachowska, *Wiele historii jednego państwa. Obraz dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego do 1569 roku w ujęciu historyków polskich, rosyjskich, ukraińskich, litewskich i białoruskich w XIX wieku*, Warszawa 2009, p. 287.

dozen Galician cities in 1869. The most important were ceremonies in Lviv, organized with difficulty by a committee formed mainly of liberal-democratic activists from Galicia and Polish emigration circles in France. It was headed by advocate Franciszek Smolka – president of the National Democratic Society founded in 1869¹⁶. On the Committee's initiative, a mound was laid down at the High Castle in Lviv, which was to capture the times of the former glory of the Republic. The intention of the organizers of this commemoration was to serve as a symbol of resistance against the invaders and an inspiration for the reconstruction of the state of free nations: Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians and Belarusians. On 11 August 1869, a ceremony organized by Smolka took place, in which was laid, on which the coats of arms of Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia were engraved along with an inscription: **'Free with the free, equal with the equal, Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia, united by the Union of Lublin on 11 August 1569'**¹⁷. The earth deposited there came from such memorial sites as the battlefield of Grunwald, the graves of Kościuszko, Mickiewicz, Słowacki and Lelewel, as well as the burial place of the 'Fallen Five' at Powązki Cemetery in Warsaw. Smolka was very keen to win the Ukrainians over to this idea, but in the face of the dispute over the future of Galicia, he did not succeed. The mound remained a symbol of regional cooperation for some and a sign of Polish domination over the city for others¹⁸.

In 1902, half a century after the first printing, another edition of Szajnocha's *Jadwiga i Jagiełło* was published in seven parts¹⁹. This work, due to its beautiful and accessible literary form, the way it is fictionalized, and its sense of the readers' needs, had so far reached a relatively wide circle of the intelligentsia. It was perceived not only as a scientific study of the eponymous characters, but also as a fascinating story about the end of the Middle Ages or a certain epoch in the history of Poland and Lithuania. Szajnocha presented it as a time of instructive examples of fraternization of different communities into one family, an attempt to 'cordially' integrate the Orient and the Occident.

¹⁶ J. Zdrada, *Archiwum lwowskiego Towarzystwa Narodowo-Demokratycznego (1868–1870)*, 'Rocznik Biblioteki PAN w Krakowie' 1966, 12, p. 80.

¹⁷ 'Wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi – Polska, Litwa i Ruś, zjednoczone Unią Lubelską dnia 11 sierpnia 1569 roku'.

¹⁸ More in: P. Sierżęga, *Obchody rocznicy unii lubelskiej na terenie Galicji w 1869 roku*, in: *Galicja i jej dziedzictwo*, vol. 15, *Działalność wyzwolenicza*, ed. J. Hoff, Rzeszów 2001, pp. 146–199.

¹⁹ S.M. Kuczyński, 'Jadwiga i Jagiełło' Karola Szajnochy na tle jego życia i twórczości naukowej, in: K. Szajnocha, *Jadwiga i Jagiełło. Opowiadanie historyczne*, introduction by S.M. Kuczyński, vol. 1, Warszawa 1969, pp. 5–75.

It seemed that at the beginning of the 20th century, at a time of intensified independence sentiments, Szajnocha's message would fall on fertile ground. This was heralded, for example, by the edition of the work of the Krakow medievalist Stanisław Smolka (son of Franciszek), *Unia Litwy z Koroną*, in which the author emphasized that the Union of Lublin put Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia in the position of hard promoters and defenders of Western civilization²⁰. However, that is not what happened. In the new reality, interest in Ukrainian issues has decreased by a third²¹. The Union of Lublin had lost its explanatory power, though it retained its magnetism, apologetic and symbolic character. The slogan 'free with the free, equal with the equal' continued in historical writing but clearly migrated from academic discourse to the memorial discourse²². This was fostered by the phenomenon of many researchers becoming servants of the idea of independence.

It is difficult to present our views on the subject we are interested in in detail, because at the beginning of the 20th century there were about 300 active Polish historians, distinguished by a great diversity of beliefs, methodological attitudes and workshop experiences²³. They have published many works, in various languages and countries. Therefore, it is reasonable to make the main subject of a reflection on the title theme of works of a general nature (syntheses, parasyntheses, compendia, textbooks, etc.), which took into account modern times and the lands of the historic Republic of Poland. These, like a lens, focus on the views present in the public space. They illustrate the 'spirit of the era' better than specialized analytical work²⁴.

Following this path one can see that, unexpectedly, the representatives of the national democratic formation were the closest to the *idée fixe* of Szajnocha and Smolka. The slogan 'free with the free, equal with the equal'

²⁰ S. Smolka, *Unia Litwy z Koroną*, Kraków 203, pp. 119–120. The renewal of the Jagiellonian myth is frequently attributed to S. Smolka, see: J. Maternicki, *Stanisław Smolka i powrót historiografii do mitu jagiellońskiego*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1989, 33, 11–12, pp. 83–101.

²¹ In general works, its share has decreased from 6% to 4% of their volume. See: A Stępnik, *Ukraina i stosunki polsko ukraińskie w syntezach i podręcznikach dziejów ojczystych okresu porozbiorowego 1795–1918*, Lublin 1998, pp. 152, 228.

²² Theoretical considerations on this subject, among others in: K. Pomian, *Historia: nauka wobec pamięci*, Lublin 2006; *Tradycja dla współczesności. Ciągłość i zmiana*, vol. 6, *Pamięć jako kategoria rzeczywistości kulturowej*, eds. J. Adamowski, M. Wójcicka, Lublin 2012.

²³ J. Maternicki, *Historiografia polska XX wieku*, part 1, *Lata 1900–1918*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1982, p. 18.

²⁴ This procedure is not easy either, as many historians of 1900–1918 consider the period to be asynthetic; see: J. Maternicki, *Historiografia*, p. 78.

was received by them with considerable satisfaction. A careful analysis of their works does not confirm the popular opinion that historians associated with *Endecja* [National Democracy] lost interest in this issue since Roman Dmowski, in his work *Niemcy, Rosja i sprawa Polska* (1907), stated that after the national awakening of the borderland minorities, Poles can no longer play a dominant role there, and the fame of Polish civilizational merits in the East has lost its former meaning²⁵.

In explaining this state of affairs, some general remarks should be made. After a hundred years of captivity, Polish historiography had its limitations, however, it also possessed a potential. Historians compensated their readers for the difficulties in source research by, among other things, deep reflection on the philosophy of history, the social role of history and its scientific nature. The works published at that time were no longer just a chronicle of events, detached from the process of their production and causality. To 'understand their heroes – the perpetrators of history, [they were able – author's note] to accept their perspective – and not that of their time – on the course of events'²⁶. They did not put them in the space of current policy. In such optics, the Union of Lublin appeared to be a great national success. The optimism derived from the thought of the positivist 'Warsaw School', intensified by the ideals of neo-Romanticism and the growing moods of freedom, improved the historical assessment of these events even more, although it placed them in the 'long gone' reality, more in the area of memory than history.

This trend can be seen quite clearly in the writings of Adam Szelaḡowski, who is one of the first generation of neo-Romantic and Modernist historians. As J. Maternicki noted, 'Describing the history of Poland 'at the turn of the middle and new centuries' Szelaḡowski fell into such a far-reaching 'optimism' that many of his formulations resemble the most apologetic texts of the Romantic era'²⁷. Treating the Union as the second stage of the execution movement's activity, he assumed that 'Poland introduced two of its fundamental directions into common history. One of them was the idea of freedom [...]. And the second direction [...] lies in its relation to the neighboring Eastern

²⁵ R. Dmowski, *Niemcy, Rosja i kwestia polska*, Lwów 1908, pp. 260–261.

²⁶ '[...] zrozumieć swoich bohaterów – sprawców historii, [umieli oni – author's note] przyjąć ich – a nie swego czasu – perspektywę patrzenia na bieg zdarzeń'. J. Pomorski, *Wstęp*, in: K. Kasprówcz et al., *Szlakami Polski Niepodległej 1914–1922. Interaktywny atlas historyczny*, Lublin 2019, p. 9.

²⁷ 'Opisując dzieje Polski 'na przełomie wieków średnich i nowych' Szelaḡowski popadł w tak daleko posunięty ' optymizm', że wiele jego sformułowań przypomina najbardziej apologetyczne teksty doby romantyzmu'. J. Maternicki, *Adam Szelaḡowski i jego poglądy na historię* (cz. 1), 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1989, 33, 11–12, p. 132.

nations of Lithuania and Ruthenia. Poland had to sow the seeds of Western European civilization in the East, educate the peoples and raise them to the ideal – based on Christian freedom²⁸. Although the historian did not comment on this thought more broadly, he clearly intended to argue the thesis that national cultures are overtaken by civilizational relationships²⁹. Szelągowski saw the sources of this civilization mainly in ‘systemic institutions’ and common ‘education’. The expansion of Poland’s borders and the influence of the Polish language was a testimony to its attractiveness and the spreading of Polish culture. As a result, he wrote, ‘one and the same culture has developed in Prussia, Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia. Residents of different origins admitted to a common nationality’³⁰. This idyll has now faded as a result of the armed intervention of the neighboring powers.

When analysing the issue of the Union of Lublin, Szelągowski noted that although there were some reservations about the nature of the covenant on the part of Lithuania, the real union met with total approval of the inhabitants of the Ruthenian lands, aware of the benefits they may experience. Despite some difficulties, the year 1569 ended, according to the Lviv historian, the process of merging of the individual modern Poland’s lands into one whole. They went beyond the area described over three hundred years later (*sic!*) in Dmowski’s incorporation concept.

An even greater optimist in the assessment of the Union of 1569 was a historian of law and publicist from Warsaw, Józef Siemieński. He treated this event as an exceptional case of voluntary merging of nations of different origins and cultures into one country. According to the author, the Union provided them with a common basis for the development of the powers. Siemieński also believed that the absolute advantage of Polish culture entailed ‘a gradual Polonization of the unified countries and the incoming foreign elements’³¹. In order to explain where the Polish-Lithuanian and Polish-Ruthenian

²⁸ ‘Polska wprowadziła do dziejów powszechnych dwa swoje zasadnicze kierunki. Jednym z nich była idea wolności [...]. A drugi kierunek [...] leży w jej stosunku do ościennych narodów wschodnich – Litwy i Rusi. Polska musiała rzucić nasiona cywilizacji zachodnioeuropejskiej na Wschodzie, kształcić ludy i podnieść do ideału – opartego na wolności chrześcijańskiej’. A. Szelągowski, *Wzrost państwa polskiego w XV i XVI w. Polska na przełomie wieków średnich i nowych*, Lwów–Warszawa 1904, p. 166; idem, *Historia nowożytna 1453–1789*, Lublin 1918, pp. 117–119; see: J. Maternicki, *Adam*, p. 132.

²⁹ W. Czapliński, H. Wereszycki, *Dorobek naukowy Adama Szelągowskiego*, ‘Kwartalnik Historyczny’ 1962, 69, 3, p. 617.

³⁰ ‘W wyniku tego – pisał – rozwinęła się jedna i ta sama kultura w Prusiech, w Polsce, na Litwie i na Rusi. Mieszkańcy różnego pochodzenia przyznawali się do wspólnej narodowości’. A. Szelągowski, *Wzrost*, p. 19; see: idem, *Historia*, p. 119.

³¹ ‘stopniową polonizację krajów zunifikowanych oraz napływowych elementów obcych’. J. Siemieński, *Dziedzictwo Rzeczypospolitej*, Warszawa 1918, pp. 9, 22.

conflicts came from, the historian of law pointed out that Polonization took place in the so-called 'higher spheres', which were able to understand that the 'truly democratic' thought was the basis of the country's system, and its parliamentarianism was excellent. The irritation was born among the spheres who were unaware of this. Therefore, the Warsaw historian had some doubts about the cohesion of the Jagiellonian system.

He was one of the few historians of the early 20th century. J. Siemieński expressed his conviction that the idea of a union outlived the Commonwealth of Two Nations for a long time. He wrote that 'Poland has fulfilled its most important mission in history – to extend the reign of Western culture to the pagan or schismatic East, and to consolidate it so that when Polishness suffered severe disasters there, the features of proximity to the West, even distant, and resistance to the East remained'³². In the opinion of the Endecja-associated historian, this was the 'dignified heritage' of the Republic. For Ukraine, it meant the formation of a new identity for the people living there, who, breaking with the legacy of the Orient, at the same time kept their distance from Poland and the Occident. In this way, the historian signaled the conviction that the reborn Poland would need a different Eastern policy than in the Jagiellonian era.

A group of researchers connected with National Democracy was under the patronage of historians of the older generation, who came from the positivist school in Warsaw. Let us take this opportunity to recall that this formation set the tone for Polish historiography in the 1890s and experienced its twilight at the beginning of the 20th century.

Tadeusz Korzon, who belonged to this generation, referred in his 20th-century texts to the evaluations formulated years ago by Klaczko and Szajnocha. Thus, he ascribed to Zygmunt August the conviction that 'the Polish-Lithuanian union is supposed to be a work lasting forever, which is why it was [the king – author's note] who showed inexhaustible patience and perseverance, in order to bring about diversity through 'love'. He was also sincerely glad that he managed to create a huge commonwealth of different nations, languages and religions, united by bonds of brotherhood, strange and charming as a dream, especially in the age of Machiavellian intrigues, wars of annexation and fanatic massacres'³³.

³² 'spełniła Polska najważniejszą swą misję dziejową – rozszerzyła panowanie kultury zachodniej na wschód pogański lub schizmatyczny i utrwaliła je tak, że kiedy polskość doznała tam klęsk dotkliwych, utrzymały się jednak rysy bliskości z Zachodem nawet dalekim i odporność wobec Wschodu'. *Ibidem*, p. 11.

³³ 'unia polsko-litewska ma być dziełem trwałym na wieki, dlatego to [król – author's note] zdobywał się na cierpliwość niewyczerpaną i wytrwałość niepospolitą, żeby przyprowadzić do skutku przez pogodzenie różnorodność przez 'miłość'. Szczere też

He attributed the success of this space to the state in the areas of ethnic, cultural and religious development. Korzon's story was more a tribute to the republican-democratic tradition and heritage than a reflection of the new historiography.

The statements of Władysław Smoleński, also connected with the positivist Warsaw school, were more patronizing towards the Ukrainians³⁴. Even more so than at the end of the 19th century, this historian emphasized Polish merits in the East. He began to treat the expansion into Ruthenian lands almost exclusively as accomplishment of the civilization mission of the Republic. 'The Jagiellonian Union', he explained on the eve of World War I, 'caused a march of Latin culture into the Byzantine East. As the advantage of an educated man is to disperse the darkness of others, it is also the merit of every cultured nation to share its moral achievements with barbaric or less enlightened peoples. The Lithuanian-Polish Union opened up the opportunity for Poland to instill Latin culture in the eastern part of Ruthenia, brought up under Byzantine influence. Conquering Ruthenia for the sake of Latin culture became one of Poland's main tasks, one of its most important merits'³⁵. Smoleński essentially saw East and West as two antagonistic worlds. In the expansion to the East, he began to see the historical mission of Poland and Poles. This led to a tendency to overestimate the role of Polishness in Ukrainian lands. This can be seen in the author's thesis assuming that 'from the Union of Lublin Polishness will gain the advantage in Ruthenia with its Western culture. [...] There has not been in the history of the world – he added – an example of

cieszył się, że mu się udało utworzyć ogromną rzeczpospolitą z różnych narodów, języków i wyznań, spojona więzłami braterstwa, dziwną i powabną jak marzenie, szczególnie w wieku intryg machiawelskich, wojen zaborczych i rzezi fanatycznych'. T. Korzon, *Historia Polski. Wydanie nadzwyczajne w zmienionym układzie*, ed. B. Bator, Kijów 1918, p. 2; see: J. Kolbuszewska, *Tadeusz Korzon (1839–1918). Między codziennością, nauką a służbą narodowi*, Łódź 2011, p. 223.

³⁴ As Andrzej Wierzbicki, the last of the Warsaw historians, noted, Władysław Smoleński did not know that he was counted as part of this 'school'. This name, if it has a scientific meaning, was created later. See: A. Wierzbicki, *Związki 'Przeglądu Historycznego' z warszawską szkołą historyczną*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 2006, 97, 1, pp. 1, 5.

³⁵ 'Unia jagiellońska – tłumaczył w przededniu I wojny światowej – spowodowała pochod kultury łacińskiej na wschód bizantyjski. Jak zaletą człowieka wykształconego jest rozpraszanie ciemnoty bliźnich, podobnież zasługą każdego narodu kulturalnego jest dzielenie się swym dorobkiem moralnym z ludami barbarzyńskimi lub mniej oświeconymi. Unia litewsko-polska otworzyła Polsce sposobność zaszczepienia kultury łacińskiej na wschodzie ruskim, wychowanym pod wpływem bizantyjskim. Zdobywanie Rusi dla kultury łacińskiej stało się jednym z głównych zadań Polski, jedną z najważniejszych jej zasług'. W. Smoleński, *Historia Polski*, Warszawa [1921], p. 27. This excerpt comes from a popular outline of Polish history, entitled *La Pologne. Résumé d'histoire*, transl. M. Rakowska, Paris 1916, written by Smoleński ca. 1914 for foreign readers.

such an association of nations different in terms of origin and past, an association made with the most durable cultural ligaments. Therefore, the Union of Lublin, carrying to the East the great slogans of equality and freedom with all the cultural achievements of the Western world, has a universal significance³⁶. According to the Warsaw historian, it protected the Polish nation from, among others, spiritual depression and economic proletarianization. It was an 'echo' of the dispute with the 19th-century Krakow conservatives, who burdened the former Republic with the dispersion of national forces and a deviation from the western direction of development. It was polemical in nature in relation to the so-called theory of space adapted by Szujski from Russian historiography.

Among the supporters of the agreement and advocates of cooperation of Slavic peoples was young Felix Koneczny. The editor of 'Świat Słowiański' initially believed that a model way of resolving conflicts in the Republic of Poland could be the 1658 Treaty of Hadiach, which *de facto* created its own state for the Ruthenian population on the principles set out in the Union of Lublin. He believed that it was 'fair to both sides'³⁷. Shortly before the outbreak of the war, the historian tried to reorient Poland on the civilizational map of the world, and his writing went astray. He considered Ruthenians (and especially Cossacks) to be representatives of the Turanian civilization, who ignored Polish achievements and became 'black masses'. Koneczny's main works were written after the Great War, so they will not be discussed here for lack of space and justification³⁸. Important analytical work (of a intricate nature) of historians of national-democratic convictions will also be omitted.

Conservative historians ('realists') referring to the attitudes developed by the Krakow history school, were more distanced, but not hostile, to the idea of fraternity with the nations living on the eastern borderlands of the Republic, promoted by the Romantics³⁹. In this group, the Polish-Lithuanian and Polish-Cossack agreements initially provoked a critical

³⁶ 'od unii lubelskiej zyska na Rusi przewagę polskość ze swą kulturą zachodnią. [...]. Nie było w dziejach świata – dodawał – przykładu takiego zespolenia narodów różnych pod względem pochodzenia i przeszłości, zespolenia dokonanego za pomocą najtrwalszych wiązań kulturalnych. Toteż unia lubelska, niosąc na Wschód wielkie hasła równości i wolności ze wszystkimi zdobyczami kulturalnymi świata zachodniego, posiada znaczenie powszechnodziejowe'. W. Smoleński, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

³⁷ F. Koneczny, *Dzieje Polski*, vol. 2, Łódź 1902, p. 151; see: P. Biliński, *Feliks Koneczny (1862–1949). Życie i działalność*, Warszawa 2001.

³⁸ More on this subject: P. Biliński, *op. cit.*

³⁹ This school *de facto* ceased to exist around 1885. See: J. Maternicki, *Zmierzch szkoły krakowskiej i opozycja historyków warszawskich*, in: idem, *Kultura historyczna dawna i współczesna*, Warszawa 1979, p. 165.

assessment of the eastern policy of the former Republic. As time passed, their views were liberalized.

August Sokołowski, who belonged to this circle, saw an event of symbolic character in the Union of Lublin: 'This is how the great historical process that has been going on since 1386, the idea that once guided Jagiełło and was bought by Jadwiga's noble sacrifice, ended', wrote the author of *Dzieje Polski ilustrowane*. 'The Byzantine culture, embodied in Ivan the Terrible, was shining with the glows of fires, when the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre was being prepared in the west, when in Brussels the head of the noble Egmont fell on the scaffold, and followers of Catholicism burned at the stake in England. Zygmunt August triumphed, and his triumph was a new victory for civilization'⁴⁰. However, the historian treated this victory as a success of dynastic politics, a victory of the monarchy over noble republicanism. However, Sokołowski approved of the principles of the Treaty of Hadiach more than those of the Union of Lublin. In the former, he saw a pattern for the arrangement of mutual relations. Usually far from unambiguous assessments, he wrote that the 'Treaty of Hadiach was [...] the coup de grâce to the Union of Lublin, it linked Ruthenia with Poland and Lithuania on the basis of the principle 'free with the free, equal with the equal', and gave the Ruthenian element complete freedom of national and religious development'⁴¹. He saw the sources of the failure of this agreement in the demoralization of the revolting Cossacks, and Moscow's intrigues.

The slogan 'free with the free, equal with the equal' was emphasized by the author of popular textbooks at the beginning of the 20th century, a teacher, encyclopedist and editor Józef Bałaban. According to Maria Wierzbicka, in terms of his historiosophical orientation, this historian 'was clearly similar to the Krakow historians – above all to Bobrzyński; he also

⁴⁰ 'Tak kończył się – pisał autor *Dziejów Polski ilustrowanych* – wielki proces dziejowy, trwający od roku 1386, idea przyświecająca niegdyś Jagielle i okupiona poświęceniem szczytnym Jadwigi, przyoblekła formy rzeczywiste, na krańcach cywilizowanej Europy powstawał organizm polityczny, na braterstwie i wolności ludów oparty, w chwili gdy bizantyńska kultura, uosobiona w Iwanie Groźnym, świeciła łunami pożarów, gdy na zachodzie przygotowywała się rzeź św. Bartłomieja, gdy w Brukseli na szafocie spadła głowa szlachetnego Egmonta, a Anglii płonęli na stosach wyznawcy katolicyzmu. Tryumfował Zygmunt August, a triumf jego był nowym zwycięstwem cywilizacji'. A. Sokołowski, *Dzieje Polski ilustrowane*, vol. 2, Wiedeń 1904, p. 330.

⁴¹ 'hadziacka była [...] wykończeniem unii lubelskiej, łączyła Ruś z Polską i Litwą na podstawie zasady 'wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi', dawała żywiołowi ruskiemu zupełną swobodę narodowego i religijnego rozwoju'. *Ibidem*, p. 287.

drew a lot from [...] Sokołowski's work'⁴². In contrast to the latter, he spent more time in state positions, as can be seen from the passage entitled 'Idea Jagiellońska' [The Jagiellonian Idea] in his textbook, in which he explained to less prepared readers: 'The Jagiellons have one great merit not only in the history of Poland, but also in the history of the whole world: that the idea of the brotherhood of peoples was not conquest, not blood and iron, not spread by deceit and treachery, but by love and good will. Leading society as executors and guides of its historical idea, they made this miracle that the neighboring nations [...] merged with Poland of their own free will. Full of lenient understanding of human frailties, taking into account the characteristics of each state and nation, respecting the convictions of their subjects, carrying the banner of religious tolerance high above the heads of the then rulers of Europe, they knew how to exploit what humanism and Western civilization carried on their wings, drawing their vitality from Christianity'⁴³. The union resulted in further colonization, as a result of which 'the people were completely free' in Ukraine⁴⁴. Unlike the conservatives of the second half of the 19th century, A. Sokołowski and J. Bałaban did not describe in more detail what social and economic consequences resulted from these events. The Union was one of those few events that allowed for a pinch of optimism in the harsh view of modern times. Fiction abundantly fed on it. This trend can be seen, for example, in Walery Przyborowski's popular novels and historical essays, but this is already a topic for a separate dissertation.

The Jagiellonian system evoked varied assessments among representatives of the independence trend in historiography. It enjoyed the greatest respect from the liberal wing. A characteristic figure for it was the Warsaw

⁴² 'był zbliżony wyraźnie do historyków krakowskich – przede wszystkim do Bobrzyńskiego; sporo też czerpał z [...] pracy Sokołowskiego'. M. Wierzbicka, *Popularne podręczniki dziejów Polski w latach 1864–1914*, in: *Edukacja historyczna społeczeństwa polskiego w XIX w. Zbiór studiów*, ed. J. Maternicki, Warszawa 1981, p. 379.

⁴³ 'Mają Jagiellonowie nie tylko w dziejach Polski, ale i w dziejach całego świata jedną wielką zasługę, że ideą braterstwa ludów nie podbojem, nie krwią i żelazem, nie podstępem i kręctwem szerzyli, ale miłością i dobrą wolą. Krocząc na całe społeczeństwo jako wykonawcy i przewodnicy jego idei dziejowej dokonali tego cudu, że narody ościenne [...] z własnej woli połączyły się z Polską. Pełni pobłażliwego zrozumienia na ułomności ludzkie, uwzględniający właściwości każdego stanu i narodu, szanujący przekonania swych poddanych, niosący sztandar tolerancji religijnej wysoko nad głowami ówczesnych władców Europy, umieli wyzyskać to, co niósł na swych skrzydłach humanizm i zachodnia cywilizacja, czerpiąca swe soki żywotne w chrystianizmie'. J. Bałaban, *Dzieje Polski. Książka poglądowa dla dojrzałszej młodzieży i dorosłych*, 4th edition, Lwów 1922, p. 247 (1st edition, Lwów 1905; 2nd edition, expanded, Lwów 1906; 3rd edition, Lwów 1909, was titled *Historia Polski*).

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, 4th edition, p. 162.

researcher Henryk Mościcki. He considered the Union of Lublin to be the crowning achievement of the Polish policy of the Jagiellonian times, a wise relationship between two states and three nations: Polish, Lithuanian and Ruthenian. He treated it as 'the unparalleled, most beautiful fact in history that the lands of the two nations were voluntarily united'⁴⁵. Thus, in a sense, he sympathised with 'a generation that could not understand ethnographic Poland'⁴⁶. He expressed his conviction that the Union of Lublin gave the state new opportunities and was therefore attractive to the interested nations. According to Szymon Askenazy's pupil, it also crowned certain natural processes. The most important of these was the fact that there were some connections between these nations since the times of Kazimierz Wielki, which gave the Union real foundations. Its signing was in a way just a formality. It brought the greatest benefits to the Ruthenian lands (security, religious freedoms, equal rights, self-government, material prosperity), so its representatives unequivocally supported the modification of the formula of agreement in the spirit of 'free with the free, equal with the equal'. This gave rise to thinking of a new Poland as a confederation of several nations.

More caution in evaluating the Jagiellonian idea can be seen in the output of historians representing the leftist and independence option. Among them was a socialist, a great mind, Bolesław Limanowski. He believed that the 16th-century Commonwealth 'could not belong to a single Polish nation, but had to be the common property of its people, united as free with the free, equal with the equal'⁴⁷. This did not mean full approval of the idea and consequences of the Union of Lublin. This intellectual believed that it had not reached its potential, as it was not preceded by democratic reforms, establishing the principles of a political federation and limiting the influence of the 'nobility'. If they were carried out, as he claimed, the Commonwealth could have become a country resembling the United States of America. Thus, it was a new idea for a reborn state⁴⁸. Limanowski, like young Józef Piłsudski, considered specific issues to be

⁴⁵ 'bezprzykładny, najpiękniejszy w dziejach fakt dobrowolnego połączenia ziem dwu narodów'. See: J. Dutkiewicz, *Henryk Mościcki jako uczeń Askenazego*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1958, 49, 1, p. 75.

⁴⁶ 'pokoleniem, które nie mogło zrozumieć Polski etnograficznej'. See: H. M[ościcki], *Znaczenie dziejowe Królestwa Polskiego (1815–1830). Odczyt wygłoszony 21 czerwca 1916 r. na uroczystym obchodzie zakończenia roku akad. Tow. Kursów Naukowych*, Warszawa 1917, p. 2.

⁴⁷ 'nie mogła należeć do jednego narodu polskiego, lecz musiała być wspólną własnością zaludniających ją narodów, połączonych ze sobą jako wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi'. B. Limanowski, *Historia demokracji polskiej w epoce porzobiorowej*, Zurych 1901, p. 458.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 426, 458.

a song of the future, 'which is likely to be decided by free and conscious of their rights working people of Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia'⁴⁹.

On the basis of his reflections on the Union of Lublin, Limanowski devoted much attention to the issue of the national identity of Ukrainians. He came to the conclusion that the formation of the national identity of the inhabitants of Ukraine, initiated in the era of Kazimierz Wielki, finally ended during the Krakow revolution of 1846 and the Spring of Nations. He did not agree with the view that 'the issue of the Ruthenian nationality was the result of the intrigues of Stadion's politics. The issue of the Ruthenian nationality in Galicia – he claimed – like the issue of Polish nationality in Silesia, was a consequence of the spread of democratic beliefs, it was a recognition of the right of the people to common and equal participation in social and state life'⁵⁰. Although the socialist historian and sociologist recognized the distinctiveness of the Ukrainians, he did not consider them a nation *sensu stricto*. He treated this otherness more as a property of the 'spirit of the nation'. He repeated after Francis Smolka: 'We consider the Ruthenian language a form of Polish not ripened in the sun, and we are convinced that to give the Ruthenians freedom and education will be to inspire them with the spirit of Poland'⁵¹. Limanowski regarded anti-Polish sentiment in Ukraine as a consequence of the influence of Austrian clerical-government policy on the inhabitants of the south-eastern borderlands, pan-Slavic slogans and the experience of the past, when Poles oppressed the peasant population of Ukraine. He saw a common future before Poles and Ukrainians, within the framework of a federal state that would unite the nations living there as 'free with the free, equal with the equal'. Such a stance resulted from the way socialism was understood in a humanistic way, in the spirit of social solidarity⁵². Limanowski's personal contacts with

⁴⁹ 'którą prawdopodobnie rozstrzygnie wolny i świadomy swych praw lud pracujący Polski, Litwy i Rusi'. See: J. Piłsudski, *Pisma zbiorowe. Wydanie prac dotychczas drukiem ogłoszonych*, vol. 2, ed. L. Wasilewski, Warszawa 1937, p. 223.

⁵⁰ 'jakoby kwestia narodowości rusińskiej była wynikiem intryg polityki stadyonowskiej. Kwestia narodowości ruskiej w Galicji – twierdził – jak kwestia narodowości polskiej na Szląsku, była następstwem szerzenia się demokratycznych przekonań, była uznaniem prawa ludu do wspólnego i równego uczestnictwa w życiu społeczno-państwowym'. B. Limanowski, *op. cit.*, p. 425.

⁵¹ 'Ruszczyznę mamy za niewyrobioną na słońcu wolności formę polszczyzny, i przekonani jesteśmy, że dać Rusinom wolność i oświatę, będzie to natchnąć ich duchem Polski'. *Ibidem*, p. 426.

⁵² See: M. Wróbel, *Socjalizm humanistyczny Bolesława Limanowskiego*, Warszawa 1988; J. Kurczewska, *Dwie postawy wobec kryzysu etosu demokratyczno-patriotycznego. Bolesław Limanowski (1835–1935) i Zygmunt Balicki (1858–1916)*, Warszawa 1975.

Ukrainian national activists may have had some influence on this: Ivan Franko and Mykhailo Pavlyk, whom, *nota bene*, he considered 'Polish rather than Ruthenian', like all Ukrainian intelligentsia⁵³.

Kazimierz Gorzycki presented an even more restrained stance on these matters, who can be counted among the same ideological and methodological formation as Limanowski⁵⁴. In the scientific life of that time, his works were not of any significance in terms of content, however, they are quite characteristic of our subject of interest⁵⁵. In his book addressed to student youth and intelligentsia, he argued that the union of 1569 led to the incorporation of the 'lands of Little Russia' into the Crown, which initiated the formation of the Jagiellonian Poland, divided into three basic provinces: Greater Poland, Lesser Poland and Lithuania. He did not combine this with the Jagiellonian idea, which was experiencing its renaissance. On the contrary. He believed that the expansion to the East was in the name of the interests of the ruling dynasty and aristocracy, which in effect harmed Poland. Gorzycki was not ready to recognize any of the agreements concluded with national minorities in the East. His position was dictated by the conviction that no settlement could last until the basic social problems had been resolved. The Treaty of Hadiach suited him more than the Union of Lublin, but only because it eliminated a festering church union.

Even greater restraint towards the Jagiellonian monarchy was shown at an early age by Józef Dąbrowski (pen name Grabiec), a writer, publicist and left-wing activist. He treated the conclusion of the real union more as a success of Zygmunt August's policy, which forced the Lithuanians to support the union. He was rather critical of the Polish 'cultural conquest' after 1569, which the 'national' school was famous for. He believed that the cultural influence was mutual, in two directions. This was expressed in the fact that 'the nobility strongly influenced the boyars and the Lithuanian and Ruthenian nobility. The Polish language was spread over vast expanses; Lithuanians and Ruthenians accepted it in the higher spheres; peasants stood faithfully by their own language, which also absorbed the Polish peasant colonists [...]. Thus, according to the Lviv historian, the Polonization of Lithuania and Ruthenia was very superficial [...] the Polish ethnographic

⁵³ See: B. Limanowski, *Studwudziesięcioletnia walka narodu polskiego o niepodległość*, Kraków 1916, p. 290.

⁵⁴ Sociologising history based on J. Lippert's concepts; idem, *Socialgeschichte Boehmens in vorhussitischer Zeit*, Wien-Prag-Leipzig 1896 (1st edition, 1886).

⁵⁵ See: M. Wierzbička, 'Zarys społeczny historii państwa polskiego' Kazimierza Gorzyckiego, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1968, 59, 4, pp. 662–663.

border did not shift far to the east'⁵⁶. The thesis about the political subjectivity of Ukraine developing after 1596 also did not appear in Grabiec-Dąbrowski's works. The Lviv historian barely pointed out that the areas preserved the local language in the offices and the broad local government.

Grabiec-Dąbrowski's disapproval, however, was aroused by the fact that 'the Union of Lublin approved as family property the huge fief estates of Ruthenian and Lithuanian dukes and magnates. This fact gave rise to royal fortune in the East, with tens of thousands of subjects, and increased the power of the nobility'⁵⁷. The historian saw this phenomenon as the source of later unrest in Ukraine. This has led to his critical assessment of the Union and its ideals.

Only the authors associated with the revolutionary wave, such as Włodzimierz Dzwonkowski and Hipolit Grynwaser, went further. They did not play a major role in Polish historiography. We will mention these figures only to contrast with the leading historical trends as people almost completely forgotten today.

Let us head towards the conclusion. On the eve of the Great War, the Jagiellonian system continued to be a popular motif for historical narratives, although as a scientific construct it became increasingly archaic. It attracted neo-Romantics more than Modernists. This historical trend was clearly marked by the need to strengthen the national spirit of Poles, 'the belief in the usefulness of this argument in the propaganda of the Polish cause outside, the longing for a great Poland 'from sea to sea', the conviction that only the combined forces of Poles, Lithuanians and Ukrainians could effectively resist the pressure of their neighbors'⁵⁸. The calculations for

⁵⁶ 'szlachta silnie oddziaływała na bojarstwo i możnowładztwo litewskie i ruskie. Język polski rozpowszechniał się na olbrzymich przestrzeniach; Litwini i Rusini przyjmowali go w wyższych warstwach; chłop zaś stał wiernie przy swoim, a prócz tego wchłaniał w siebie kolonistów chłopów polskich [...]. Polonizacja więc Litwy i Rusi była – zdaniem historyka lwowskiego – bardzo powierzchowną [...] polska granica etnograficzna nie przesunęła się daleko na wschód'. J. Grabiec [J. Dąbrowski], *Dzieje narodu polskiego*, Kraków [1909], p. 162.

⁵⁷ 'unia lubelska zatwierdziła jako własność rodową olbrzymie posiadłości lenne książąt i magnatów ruskich i litewskich. Fakt ten dał początek królewskim fortunom na Wschodzie, z dziesiątkami tysięcy poddanych, i wpłynął na wzmożenie się możnowładztwa'. J. Dąbrowski, *Dzieje Polski w streszczeniu. Z tablicą chronologiczną, wykazem urzędów, szkolnictwa, podziału administracyjnego, kościelnego, politycznego, urządzeń skarbu i wojskowości Rzeczypospolitej oraz 12 mapkami*, Warszawa 1916, p. 175.

⁵⁸ 'wiara w użyteczność tego argumentu w propagandzie sprawy polskiej na zewnątrz, tęsknota za Polską wielką 'od morza do morza', przekonanie, że tylko połączone siły Polaków, Litwinów i Ukraińców dać mogą skuteczny odpór naciskowi sąsiadów. Brano pod uwagę rachuby na utrzymanie polskiego stanu posiadania na ziemiach litewskich, ukraińskich, białoruskich itp.'. J. Maternicki, *Stanisław*, p. 101; R. Stobiecki, *op. cit.*, pp. 257–258.

maintaining Polish property in Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, etc. territories were taken into account. As a result, differences in the views of historians began to 'flatten' and slow down the development of scientific progress. This in turn served more to build collective memory than critical historiography⁵⁹. In other words, it caused the migration of the Jagiellonian system from the discourse of history to the discourse of memory.

The reinterpretation of the slogan 'free with the free, equal with the equal' also brought some benefits to historiography. Among them one can notice the search for a new model of patriotism, rational reorientation of Poland between the East and the West, as well as the inspiration for future domestic and foreign policy. It was valuable to evoke many new cognitive threads, such as regional economic flows, penetration of cultures, national aspirations and identity transformations. Many theories gained theoretical support from this. They show a trace of the then fashionable sociologising and psychologizing directions in Western Europe, especially the sociological theories of the German historian Julius Lippert, or of the native ones, such as B. Limanowski's theory of the nation, Aleksander Jabłonowski's theory of 'Ruthenian national conviction'⁶⁰. This broadened the micrographic orientation of Polish historiography of that period.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Polish historians saw the changes that were taking place in Ukraine, especially since the Cossack uprisings (rebellions) in the 17th century. For the most part, they were not ready to accept the loss of historical south-eastern lands in the future, so they considered the idea of regulating their relations with the Ukrainians through compromise. They tried to anticipate the technological motives of history for this purpose⁶¹. However, they were aware that at the moment neighborly relations were beginning to give way to international relations. If this was not written about directly, it was mainly to avoid weakening the patriotic rapture on the eve of the great game for a new shape of Europe. For the average reader at the time, the Jagiellonian myth was generally attractive. The naivety of this thinking was shown by the Treaty of Riga of 18 March 1921, between Poland, Soviet Russia and Ukraine.

(translated by LINGUA LAB)

⁵⁹ J. Kolbuszewska, *Mutacja modernistyczna w historiografii polskiej (przełom XIX i XII wieku)*, Łódź 2005, p. 28.

⁶⁰ A. Gil, *Rusini w Rzeczypospolitej Wielu Narodów i ich obecność w tradycji Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego – problem historyczny czy czynnik tworzący współczesność?* <https://www.iesw.lublin.pl/projekty/pliki/IESW-121-02-07.pdf> [accessed on: 25 V 2020].

⁶¹ Understood as: proven solutions, patterns.

REFERENCES

- Bałaban J., *Dzieje Polski. Książka pogładowa dla dojrzałszej młodzieży i dorosłych*, 4th edition, Lwów 1922 (1st edition, Lwów 1905; 2nd edition, expanded, Lwów 1906; 3rd edition, Lwów 1909, was titled *Historia Polski*).
- Biliński P., *Feliks Koneczny (1862–1949). Życie i działalność*, Warszawa 2001.
- Błachowska K., *Wiele historii jednego państwa. Obraz dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego do 1569 roku w ujęciu historyków polskich, rosyjskich, ukraińskich, litewskich i białoruskich w XIX wieku*, Warszawa 2009.
- Boruta M., *Wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi. Polska i Polacy o niepodległości wschodnich sąsiadów Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków 2002.
- Dąbrowski J., *Dzieje Polski w streszczeniu. Z tablicą chronologiczną, wykazem urzędów, szkolnictwa, podziału administracyjnego, kościelnego, politycznego, urzędzeń skarbu i wojskowości Rzeczypospolitej oraz 12 mapkami*, Warszawa 1916.
- Dmowski R., *Niemcy, Rosja i kwestia polska*, Lwów 1908.
- Dutkiewicz J., *Henryk Mościcki jako uczeń Askenazego*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1958, 49, 1.
- Edukacja historyczna społeczeństwa polskiego w XIX w. Zbiór studiów*, ed. J. Maternicki, Warszawa 1981.
- Gil A., *Rusini w Rzeczypospolitej Wielu Narodów i ich obecność w tradycji Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego – problem historyczny czy czynnik tworzący współczesność?*, <https://www.iesw.lublin.pl/projekty/pliki/IESW-121-02-07.pdf> [accessed on: 25 V 2020].
- Grabiec J. [Dąbrowski J.], *Dzieje narodu polskiego*, Kraków [1909].
- Grabski A.F., *Perspektywy przeszłości. Studia i szkice historiograficzne*, Lublin 1983.
- Julkowska V., *Historia dla wyobraźni. Recepcja i interpretacja pisarstwa historycznego Karola Szajnochy*, Poznań 2010.
- Kolbuszewska J., *Mutacja modernistyczna w historiografii polskiej (przełom XIX i XII wieku)*, Łódź 2005.
- Kolbuszewska J., *Tadeusz Korzon (1839–1918). Między codziennością, nauką a służbą narodowi*, Łódź 2011.
- Koneczny F., *Dzieje Polski*, vol. 2, Łódź 1902.
- Korzon T., *Historia Polski. Wydanie nadzwyczajne w zmienionym układzie*, ed. B. Bator, Kijów 1918.
- Kuczyński S.M., *'Jadwiga i Jagiełło' Karola Szajnochy na tle jego życia i twórczości naukowej*, in: K. Szajnocha, *Jadwiga i Jagiełło. Opowiadanie historyczne*, introduction by S.M. Kuczyński, vol. 1, Warszawa 1969.
- Kurczewska J., *Dwie postawy wobec kryzysu ethosu demokratyczno-patriotycznego. Bolesław Limanowski (1835–1935) i Zygmunt Balicki (1858–1916)*, Warszawa 1975.
- Lelewel J., *Dzieje Polski potoczny sposobem opowiedziane*, in: J. Lelewel, *Dzieła*, vol. 7, Warszawa 1961.
- Lelewel J., *Obraz dziejów polskich*, in: J. Lelewel, *Polska, dzieje i rzeczy jej*, vol. 1, Poznań 1858.
- Limanowski B., *Historia demokracji polskiej w epoce porozbiorowej*, Zurych 1901.
- Limanowski B., *Studwudziesięcioletnia walka narodu polskiego o niepodległość*, Kraków 1916.
- Litwin H., *Równi do równych. Kijowska reprezentacja sejmowa 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2009.
- Maternicki J., *Adam Szelański i jego poglądy na historię (cz. 1)*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1989, 33, 11–12.
- Maternicki J., *Historia i wychowanie*, Warszawa 1990.
- Maternicki J., *Historiografia polska XX wieku*, part 1, *Lata 1900–1918*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1982.
- Maternicki J., *Michał Bobrzyński wobec tzw. unii jagiellońskiej. Ewolucja poglądów i jej uwarunkowania*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1977, 21, 12.

- Maternicki J., *Początki mitu jagiellońskiego w historiografii i publicystyce polskiej XIX wieku: Karol Szajnoch i Julian Klaczko*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1988, 32, 11–12.
- Maternicki J., *Stanisław Smolka i powrót historiografii do mitu jagiellońskiego*, 'Przegląd Humanistyczny' 1989, 33, 11–12.
- Od ugody hadziackiej do Unii Europejskiej*, vol. 1, *Wolni z wolnymi, równi z równymi, zacni z zacynymi*, ed. A. Kulczycki et al., Rzeszów–Iwano-Frankiowski 2012.
- Piłsudski J., *Pisma zbiorowe. Wydanie prac dotychczas drukiem ogłoszonych*, vol. 2, ed. L. Wasilewski, Warszawa 1937.
- Pomian K., *Historia: nauka wobec pamięci*, Lublin 2006.
- Pomorski J., *Wstęp*, in: K. Kasprówicz et al., *Szlakami Polski Niepodległej 1914–1922. Interaktywny atlas historyczny*, Lublin 2019.
- Schmitt H., *Dzieje narodu polskiego od najdawniejszych do najnowszych czasów*, vol. 1, Lwów 1863.
- Siemieński J., *Dziedzictwo Rzeczypospolitej*, Warszawa 1918.
- Siemieński W., *La Pologne. Résumé d'histoire*, transl. M. Rakowska, Paris 1916.
- Sierżega P., *Obchody rocznicy unii lubelskiej na terenie Galicji w 1869 roku*, in: *Galicja i jej dziedzictwo*, vol. 15, *Działalność wyzwolenicza*, ed. J. Hoff, Rzeszów 2001.
- Smoleński W., *Historia Polski*, Warszawa [1921].
- Sokołowski A., *Dzieje Polski ilustrowane napisal [...] z ilustracjami Jana Matejki, Walerego Eljasza, Juliusza Kossaka, Henryka Rauchingera i innych artystów polskich*, vol. 1–4, Warszawa 1901, 2nd edition, Wiedeń 1904–1911.
- Stępnik A., *Ukraina i stosunki polsko ukraińskie w syntezach i podręcznikach dziejów ojczyznian okresu porzbirowego 1795–1918*, Lublin 1998.
- Stobiecki R., *Idea jagiellońska w środowisku polskich imigrantów politycznych po 1945 roku*, in: *Wspólne dziedzictwo. Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów w polskiej, litewskiej i ukraińskiej historiografii XIX–XXI wieku*, eds. M. Hoszowska et al., Rzeszów 2019.
- Szelągowski A., *Historia nowożytna 1453–1789*, Lublin 1918.
- Szelągowski A., *Wzrost państwa polskiego w XV i XVI w. Polska na przełomie wieków średnich i nowych*, Lwów–Warszawa 1904.
- Unia Lubelska 1569 roku. Akta prawne*, introduction and ed. H. Litwin, Kijów 2019.
- Wierzbicki A., *Spory o polską duszę. Z zagadnień charakterologii narodowej w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX wieku*, Warszawa 2010.
- Wierzbicki A., *Związki 'Przeglądu Historycznego' z warszawską szkołą historyczną*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 2006, 97, 1.

STRESZCZENIE

Mit jagielloński jest stosunkowo dobrze opracowany w historiografii polskiej. Wyjątek stanowi pierwsze dwudziestolecie XX w., kiedy to doszło do kolejnych jego konwersji i przyspieszenia migracji z dyskursu historiografii do dyskursu pamięci. W tle tych procesów dokonywał się (warunkowany politycznie) swoisty awans problematyki polsko-ukraińskiej, która dotychczas była zdominowana relacjami polsko-litewskimi. Niniejszy artykuł ma na celu rozwinięcie i udokumentowanie tychże kwestii. Przedmiotem analizy i wnioskowania były prace o charakterze ogólnym (syntezy, parasyntezy, podręczniki, kompendia etc.), które kumulują w sobie i 'odbijają' aktualne tendencje naukowe, polityczne, społeczne, kulturowe i inne, tworząc interesujący materiał badawczy. Pozwolił on na ustalenie, że w latach 1900–1918 symbol unii lubelskiej, idea 'wolnych z wolnymi, równych z wolnymi', była popularnym motywem narracji historycznych, który jako konstrukt naukowy stawał się jednak coraz bardziej archaiczny. Jego pielęgnowanie powodowało pośrednio odwrót

od historiografii krytycznej. Daje się zauważyć, że mit jagielloński większym stopniu przyciągał neoromantyków niż modernistów zmierzających do ściślejszego powiązania historiografii z naukami społecznymi. Nie można jednak stwierdzić, że nie było ciekawych prób jego reinterpretacji. Do takich należały nawiązywania do niektórych, obiecujących wówczas, kierunków socjologizujących i psychologizujących, jakie pojawiały na Zachodzie, ale też na gruncie krajowym. Zaskakująco, największymi admiratorami tej idei na początku XX w. stali się historycy identyfikujący się z ideami narodowodemokratycznymi, dalej plasowali się ówcześni konserwatyści (realiści) i badacze związani z różnymi frakcjami obozu niepodległościowego. Traktat ryski z 18 marca 1921 r., zawarty między Polską, Rosją Sowiecką i Ukrainą, wykazał, że romantyczny duch unii lubelskiej przeżył się i stał się fragmentem historii idei.

Słowa kluczowe: historiografia polska, XX wiek, Ukraina, Ukraińcy, unia lubelska, niepodległość, mity narracyjne, pamięć zbiorowa

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Andrzej Stępnik – PhD with ‘habilitation’, Professor UMCS, works in the Department of Methodology and Research on the 20th and 21st Centuries at the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, specialises in research on historical education and the history of historiography. The author of many works in this field, including: *Historia regionalna i lokalna w Polsce 1918–1939. Badania i popularyzacja* (Warszawa 1990); *Ukraina i stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w syntezach i podręcznikach dziejów ojczystych okresu porozbiorowego 1795–1918* (Lublin 1998); *Ukraina, Litwa, Białoruś w ‘Zeszytach Historycznych’ (1962–1991)*, in: *Jerzego Giedroycia rozrachunki z historią i polityką. Studia i szkice w czterdziestą rocznicę ‘Zeszytów Historycznych’*, eds. S.M. Nowinowski, R. Stobiecki (Łódź 2005); *Edukacja muzealna w Polsce. Aspekty, konteksty, ujęcia* (Lublin 2013, co-author and co-editor); *Ukraina i Ukraińcy w koncepcjach ‘przedmurza’*. *Preferencje polskich romantyków*, in: *Wspólne dziedzictwo. Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów w polskiej, litewskiej i ukraińskiej historiografii XIX–XXI wieku*, eds. M. Hoszowska et. al (Rzeszów 2019); *Szlakami Polski Niepodległej 1914–1922. Interaktywny atlas historyczny. Przewodnik metodyczny dla nauczycieli* (Warszawa 2019, co-author).

