

THE POLITICAL NATION OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA.

THE LITHUANIAN PERSPECTIVE

Jūratė Kiaupienė

SUMMARY

The article attempts to provide a theoretical model for the term of *the political nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*; to disclose its historical sources, development, structure and dynamics, the content and forms of its expression in the public life; to indicate its peculiarities, identify factors which determined its character and its associations with processes in the Central Eastern Europe; to provide arguments for reasonable application of the term *political nation* in social studies of Early Modern period.

The political nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is understood as a unique socio-political community, members of which participated in the public life by various means, and its composition and size changed. However, *the political nation* had never covered the entire nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and had never been an equivalent of the nobility. A nobleman's status would only open a window to *the political nation*, but the true membership was individual and determined by the person's will and choice of active participation in the public life of the state, willingness to take responsibility for its fate.

The membership of *the political nation* in question was continually changing and varied since it was joined by representatives of the Ruthenian lands which belonged to the state. Therefore, the preferred term for the description used in the Lithuanian historiography (*the Lithuanian political nation*) is *the political nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*. It enables us to avoid identification of the socio-political community (diverse in terms of ethnicity, religion and culture) with only one Lithuanian nation as well as to attribute an aspect of modern nationalism which does not suit for the historical term of the Early Modern period. Furthermore, it provides an opportunity to understand the nature of the community which participated in governing of the state and to reveal the specific ties which united and consolidated its complicated structure.

THE RUTHENIAN LITERATURE OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIAN
AS A MODEL OF CULTURAL INTEGRATION

Sergejus Temčinas

SUMMARY

The paper presents a survey of translations made from different languages (Old Church Slavonic, Hebrew, Czech, Polish, Latin, and Greek) into Ruthenian in both the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland. The survey shows a large variety of literary genres and individual texts which have been translated into Ruthenian from different – Western and Eastern – sources. The summary translation activities produced by Ruthenians range them at the first place in the region, so that the Ruthenian literature may be viewed as a vivid model of cultural integration within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and beyond. It should be noted that Ruthenian started functioning as a literary language as early as in the middle of the 15th century, e.g. much earlier than it is commonly believed to have emerged. Already at that date the earliest translations from at least three languages – Hebrew, Czech, and Latin – were produced. The paper also discusses the possibility of a general definition of the multilingual Ruthenian literature (as opposed to the multilingual Lithuanian literature) based on formal criteria such as geography, faith, language, and script. The last criterion, while far from being ideal, turned to be most suitable, since the Cyrillic script (which was considered emblematic by the Ruthenian themselves) has been normally applied to both Old Church Slavonic and Ruthenian – the two main literary languages of the Ruthenian people (who did use, but to a lesser extent, also Latin and especially Polish).

WIELOKULTUROWOŚĆ WIELKIEGO KSIĘSTWA LITEWSKIEGO I IDEA TOLERANCJI,
A PRAKTYKA STOSUNKÓW MIĘDZYWYZNANIOWYCH W XVI–XVIII W.

Urszula Augustyniak

SUMMARY

The purpose of the lecture is to describe and characterise the society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as seen from the perspective of a historian of culture. To begin with, the lecturer polemizes with transferring to the past of the term „multiculturalism” – associated with the contemporary doctrine of equality of cultures; and the term of „nation” in its present-day meaning formulated by the 19th-century nationalism. The lecturer proposes a thesis that the use of the term „nation” has no substantiation in the subject-matter, and provokes (against researchers’ intentions) attempts to split the shared cultural heritage between the countries that emerged in the territory of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as well as reduces to a common denominator different ethnic and religious communities with diverse legal status that had for centuries inhabited the territories of Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia, and immigrant ones, which settled within the area of the whole country (like Jews), or only in the Grand Duchy (like the Karaites, Tartars or Armenians) – apart from subsequent immigrants from the West (Scotsmen, Hauländers [Polish: *Olędrzy*]). The lecturer stands against the concept of „multiculturalism” of the Commonwealth understood as the coexistence of „many cultural ghettos”, but espouses the concept of constant exchange between ethnoses and of cultural syncretism. The second part of the lecture is devoted to the social, linguistic and denominational structure of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania’s population in the analysed period, with the emphasis put on the low standards of the current state of research and on the postulate of cooperation between Polish-Lithuanian and Belarusian historians. The third part, dedicated to the inter-denominational relations, begins with the explanation of the term „tolerance” and justification why in relation to the analysed territory till the mid-17th century we should speak not about „tolerance” but about „equality of confessions”. Then the inter-denominational relations are characterised on the basis of the synodical records of the Lithuanian Brethren of the Polish Evangelical Reformed Church. In Conclusions, special attention is paid to the threat being posed by the falsification of the terms „tradition” and „patriotism” as a result of the selective use of history in the Polish school education and of limiting it to the history of Polish Catholicism.

FINIS POLONIAE, FINIS LITUANIAE, FINIS REIPUBLICAE?

Richard Butterwick

SUMMARY

Finis Poloniae. The words attributed to Tadeusz Kościuszko at the battle of Maciejowice invite a reflection on the place of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, Polish and Lithuanian, and the meaning of concepts such as „nation” and „Fatherland” in the consciousness of Lithuanian nobles during the reign of Stanisław August Poniatowski (1764-1795). Traditionally the final decades of the Commonwealth have been viewed as the culmination of the integration of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania within an ever more „Polish” Commonwealth. However perceptions of the period have changed considerably in recent years. This paper explores these problems via examples of noble discourse. Two are exchanges between Kazimierz Nestor Sapieha, the marshal of the Lithuanian confederacy during the Four Years’ Diet (1788-1792), and King Stanisław August. Others are drawn from the instructions issued by Lithuanian dietines to their envoys in November 1790. On the basis of these examples and earlier research, the author cautiously concludes that in this period, while Lithuanian nobles did indeed speak of „the Lithuanian province” and „the Crown provinces”, they did not necessarily accept that the Commonwealth was constituted by three equal provinces. Likewise, while Lithuanian citizens tended to refer to identify „the nation” or „the Fatherland” with the Commonwealth as a whole, and even with „Poland” (which was almost never used in relation to the *Corona Regni Poloniae*), they continued also to speak of the „Lithuanian nation”. At this time, these concepts were not considered mutually exclusive.

THE STATEHOOD TRADITION OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN THE POLITICAL AGENDA OF THE LITHUANIAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Rimantas Miknys

SUMMARY

The article analyses links of the statehood tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with the political agenda of the Lithuanian national movement which have not been specifically discussed in the Lithuanian or Polish historiography concerning the movement in question. The article aims at identifying and discussing theoretical and practical aspects, attempts to determine the impact of those links on the political targets of the Lithuanian national movement during its different stages and on the final wording of the statehood of Lithuania. It claims that in the first (cultural) stage of the national movement there were changes in the environment of the movement shifting from the statehood tradition of the GDL towards a modern wording of statehood based on ethnic values. Such shifts were determined by the changing concept of what is Lithuanian. The second stage of transition from cultural to political content directly faced the issue of prospects for the state of Lithuania. Stronger emphasis was laid on negative consequences of the „union“ for the statehood of the GDL and the *relationship* with Poland was straightforwardly identified as a cause for the downfall of the GDL statehood. Given such position the axis of the political agenda of the Lithuanian national movement became the aim stipulated in the decision of the Great Sejm of Vilnius of 1905 concerning the autonomy of Lithuania within its ethnographic boundaries. Following the close of this stage in the environment of the Lithuanian national movement the statehood tradition of the GDL was further used as a tool whenever it was necessary to provide grounds for the Lithuanian nation's right to political independence. The article states that due to the changing context of the political life in Russia at that period and due to the international „issue of Poland“ on the eve of the First World War, individual moments of the statehood tradition of the GDL were used instrumentally in 1905–1915 as well. They were identified both in the political agenda of the national movement and used in political practice. During the years of the First World War, when the geopolitical status of Lithuania underwent changes, the influence of the tradition in question diminished. Leaders of the Lithuanian national movement attempting to forestall the possibility of restoring national ties between Poland and Lithuania actually waived their plans to implement the statehood model of the GDL. However, even renouncing Historical Lithuania in the Act of February 16th the same leaders of the Lithuanian national movement declared restoring „an independent state of Lithuania based on democracy and with capital in Vilnius“ and thus declared its link with the statehood tradition of the GDL. The author supports the opinion of Römer that the Lithuanian national movement had historical ambitions to maintain this continuation and „to build Lithuania not as a new creation but only to restore and revive it“. The said scholar referred to the „requirement of Vilnius, the capital of Historical Lithuania, and its association with the political restoration of Lithuania“ as a manifestation of such ambitions. This tendency might be noticed in the political practice of the Lithuanian national movement of 1905–1918. In that period activists of the Lithuanian national movement more openly related the statehood tradition of the GDL with the acquisition of Vilnius as the historical capital.

LIETUVOS DIDŽIOSIOS KUNIGAIKŠTIJOS IDĖJA IR TAUTINIAI ATGIMIMAI.
VIENO LIETUVOS LENKO PERSPEKTYVA

Ryšard Gaidis

RÉSUMÉ

La notion de Grand Duché de Lituanie a été analysée selon différents aspects dans toutes les reconstructions nationales, qui ont eu lieu à la fin du XIX et le début du XX ème siècle sur les terres de la Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodow. Les différentes nations et leurs organisations politiques construisaient de diverses manières. Cette notion occupait différentes places dans l'idéologie nationaliste et ensuite dans les doctrines. Comme on s'en est aperçu rapidement, que les étroits principes de nationalisme ne permettent pas de garder la tradition de GDL comme une unité.

Dans cet article, la notion de GDL est présentée par Jozef Mackiewicz (1902.06.01. – 1985.01.31.), écrivain et publiciste connu, dans le contexte du mouvement politique et social de „krajowcy”. L'auteur s'efforce d'expliquer cette notion à travers 3 aspects. En premier, quelle place occupait J. Mackiewicz dans le mouvement „krajowcy”? En deuxième, quelle était sa vision historique de GDL? En troisième, quelle signification géo-politique avaient les essais de reconstruction de GDL?

J. Mackiewicz s'est basé sur la pensée idéologique des tels connus „krajowcy” comme M. Römer, L. Abramowicz et T. Wrublewski.

Dans ses programmes géo-politiques J. Mackiewicz appelait pour la création d'Etat, qui pourrait repousser la menace de la part de Russie et d'Allemagne. La base de cette structure géo-politique devait être 3 Etats: Pologne, GDL et Ukraine.

RUSSIAN NATIONALITY POLICY AND THE REDISTRIBUTION OF THE HERITAGE
OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA

Darius Staliūnas

SUMMARY

This article analyses how the requirements of Russian nationality policy compelled the imperial authorities to initiate historical projects seeking to prove the Russian nature of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Most attention is paid to the tender held by the Ministry of Education in the 1830s and initiated by the minister Sergei Uvarov for the publication of history textbooks, after which the canon of Russian interpretations of GDL history formed. The most important creator of this narrative was Nikolai Ustrialov.

THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA AS REFLECTED IN THE RUSSIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Michail Krom

SUMMARY

The paper deals with the image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Russian historiography and traces its evolution from the early 19th century to the present. The author assumes that the main feature, characteristic of the Russian historical discourse of the GDL, lies in efforts to inscribe the GDL history into the Russian national narrative. The most notorious attempts to present the GDL as a „true Russian land” followed the suppression of uprisings of 1830–1831 and 1863–1864, but due to their rude and unskillful forms (Nikolai G. Ustrialov and Mikhail O. Koialovich, respectively) they had nothing to do with scholarship.

During the imperial period, the academic discourse of the GDL passed two different phases: in 1860s though 1880s, the debate on „native and alien principles” underlying the law, state order, and culture of the Grand Duchy, echoed the ideas of Romantic German school of legal history. Later on, at the turn of the 19th century, the Russian historiography entered a new, positivistic stage marked by extensive use of documentary sources and special attention to socio-economic issues in history. The last decades before the revolution of 1917 saw the appearance of standard works on the GDL history written by Matvei K. Liubavskii, Mitrofan V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii, Vladimir I. Picheta and other prominent scholars.

After the collapse of the Russian empire, the academic discourse of the GDL broke into national pieces. During the Soviet period Russian scholars paid little attention to the GDL history. In the 1980s and 1990s, there arose some interest to it but only in conjunction with Russian national history. In author's view, the progress of the GDL historical studies depends on international efforts aimed at overcoming the national paradigm of historical writing and introducing new approaches and concepts.

„POLAND“ AND „LITHUANIA“: SEMANTICS SPACES GAZE FROM KIEV
(MIDDLE OF THE XIX–EARLY XX CENTURIES)

Natalia Jakovenko

SUMMARY

This article discussed „tissue“ spatial perception of the Polish-Lithuanian State, established in the Ukrainian academic historiography mid XIX–early XX centuries, including the so-called „compression“ this space to the points where the fateful event for the Ukrainians and where „spatial behavior“ Rzeczpospolita these events contributed to, or, conversely, prevented the (of course, in the assessment of Ukrainian historians).

In the later works of Ukrainian historians (to date inclusive!) can be found echoes of almost all shades of cultural and geographical image of the Polish-Lithuanian state: romantic legacy of Nikolay Kostomarov, the first description of the past in a positivist vein, Vladimir Antonovich and, finally, academic „delimitation“ Ukrainian history as a national project in the works of Michail Hrushevskiy. However, they are intertwined so whimsically, and at different times due to the complex mixing of „language sources“, „language historiography Fathers“ and the „language of ideology“, that it would require special analysis. The only that unites them – is that the semantics of spaces „Poland“ and „Lithuania“ least cares reality. In the future, the Ukrainian „geographical identity“ surrounding areas are seen merely as a decoration – „moving backstage stories“, which help to understand and describe themselves.

RECEPTION OF FEDERALIST IDEAS IN LITHUANIA (1918–1922)

Zenonas Butkus

SUMMARY

The article deals with the alternatives of the Lithuanian state established on the national basis after the First World War which have received little attention in the historiography. A prevailing historians' opinion states that there was no alternative for the national state, and the whole Lithuanian community had a determination to build a national state, thus nobody was seriously inclined to create a federation with Poland or with any other neighbouring state.

The creation of ethno politic state was actually the climax of Lithuanian national movement, the result which crowned the whole process. Nevertheless, the movement was often treated by the southern neighbours of Lithuania as anti-Polish fanaticism rather than consistent development of the national idea. In Poland itself federalists were dominated by annexionists who controlled the parliament and were more successful in the military and political sphere. In general, the political practice was not favourable for the federalist ideas.

However, the above ideas had existed in Lithuania; plans to create Lithuania's federation with Latvia or Poland were had been made. This article presents a more detailed analysis of the projects aimed at establishing federalist or any other close ties between Lithuania and Poland.

Two stages of the spread of federalist ideas have been distinguished: the first is the development of the ideas until the announcement of the Lithuania – Poland conciliation project by the president of the League of Nations, Paul Hymans in spring, 1921, the second – the process of discussing this project and its rejection.

Lithuanian politicians had consultations regarding federal or confederate relations both with the representatives of Polish authorities and Polish political or social organizations in Vilnius when quite a few projects of confederate relations were discussed. The projects might have been used by P. Hymans while he was working on his plan. The second variant prepared by P. Hymans with the planned transfer of Vilnius to Lithuania and its defined confederate relations with Poland was approved by many influential Lithuanian politicians including the Prime Minister Kazys Grinius, ministers Ernestas Galvanauskas and Jonas Simkus. The project was supported by Tomas Narusevicius as well as many other famous Lithuanian diplomats who thought that it was the last chance for Lithuania to regain Vilnius through the mediation of Western democratic states.

The Hymans project was rejected due to the resistance of the political parties, the army as well as the policy of Soviet pressure. The specifics of the resistance mechanism have not been clarified yet and are to be studied.

ZENONAS IVINSKIS AND HENRYK ŁOWMIAŃSKI: THE CHANGING MEDIEVAL STUDIES IN THE INTER-WAR PERIOD IN KAUNAS AND VILNIUS

Rimvydas Petrauskas

SUMMARY

The paper investigates the parallels between the two scholars of medieval studies: Polish historian Henryk Łowmiański and Lithuanian historian Zenonas Ivinskis. During the inter-war period both authors have published influential studies introducing new research perspectives on the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, both studies did little outreach the political border that existed between Vilnius and Kaunas in the 1920s–1930s. The first part of the paper examines methodologies of the two authors in the context of the contemporary European historiography. Both historians demonstrate original integral approach towards the research object combining social, economic and political history. They also apply comparative method, focus on methodology and innovative historic source display.

The second part of the paper is focused on the academic relations between the two countries, represented by Vilnius and Kaunas, in the context of the Polish and Lithuanian historians' relations. It is worth mentioning that scholars of medieval studies pioneered and dominated in the academic relations between the two countries not only because of the similar historical interests and same sources or archives, but also because they could not frame themselves in the narrow national historiographies. Both Łowmiański and Ivinskis made attempts to review Lithuanian and Polish medieval studies. However, the lack of personal contacts between the two historians – who shared the interest for the same research object and later lived in the same city – is rather characteristic fact that reflects difficulties in communication between relatively closed Lithuanian and Polish historiographies.

ZENONAS IVINSKIS (1908–1971). HISTORIAN IN EXILE

Mathias Niendorf

SUMMARY

This article deals about the famous Lithuanian historian in exile, whereas the focus concentrates on his last years spent in Germany (1963–1971). As sources serve especially the personnel files in the University Archives of Bonn and Berlin. These materials allow giving an overview about Ivinskis' material circumstances, his carrier in the academic world in Postwar-Germany and his contacts: to students, colleagues in Germany and abroad, even in the Soviet Union.

Although an analyze of the exile publications itself lies beyond the scope of this article, it seems that Ivinskis has made the best use of his situation by researching in the up to then unknown to Lithuanian historians Vatican Archives as well as by choosing topics and presenting theses which would not have passed Soviet censorship. At the end the author suggests further research about Ivinskis' influence in Lithuanian historiography.

LOCAL COMPONENT IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIOCULTURAL IDENTITY
OF THE LITHUANIAN TATARS (A HISTORIOGRAPHIC ASPECT)

Tamara Bairašauskaitė

SUMMARY

The article deals with the question how image of the Tatar sociocultural identity was formed in the Byelorussian, Lithuanian, Polish, and Russian historiographies. Tatars existed in the model of the society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) as strange, but tolerable subject. While identifying Tatars, there are usually emphasized such features like their severality, „nonconflictic otherness”, „mussulmanness”, „orientalness”. However, integration/assimilation processes, which conditioned the rise of new sociocultural identities, substantially influenced the Tatars. A historiographic analysis shows that in the works of historians there were actively, but controversially constructed the Tatar identities (of nobleman, warrior, and scribe) that have been formed in the society of the GDL. In the historiography a nobleman identity was constructed dealing with a question whether the society of the GDL treated the Tatars as noblemen, also, disclosing meaning of legitimization of the nineteenth-century noblemen for the spread of the Tatar knighthood of the Russian nature. It is supposed that an identity of warrior was constructed bearing in mind not the Tatar military service for the land given by a suzerain, but the Tatars' shift to the mercenary army form and professional military service. A construction of identity of a scribe can be seen in the works, authors of which payed attention to the fact that methods of creators of the Tatar writings as well as forms of adaptation of literature were borrowed from the cultural environment of the GDL. A presumption is made that the aforementioned identities are sign of the local culture, and the works of historians substantially contributed to the spread of these identities in the current social consciousness.

HISTORICAL CULTURE IN THE MODERN LITHUANIA:
 „MULTICULTURALISM“ CONCEPT IN THE SOCIETY AND
 IN THE RESEARCHES OF GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA

Grigorijus Potašenko

SUMMARY

The article explores the attitude to the multiculturalism, its relations with history and problems of identity in present Lithuania. The problem of multiculturalism in present Lithuania is closely connected with identity of Lithuanians. As it seems to me, external interest of some historians a variety of cultures frequently opens descriptive (demographic) multiculturalism, or any certain model of multiculturalism. Besides the traditional sight of historians at formation of the Lithuanian nation as historical subject first of all is connected with the theory of ethnos and-or the ethnic nation. There is a problem.

One of the first after 1990 sintetic works of the ancient history of Lithuania was „History of Lithuania up to 1795“ by Z. Kiaupa, J. Kiaupenė, A. Kuncevičius who have left in 1995. As the main reality of the Lithuanian history they consider Lithuanian people, ideas, feelings and acts of its members the given historiographic job can be named ethnocentric. Various religious, ethnic and racial minority (here speech does not go about a role of Lithuanians, Ruthenus and Poles) in this version of history of Grand Duchy of Lithuania of three authors are represented as additional, illustrative and as a matter of fact the statistical fact lost in image GDL as „the multi-national state, the state of different beliefs and cultures“. They are superseded on boondocks of history where they as though automatically get potential of insignificance and even greater threat and danger.

„History of ancient Lithuania. 1009–1795“ by Alfredas Bumblauskas – a vivid example of overdue connection of Lithuania to history of modernization of the Western Europe. It is new and even postmodernist work under the form in a context of the Lithuanian historiography. Traditional and modernist ethnocentrism in „History of ancient Lithuania. 1009–1795“ have different value, and their specific weight during the historical argument – different. Modernist – opened and inclined to dialogue – the ethnocentrism competes and, apparently, wins the traditional ethnocentrism closed and mistrustful to another and their originality.

I think that the exhaustive national history today should be considered not as one of alternatives which preference can give any of centres of science or the leadership of the Ministry of Education of Lithuania, and as a historical imperative for historians and the public as a whole. Simultaneously for Lithuania it is necessary flexible, focused on multiculturalism a policy of education. It would provide the option of the person which would correspond to its cultural identity, and also would enrich imagination of children, which collide with a variety, different languages and way of life.

THE HERITAGE OF GDL IN THE HISTORICAL MEMORY OF PRESENT DAY BELARUSIANS

Viacchaslavu Nasevich

SUMMARY

In Belarus different ideas about the role and the heritage of GDL exist in three main age groups of adults. In the older group (up to 1960-es inclusive) basic notions were formed in school years via soviet textbooks, and the notions are dominant to our time: GDL was an insignificant historical phenomenon, and the memory about them is not of current importance. President A. Lukashenko is the political leader who voiced these notions more than once. The second group can be conditionally named „children of perestroika”. These people have caught the period of the soviet ideology, and they learned history by old textbooks, but their views formed in the period of heated debates, when different points of view were opposed. Nevertheless, the idea of special importance of the GDL period is not characteristic for them, and in general they turned out to be unreceptive to the national-romantic myth. The youngest group formed views under conditions of independent Belarus. In school they learned history by new textbooks, where high emphasis was placed on the period of GDL. Importance of the period is axiomatic for most of them, but in specific interpretations. According to opinions expressed on Internet-forums, the idea of modern „lithuanism” is very popular among them. It means, in particularity, manifestation of identity with the political elite of GDL irrelative of their ethnic origin, that was not characteristic for the national-romantic myth.

UKRAINE: LITHUANIAN PERIOD OF HISTORY
(MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY AND HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS)

Andrey Blanutsa, Dmitriy Vaschuk

SUMMARY

The issues which are connected with the development of the historical conceptions in the modern Ukrainian historiography concerning the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (henceforth. – the GDL) history are examined in this article. The main works among the modern Ukrainian Lithuanian studies, for our opinion, are books of F. Shabul'do, N. Koval'skiy, N. Yakovenko, N. Krikun, G. Boryak, P. Sas, E. Rusina, A. Gurbik, B. Cherkas, A. Blanutsa and D. Vashchuk. Consequently the authors' conceptions concerning the genesis of the GDL and its internal development were proposed to the scientific community. The formation of the scientific school for studying sources of 14th–16th centuries which was found by N. Koval'skiy (P. Kulakovskiy, V. Atamanenko, Yu. Svyatets, O. Dyachok etc.) has been started. The new, 21st century, gives new generation of historians, which started to research the specific aspects of the GDL development (the external policy – B. Cherkas; economic – A. Blanutsa, L. Zherebtsova, W. Berkowskiy; legal – D. Vaschuk, V. Polischuk). The scientific development of the Lithuanian studies in Ukraine reflects in periodicals, essentially on pages of the Ukrainian historical journal.

THE ETHNIC ORIGIN OF UKRAINIANS AND BYELORUSSIANS
IN THE MODERN RUSSIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Igor' Kurukin

SUMMARY

Such researches seldom remain academic and always cause the heightened public interest. Now the „centre of gravity” of similar researches is in Ukraine and in Belarus; in Russia the given plots until recently were not a priority. Therefore it is possible to ascertain absence of precise approaches to a problem of ethnic origins in the manuals on domestic history intended for the mass reader.

The task of scientific research of the problem set in 1953 have not been realized, and appearance of Byelorussians and Ukrainians gradually „moved” for more later time – from XII – to XVI century.

„Byelorussians”, in V. V. Sedov's opinion, originally had no any ethnic meaning and it was applied to name various areas of east Slavic peoples. Only in XVII century the name „White Russia” was fixed to the Western Russia.

In M. V. Dmitriev's opinion, the correct approach would be not to dispute whether a slavic population of the Kievan Russia in X–XIII centuries a Ukrainian language, Russian or Belarus, but to find out how, based on what factors the ethnic characteristics.

A reference point in development of ethnic consciousness in B. N. Floria's opinion, became the Russian-Lithuanian wars of the end XV and the beginnings of XVI centuries when the first proofs of aversion Lithuanian nobility and petty bourgeois „tyrannical authority” of the Moscow sovereigns became evident. But only in the last quarter of XVI century acknowledgement of distinctions has led to changes in character of ethnic consciousness character of east Slavs in territory of Rzeczpospolita. However the begun of ethnic differentiation has not been completed. In XVII century the name „Small Russia” was used to determine territory Kievan Metropoly, i.e. all Russian territories of Rzeczpospolita. In first half of XVII century the term „White Russia” was the regional name for of some the grounds of modern East Belarus, and inhabitants of modern Ukraine were named as „belorustsy” in the Moscow documents also.

M. V. Dmitriev has supported opinion, that the concept of „All-Russian” People was born in Ukrainian-Belarus culture XVI–XVII centuries.

Discussions on the listed questions have revealed; now we can speak about definite increase of interest displayed by Russian scientists to the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

TEKSTŪ AUTORIAI

Urszula Anna Augustyniak – daktarė, Varšuvos universitetas (Lenkija)

Tamara Bairašauskaitė – habilituota mokslų daktarė, Vilniaus universiteto
Istorijos fakulteto Kultūros istorijos ir istorijos teorijos katedra,
Lietuvos istorijos institutas (Vilnius)

Richard John Butterwick – daktaras, Londono universiteto koledžas
(Didžioji Britanija)

Andrij Blanuca – daktaras, Ukrainos nacionalinės mokslų akademijos
Ukrainos istorijos institutas (Kijevas, Ukraina)

Alfredas Bumblauskas – profesorius, habilituotas mokslų daktaras,
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto Kultūros istorijos ir istorijos teorijos katedra

Zenonas Butkus – profesorius, habilituotas mokslų daktaras,
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto Naujosios istorijos katedra

Rišard Gaidis – daktaras, Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto
Naujosios istorijos katedra

Natalija Jakovenko – profesorė, daktarė, Nacionalinis universitetas
„Kijevo Mohilos akademija“ (Kijevas, Ukraina)

Jūratė Kiaupienė – daktarė, Lietuvos istorijos institutas (Vilnius)

Michail Krom – daktaras, Sankt-Peterburgo Europos universitetas (Rusija)

Igor Kurukin – profesorius, daktaras, Rusijos valstybinis humanitarinis
universitetas (Maskva, Rusija)

Rimantas Miknys – docentas, daktaras, Lietuvos istorijos institutas (Vilnius)

Viaceslav Nasevič – daktaras, Baltarusijos elektroninės dokumentacijos
mokslo tiriamais centras (Minskas, Baltarusija)

Mathias Niendorf – profesorius, Greisfaldo universitetas (Vokietija)

Rimvydas Petrauskas – docentas, daktaras, Vilniaus universiteto
Istorijos fakulteto Senovės ir vidurinių amžių istorijos katedra

Grigorijus Potašenko – docentas, daktaras, Vilniaus universiteto
Istorijos fakulteto Kultūrinių bendrijų studijų centras

Darius Staliūnas – daktaras, Lietuvos istorijos institutas (Vilnius)

Sergejus Temčinas – profesorius, habilituotas mokslų daktaras,
Lietuvių kalbos institutas (Vilnius)

Dmitro Vaščiuk – daktaras, Ukrainos nacionalinės mokslų akademijos
Ukrainos istorijos institutas (Kijevas, Ukraina)

**LIETUVOS DIDŽIOSIOS
KUNIGAIKŠTIJOS TRADICIJA IR
TAUTINIAI NARATYVAI**

Leidinį sudarė *Alfredas Bumblauskas, Grigorijus Potašenko*
Kalbos redaktoriai *Birutė Ilgūnienė, Larisa Lavrinec, Milda Norkaitienė*
Viršelio dailininkė *Audronė Uzielaitytė*

Išleido VšĮ Vilniaus universiteto leidykla
Universiteto g. 1, LT-01122 Vilnius
El. paštas: info@leidykla.vu.lt

Spausdino AB „Aušra“
Vytauto pr. 23, LT-44352 Kaunas