

## SUMMARIES

THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA – REALM OF MEMORY FOR NATIONS:  
FROM HISTORIOGRAPHICAL COURTESY TO THE IDEA OF HEPTATEUCH

*Alfredas Bumblauskas*

The article is formally dedicated to review the source and theoretical of the several years ongoing Vilnius University's project "Tradition, image and modern identities of the GDL".

In the post communist epoch the image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was determined by the outlook of the traditions of mono-perspective national historiographies. The Great narratives of these traditions produced a separating (splitting) effect of the GDL' history, culture and heritage, which was accurately called "splinters of broken mirror". In order to overcome this "splinter" effect, which was determined by the optics of national historiographies, it was aimed to demonstrate the multiculturalism of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its homogeneous cultural forms. The purpose was also to reveal how the ideas evolved in the course of contacts with the colleagues and partners historians from Lithuania and neighbouring countries – Poland, Belarus, the Ukraine, Russia and etc., who understand the subjectivity of the GDL' history.

This evolution can be described as follows: from historiographical "courtesy" to poli-perspective view of the GDL's history. This leads to the idea that the application of theory "realm of memories" could create a new form of synthesis – "Heptateuch". It would not level different approaches but rather make them public in the greatest extend presenting traditional mono-perspective as well as new dialogistical attitudes and rejecting those parts of historical chronicles which do not contain intersection of different narratives and thus do not become the realm of memories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA AS THE PLACE OF MEMORY:  
LUDWIK ABRAMOVICH" AND JÓZEF MACKIEWICZ' CASES

*Ryszard Gaidis*

This article intends to reveal the coherence between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a „place of memory" and krajowcy ideology. In interwar period Ludwik Abramovich (1879–1939) was one of the most prominent architect and representative of the krajowcy ideology (next to Michał Pius Römer), the publisher and chief editor of the weekly magazine of Vilnius „Przegląd Wileński" in 1912–1914 and 1921–1938. Józef Mackiewicz (1902–1985) was famous writer and publicist, who advisedly assigned himself to the krajowcy stream, the journalist of Vilnius newspaper „Slowo" in 1922–1939, the editor of the daily newspaper „Gazeta Codzienna" (this daily newspaper was krajowcy trend) in 1939–1940. These two persons were chosen as the representatives of krajowcy ideology.

J. Mackiewicz has emphasized, that he believed being the successor of L. Abramovich ideas. Therefore, the comparison of those two personalities' attitudes towards the tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is interesting and scientifically valuable.

The chronological frames, when we analyze L. Abramovich ideas, restricts to the inter-war period, from 1921–1922, when, according to his opinion, the most realistic chance to restore political unity of the former lands of the Grand duchy of Lithuania has gone (The Peace of Riga, also known as the Treaty of Riga, was signed in 1921 between the Soviet union and Poland. Vilnius and East Lithuania was nominally incorporated into Poland in 1922.) In the case of J. Mackiewicz the main attention is focused on his inter-war publicistic writings and on some publications of the Second World War and post-war period.

As L. Abramovich so J. Mackiewicz tried to take the most valuable or universal characters of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania' historical tradition. Apparently, they were influenced by the constantly repeated charges that krajowcy were going to resurrect what has been dead for a long. On the other hand, they were not so naive and idealistic. They really did not think that Lithuania of Vytautas times will be restored. Undoubtedly, a joint statehood of Lithuania and Belorussia and its idea is the most important element in their texts. And it does not seem so unbelievable.

It should be assented with J. Mackiewicz statement that concept of krajowcy was not very precisely formulated. Other krajowcy representatives' definitions could partly or completely differ from L.

Abramovich and J. Mackiewicz ones. However, historical memory was very important background of this ideology.

THE FIRST (CATHOLIC) LITHUANIAN BOOK PRINTED IN THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA: THE HYPOTHETICAL CATECHISM OF 1585 OR MIKALOJUS DAUKŠA'S CATECHISM OF 1595?

*Sergejus Temčinas*

The author critically examines two primary sources (written or published in 1589 and 1605) which have long been used as evidence indicating the putative Lithuanian edition of Peter Canisius' Catechism which was assumed to have been printed in Vilnius or elsewhere in c. 1585, and in doing so he demonstrates that this hypothesis is not inevitably necessary for making sense of these two primary sources. Mikalojus Daukša's Catechism of 1595 is to be viewed as the first (Catholic) book in Lithuanian printed in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

VILNIUS AS THE SLAVIA ORTHODOXA OR SLAVIA UNITA IN THE HISTORY OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA UNTIL 1569

*Józef Maroszek*

In the city of Vilnius, in the XIV-XVIII century there was a division into two territories: separately inhabited by Orthodox Ruthenians believers and separately Roman Catholics. The division ran the main road leading through the city communications from Rudnicka Gate, the Market, on Grodzka street to the castle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania then the Great street and the Castle street to the castle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania.

In 1387, when the king gave Vilnius Magdeburg law, it concerned only a part inhabited by Catholics. Much of the "Russian city" from 1416 or 1419, was one of the metropolitans of Kiev. The spatial layout of the city was a counterweight to the area of the Roman Catholic bishops. Residents of the district of Russian metropolitans were subject to the jurisdiction of metropolitan officials. It had a cathedral-council (completely destroyed by the army of Moscow in 1655) dedicated to the Nativity of the Virgin Mary and several other churches that since 1596 all were in union with the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1501, Alexander Jagiellon built a church dedicated to the St Anna, whose architecture combined thread of Gothic – typical features of Roman Catholicism with the Moscow architecture of the time. It can be assumed that it was to be an ecumenical church, combining the two religions. Hence its unique architecture. In 1514, Hetman Konstany Ostrogski victory over the forces of the Moscow.

To Vilnius, winner with King Zygmunt I, entered through the Gate of Dawn, which has since become the principal gate of the city parade. Ostrogski built in "the city of Rus" two thanksgiving brick churches - St. Trinity and Holy Nicholas Relics and rebuilt the ruined east cathedral. Also religious disputes ended, when in 1511, the king approved the Orthodox law.

SOME LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE UKRAINIAN CULTURAL ELITE  
OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA UNTIL 1569

*Dmitrij Vaščiuk*

The article deals with the some aspects of legal culture of the Ukrainian elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (henceforce – GDL) during the before Statutes period.

The beginning of the legal culture formation of the population of the GDL put effective use of standards of the land charters [«*ustavnaya zemskaya gramota*»] in law. They became the main sources of the presented research. The main attention is paid to the analysis of such structural elements of legal culture, as culture of legal practice and culture of legal behavior. The author notes that the legal culture of the GDL during the before Statutes period is characterized by rather good level of progress both a culture of legal behavior, and culture of legal practice. Features of the person's legal culture are separately considered. It is thus noted that introduction of the written legislation in the GDL from the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century considerably influenced upon increasing of the legal culture not only the state as a whole, but also on representatives of elite (princes, landowners and service nobility) including Ukrainian.

COSSACKS IN THE HISTORICAL TRADITION  
AND IN COLLECTIVE MEMORY OF BELORUSSIA

*Igor Marzaliuk*

The article analyzes the image of Cossack in Belarusian historiography and in collective memory. The author examines the role of the Belarusian Cossacks in the formation of Zaporozhye (Ukrainian) Cossacks. He also explores the Orthodox intellectuals', who derived from Belarusian lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, attitude towards the Cossacks of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. At the same time Belarusian historian notices that in the middle of the 17th century Cossacks as well as their opponents in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania treated Ruthenian people in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and in the Kingdom of Poland after the Union of Lublin in 1569 as one ethno-cultural group, with common history, language and faith. Although "Cossacks project" in the Belarusian lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was not realized, the memory of the Cossacks remained in Belarusians memory in 18th century as well as in Belarusian folklore.

COSSACKS OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA  
(THE END OF XV CENTURY – 1569): A SOCIAL PORTRAIT

*Boris Cherkas*

This article attempts to show the social portrait of early Cossacks of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Documents are the main source of military service state Cossack's. The paper analyzes three periods (1502–1503, 1524, 1534–1537) and the characteristic of nature of military service in the GDL. By comparative analysis the author comes to the conclusion that in the first third of the 16th century Cossacks is a real social group. The main social base of the Cossacks was the servants of the boyars. The causes of the formation of Cossacks' are hiding in social change to GDL.

GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN THE POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS  
OF THE UKRAINIAN COSSACKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE XVII CENTURY:  
FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

*Valeriy Stepankov*

Problem of the Ukrainian-Lithuanian relations when Bohdan Khmelnytsky was a hetman is not become a subject of special researches. Owing to what there are many questions demanding the lighting. Among them is study of the image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (henceforce – GDL) in consciousness of Zaporozhye Cossacks. By the beginning of the Ukrainian national revolution (1648–1676) Ukrainian Cossacks saw in its political elite (especially of Protestant religion) the patrons and potential allies. Therefore ethnonym "*litvin*" ("Lithuanian") didn't cause any negative feelings and estimates by them that can't be told about ethnonym "*Pole*" ("*lyakh*") who was perceived as something potentially hostile. During revolutionary events of 1648 the Zaporozhye Army aimed, on the one hand, to maintain neutrality of the GDL, and with another – to extend their power to its southern part. Bohdan Khmelnytsky supported at the beginning of 1649 Transylvanian princes Rakotsi's project in creation of the anti-Polish coalition, which providing entry into its structure the GDL. But Y. Radzivil's repressions against rebels and Cossaks in the south of the principality, and also the fidelity declared by the Lithuanian hetman to Jan Kazimir, became the reason for formation by B. Khmelnytsky and Cossack's foremen a view upon the GDL as on the hostile state which should be destroyed.

THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA MILITARY CONTRIBUTION  
DURING STRUGGLE WITH BOHDAN CHMIELNICKI UPRISING IN 1648–1651

*Mirostaw Nagielski*

The Grand Duchy of Lithuania similarly to the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland was surprised by incidents after defeats of field hetmans in battle of Korsuń and coming of Cossacks in Brześcian and Czernihow provinces in June 1648. Chmielnicki wanted his

forces in Lithuania to absorb local commanders so he would be able to focus on struggles against Polish forces in Ukraine. In 1649 Lithuanian army defeated Cossacks army led by M.S. Krzyczewski of Łojów (31<sup>st</sup> July 1649) but because of lack of gun powder and big losses field hetman Janusz Radziwiłł definitely refused to go on Kiev. It downgraded relations between king John Kazimierz and hetman Radziwiłł. During campaign of 1651 Cossacks troops were bracked owing to victory of Lithuanian forces over Cossacks commanded by colonel Martyn Nebaba of Łojów (6<sup>th</sup> July) and seizure of Kiev. Janusz Radziwiłł's triumphal entry into aforementioned city (4<sup>th</sup> August) did not end Lithuanian struggles with Cossacks that year; after joining the Crown Army they fought on Biała Cerkiew (23<sup>rd</sup> September). Lithuanian struggles against the Cossacks in 1648–1651 have shown how dangerous for Chmielnicki was cooperation of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth that forced him to divide his forces and enabled Lithuanians further military activities towards Kiev.

POLISH-LITHUANIAN CONFLICT IN THE END OF XIX<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY –  
BEGINNING OF THE XX<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY: REVIVAL OF OLD CONCEPTS

*Rimantas Miknys, Darius Staliūnas*

This article confronts recent debates in Lithuanian as well Polish historiography claiming that a conflict that arose in late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century in Lithuania should be labelled not as a confrontation between Lithuanian and Polish Nationalisms but rather as a clash between „Old” and „New” Lithuanians. This article presents different types of collective identity in the period under discussion and claims that part of those persons who might be identified as „Old Lithuanians” were in a discussion with modern Lithuanian Nationalisms, but not in a conflict with it, and others used that argument about being Lithuanians just instrumentally. The main axis of the conflict lay between the modern Lithuanian movement and the modern Polish National movement.

„A FORGOTTEN” GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA – SOME CRITICAL REMARKS ABOUT THE REGRESS OF THE TERM IN POLISH HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup> AND 20<sup>TH</sup> C.

*Leszek Zasztowt*

It seems pondering on, of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> c. Polish historiography since the times of its creator Joachim Lelewel, that a term Grand Duchy of Lithuania occurs very rarely in the majority of popular outlines of the history of the ancient Commonwealth (*Rzeczpospolita – the Republic*). It emerges mostly in the context of discussions concerning particular issues of the subsequent Polish-Lithuanian unions: at Krewo (1385), in Vilna-Radom (1401), Horodlo (1413), Grodno (1432), Vilna (1499), Mielnik (1501), and finally of the Lublin union (1569). Even the establishing of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the concluding of the so called „real” and final union at Lublin, was not mentioned and reflected in Polish historiography as an ultimate change of the character of the state, but rather as an enlargement of Polish elite influence on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which much earlier was already united with the Crown (or even incorporated to the Crown) through a dynastic union.

Meaningful and visible tendency is resignation from using the term Grand Duchy of Lithuania, as well as of the term Commonwealth of Both Nations, and replacing it by a simple denomination Poland as a core. Therefore there is no purpose to look for any synthesis entitled a history of the first Commonwealth or a history of the ancient Commonwealth. Everywhere and every time other titles are requested in various modified versions: A History of Poland, An Outline of the History of Poland, the Polish History etc. Of course it has its own historical and serious justification concerning the pre Jagiellonian period, at least till the concluding of the Krewo union. But for the Jagiellon dynasty’ times and the period of the Commonwealth of Both Nations the resignation of this term seems very symptomatic and meaningful. Why the authors resigned of using the fruitful idea of the Commonwealth of Both Nations, in fact of many nations, the idea which in large scope although in a different manner was and is still used in many historic narratives, i.e. in English tradition of the British Commonwealth, as well as in Russian and Soviet tradition in a shape of its Pan-Slavic idea, as for example in the concept of the brotherhood of nations of the former USSR? Why no one dares to write *The History of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*? Such an attempt was already undertaken few years ago by professor Jerzy Kłoczowski in his Institute of East Central Europe in Lublin. It resulted in preparing the national histories of Poland, Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine, written by historians of those nations. But a common synthesis was not achieved.

The question is: neither any one, nor no one of historical milieu of the countries which carry on a burden of the history of common state, do not dare to represent the ancient idea of the Commonwealth? Shall we write only and exclusively national narratives?

Grand Duchy of Lithuania is not displayed as a title of none of Polish language synthesis of the history of the first Republic (*pierwsza Rzeczpospolita*). There is only one exception – Paweł Jasienica and his popular trilogy: *Piast Poland* (18 editions in 1960–2012, including 2 in English), *Jagiellonian Poland* (18 editions, including two in English translation), *Calamity of the Realm – Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów – The Commonwealth of Both Nations* (31 editions including two in English translation). But even Jasienica did not entitled none of his books a history of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

In popular Polish language dictionaries since the first compiled by Samuel Bogumil Linde, we can not find the entry Grand Duchy of Lithuania, however the entry Lithuania emerges very often. In quite popular *Encyklopedia staropolska* of Zygmunt Gloger there is no trace of the entry: Grand Duchy of Lithuania, nor Lithuania. In *Encyklopedia staropolska* of Alexander Brückner there is no article on Grand Duchy, but there is a large text on Lithuania.

Similar situation is in the Geographical Dictionary of the Kingdom of Poland (*Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego*) where one can not find the entry Grand Duchy, but the article on Lithuania seems very significant.

In the latest Polish encyclopedias i.e. in the fourth volume *Encyklopedia Powszechna*, published in 1980s we have the title Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but only with a paginal reference to the entry Lithuania. In the most popular one volume encyclopedia of 1960s - *Encyklopedia Powszechna PWN*, edited by professor Bogdan Suchodolski, there is no entry about Grand Duchy. On the other hand in the 20<sup>th</sup> volume encyclopedia of *Gazeta Wyborcza* and the Printing House PWN, published at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the entry about Grand Duchy of Lithuania is included, but it occupies less place than the neighboring article about the Grand Duchy of Poznan.

In this article author tries to answer the questions why such situation happened in Polish historiography in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> c.? What were the reasons of this phenomenon? And what kind of historic narratives concerning Polish or Commonwealth nations *in spe* were in the focus of this historiography? Is a presentation of the history of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth possible only through the national issue, and exclusively from the contemporary point of view, and a present division on the statehoods? The text might give some answers for those questions.

#### THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA AND THE “RUS’ ” IN THE CONCEPTION OF FATHERLAND (KRAYOVOST’) BY ROMAN SKIRMUNT (1868–1939)

**Aleksandr Smoliančuk**

The phenomenon of “the fatherland idea” (krajovost’) is usually treated as the type of ideology of the political nation. “The fatherland idea” was formulated at the beginning of the XX century in Belarus and Lithuania. The fatherlandists (krajovcy) claimed that all local inhabitants of the historical Lithuania, irrespective of ethno-cultural accessory, were “the citizens of fatherland” and were of one nation. Approving unity of historical destiny of all people of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania (VKL), the fatherlandists said about the preservation of the territorial integrity of “the historical Lithuania”.

The final registration of “the fatherland idea” was significantly affected by the publications of Roman Skirmunt. His life and activities were inseparably linked with the Belarusian Polesye. In the booklets *Nowe hasła w sprawie odrodzenia narodowości litewskiej* (New slogans in the revival of the Lithuanian nationality) (Lvov, 1904) and *Głos przeszłości i potrzeba chwili* (A voice of the past and a time requirement) (Lvov, 1905) Roman Skirmunt proved an active presence of the “Rus’ ” in the political history of the VKL and its domination during a certain period in the cultural life. The concept “Rus’ ” in this interpretation was identified with the Belarusian land. The author disproved the Russian historians and politicians who said about the identity of the “Rus’ ” and Russia and tried to use the local orthodox inhabitants in interests of the Russian empire.

In the political part of the conception by R. Skirmunt “Rus’ ” gradually turned into “Belarus” (1906). Its final transformation happened not in the author’s publicist works, but in his practical political activities.

THE CINEMATOGRAPHY OF THE INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA  
AND THE HISTORY OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA. WHAT IF..?

*Aurimas Švedas*

This article analyses the attempts of the representatives of the independent Lithuanian cinematography to interpret the history of Lithuanian Grand Duchy in the scripts of "Margiris" and "Žalgiris". These scripts were written for a historical film competition in 2006, which was funded by the programme to mark the Millenium of Lithuania.

The key question discussed in this article is – do the scripts, which were voted the best in the competition, express a qualitatively new approach towards the history of the Lithuanian Grand Duchy?

This research revealed that the script of R. Banionis and M. Daškus' film "Žalgiris" was written to convey the stereotype images of the old history that had been formed in the historical memory of the society. The two main characters – Jogaila, the King of Lithuania and Poland, and Vytautas, the grand duke of the Lithuanian Grand Duchy – were depicted according to the Lithuanian society's stereotype preconception of these figures. The conceptually very important antagonism between Lithuania and Western Europe, represented by the Teutonic Order, also remains trapped in the captivity of stereotypes which at the same time mark the tension and unbridgeable chasm between us (good Lithuanians) and them (evil).

M. Ivaškevičius' script focuses on the struggle between Lithuanians and Crusaders as well as the battle in the castle of Pilėnai in 1336, during which all the defenders of the castle as well as the villagers hiding inside the castle were killed.

Despite attempts to destroy the established stereotypes in the historiography and the historical memory of the society by introducing a new interpretation of the Pilėnai and Margiris themes, M. Ivaškevičius did not withdraw from the influence of the great heroic narrative – the final scene of the script on the assault of Pilėnai castle. The heroic battle of Lithuanians reiterates the stereotype images settled in the historical memory of the society.