

Norbert Morawiec
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5025-5528>
Jan Długosz University in Czestochowa

“Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant”¹. Koliyivshchyna: a Polish historiographic reflection and a metaphor of unity

“Więc za łotrów skaranych i bitych zbawienie
Należy się anielskie zmówić pozdrowienie.
Gdy już są osądzeni na ziemi i w niebie,
Zabójcy i zabici widzą wspólnie siebie”.

M. Darowski (lines 783–788)²

Published in 2019, a book by Prof. Tatiana Tairowa-Jakowlewa, *Koliyivshchyna: Great Illusions*, constitutes a very important publication in the scientific discourse concerning this important historical event.³

- 1 Tacitus, *The Life of Titus Cnaeus Agricola*, quote after: J. M. Giżycki, *O bazylianach w Humaniu*, “Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki” 27 (1899), pp. 456.
- 2 Польська поема про уманську різню, подав др. Іван Франко, “Записки Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка” 62 (1904), p. 25. “Thus, for the condemned villains and the beaten’s salvation/ There must be the Angelus prayer recitation. Once they’re judged on earth and in heaven, / The killers and the killed repose together.”
- 3 Т. Г. Таїрова-Яковлева, *Коліївщина: великі ілюзії*, Київ 2019; Т. Г. Таїрова-Яковлева, *Между Речью Посполитой и Россией: Правобережная Украина в эпоху*

The researcher was interested in the history of the Koliyivshchyna participants and also the memory about them.⁴ During the session of the round table, organized by the Russian Academy of Sciences, she pointed out to the need of conducting common Russian-Ukrainian-Polish historical and historiographic research that might analyse the “Haidamak” issue from various national-confessional perspectives.⁵ Prof. Tairova’s initiative became particularly relevant in the face of the Russian aggression against Ukraine. For, when we maintain academic contacts with the anti-Putin circles of Russian researchers, we should be preparing the ground for the future, post-Putin research discourse, where the reflection on the mnemohistorical (and historiographical) heritage of Central and Eastern Europe should be prioritized. This text might constitute a contribution to such contacts and research. It aims to show and analyse a historical (historiographical) metaphor of unity—overlooked in previous Ukrainian, Russian and Polish research reflections—constructing the Polish historiography of Koliyivshchyna and to prove that it was an outcome of mnemohistorical discourse between the researched past and the researchers’ present⁶. In my opinion, the metaphorization of the historical text takes place in the context of the internalization of the epistemological resource (this resource is the ideas/values/norms of culture—the cultural matrix)⁷.

гайдамаков, Санкт-Петербург 2020. There have been many publications on Koliyivshchyna, such as W. W. Sokyrka, T. Srogosz, *The haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna in the Polish and Ukrainian historiography. The Polish-Ukrainian duet*, “Review of Historical Sciences” 16 (2017) no. 3, pp. 7–40.

- 4 T. Г. Таирова-Яковлева. *Участие запорожцев в восстании гайдамаков 1768 г. (Коливищина)*, “Quaestio Rossica” 7 (2019) no. 3, pp. 969–980; T. Г. Таирова-Яковлева. *Коливищина в исторической памяти*, “Диалог со временем” (2019) issue 66, pp. 37–53.
- 5 *Россия и Речь Посполитая накануне разделов*, 10.12.2021, <http://www.spbiiran.nw.ru/kruglyi-stol-tairova-7-12-21/>
- 6 J. Assmann, *Collective Memory and Cultural Identity*, “New German Critique” 65 (1995), p. 130; M. Tamm, *History as Cultural Memory: Mnemohistory and the Construction of the Estonian Nation*, “Journal of Baltic Studies” vol. 39 (2008) issue 4, p. 500.
- 7 See: M. Woźniak, *Metafora jako narzędzie badań historycznych. Kilka uwag na marginesie pracy R. Stobieckiego “Bolszewizm a historia. Próba rekonstrukcji bolszewickiej filozofii dziejów”*, “Historyka” 30 (2000), pp. 89–112.

Unity and bloodshed

The first group of Polish sources is represented by few reports, whose authors witnessed the tragedy (or they came to Uman right after the bloodshed). We know that the very first one was written by Jerofeusz Korczyński, a Basilian monk, who took over the management of a school located next to the monastery in Uman, after Irakliij Kostetskyj had passed away. Korczyński (1737–1791) studied at the Roman College of Faith Propagation, as a lawyer he dealt with the issues of a monastery in Warsaw (in 1764), based on the royal fund he organised the construction of a monastery in Warsaw (1769–1772), and afterwards he moved to St. Jura monastery in Lviv, where he became attorney general of the Basilians at the Holy See (1772–1780) and monastery curate general (1786–1788). Certainly, we are most interested in Korczyński's stay in Uman. Having arrived there in 1768, he was forced to organize the monastery in Uman and its school from scratch.⁸ He decided to describe the bloody Uman events, and in order to do that, he began to collect accounts of people who survived the massacre. This description was first placed in the files of the Basilian monastery (probably a few months after the event in question), and later on it was copied (it functioned in the circulation of manuscripts under changed titles and in various editions).⁹ In 1854, it was published as “A Short Description of the Massacre in Uman...”¹⁰ Before the analysis, let us pay attention to the activity of the very Basilians. The order was established after the Union of Brest (1596), by Orthodox monks from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, who acknowledged papal authority.¹¹ Their main task was to spread the Catholic faith in the Orthodox community, so they focused on pastoral, religious, missionary and scientific-research

8 Ю. Стецик, *Ченці-педагоги уманських василіанських шкіл (1769–1774 рр.): біографічний огляд*, “Емінак” (2016) no. 2 (1), p. 23.

9 See: M. Marcinkowska, *Wydarzenia roku 1768 w Humaniu w świetle rękopisów Biblioteki Kórnickiej*, in: *Архітектурна та культурна спадщина історичних міст країн Центрально-Східної Європи: кол. Монографія*. eds. P. Димчика, I. Кривошеї, Н. Моравця, Умань–Познань–Ченстохова 2016, pp. 204–214.

10 *Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humaniu od czerni ukraińskiej dnia 20 miesiąca czerwca 1768 roku działywanej*, in: *Bunt hajdamaków na Ukrainie r. 1768 opisany przez Lippomana i dwóch bezimiennych*, ed. E. Raczyński, Poznań 1854, pp. 121–146.

11 See: M. Pidlypczak-Majerowicz, *Bazylianie w Koronie i na Litwie: szkoły i książki w działalności zakonu*, Wrocław 1986, pp. 18–23.

activity.¹² They tried to prove that the act of 1596 did not constitute an individual event, but it rather referred to the Council of Florence or Vladimir's baptism (Hypatius Pociiej, Joakym Morokhovskij, Lev Krevza-Zhevuskyj).¹³ The schism was not heard of at that time, so the prince baptized Ruthenia in Catholic unity, but following the Eastern rite. This unity, cultivated in Ruthenia, was recalled in Brest. However, it was opposed by Orthodox Ruthenians, who were politically supported by Russians. From that moment, the anti-Uniate Orthodox (Dysuniates) became an anti-state side, whereas Orthodox Cossacks were the force threatening the stability of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. Meanwhile, Uniates constituted a unifying force, and they brought confessionally and politically a torn statehood together. The unity metaphor constructed in such a way captivated Basilians' cultural memory (it defined the geography of sacred places, the number of mass events, annual pilgrimages, miraculous painting coronation events),¹⁴ and generated their intellectual work (Ignacy Kulczyński, Ignacy Stebelski), made one fear Russian-Orthodox aggression, but also inspired to win “Moscow” over confessionally.¹⁵ However, the priority was to protect this political (Ruthenian-Polish) and confessional (Catholic of two rites) unity.¹⁶ Certain mnemonic changes can be discerned in the period preceding the massacre of Uman. Thanks to the order's reforms (based on Roman Catholic ones), acknowledging

- 12 A. Nowicka-Jeżowa, *Udział bazylianów w kształtowaniu kultury chrześcijańskiej na wschodnich Kresach Rzeczypospolitej*, “Warszawskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze” 4–5 (1997), pp. 240–251; M. Radwan, *Bazylianie w zaborze rosyjskim w latach 1795–1839*, “Nasza Przyszłość” 93 (2000), pp. 153–225.
- 13 See: В. Шевченко, *Православно-католицька полеміка та проблеми унійності в житті Русь-України доберестейського періоду*, Київ 2001.
- 14 D. Stern, *The Making of a Marian Geography of Grace for Greek Catholics in the Polish Crownlands of the 17th–18th Centuries*, “Religions” 12 (2021) issue 6, pp. 1–29, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12060446>.
- 15 See: the legend on Nikon's conversion by the intercession of Josaphat Kuntsevych: M. A. Korzo, *Reality Invented: How Uniate Josaphat Kuntsevych Supposedly Contributed to the Conversion of Nikon, Patriarch of Moscow*, “Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio FF: Philologiae” 38 (2020) issue 1, pp. 35–45.
- 16 В. В. Старостенко, *Проблема Брестской церковной унии в белорусской общественно-философской мысли конца XVI в. — начала XVII в.*, in: *750 определений религии: история символизаций и интерпретаций*, ed by Е. И. Аринин, Владимир 2014, p. 429.

papal authority and significant secular help, Basilians saw the opportunity to complete their work of creating that unity.¹⁷ Yet, problems occurred. First of all, there was the Dysuniate policy of Catherine II and Orthodox priests, among all, Georgij (Konisskyj), Gervasij (Lyntsevskyj), Melkhizedek (Znachko-Javorskyj), and the confessional instability of Uniate parish priests. Contrary to the finely equipped Basilians, enjoying a monopoly of Uniate dioceses, parish priests were almost commonly despised as morally deprived theological ignoramuses. It was feared that triggered by their poverty, they would abandon this unity and together with their faithful exchange the Catholic Church for the Orthodox Church.¹⁸ Thus, it had to be propagated, and with the help of journalism, literary works, historiography and education, especially in Basilian schools (among all, the one in Uman), the Polish-Ruthenian memory, developing an “integrity” identity had to be created.¹⁹

In the light of the aforesaid analyses, let us focus on the initial narration of Korczyński, concerning the causes of the pogrom. He proved that it derived from the Orthodox Church being disgusted with “Church unity.” When “the lords of Ukrainian estates, and metropolitan bishops even more” began to “propagate the defence of the unity of the Roman Catholic Church,” it met with the objection of Melkhizedek, prior of the Motronynskyi Monastery,²⁰ who was probably complying with the orders of his spiritual superiors. He began to “persuade both laymen and priests to support the schism and to speak out against the Uniate metropolitan bishop.” It led to social unrest and the attack on Uniate priests by Orthodox priests. When the Bar Confederation took place, an order was issued to send military units from the territory of Ukraine to help. However, the “lords” did not allow their Cossack units to take part in the confederation. Melkhizedek took advantage of the situation and instigated Cossacks and Orthodox peasants, even more so by showing them “fabricated ukases”

17 Y. O. Stetsyk, *Monasteries of western dioceses of Kyiv union metropoliya (90th years of XVII 90th years of XVIII centuries): jurisdictional conversions*, in: *Relevant research of historical sciences: collective monograph*, ed. V. M. Andreyev, et al., Lviv-Toruń 2019, pp. 164–182.

18 R. Butterwick, *Deconfessionalization? The Policy of the Polish Revolution towards Ruthenia, 1788–1792*, “Central Europe” 6 (2008) no. 2, pp. 95–96.

19 І. Кривошея, *Василіанський орден на Правобережній Україні в др. пол. XVIII — пер. трет. XIX ст.*, in: *Архітектурна та культурна спадщина...*, p. 115–132.

20 *Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humaniu...*, p. 121.

of Catherine II.²¹ The news about the approaching military units contributed to the decision on organizing the defence of the city. Also, the Basilians from Uman “were brave enough to stay in the monastery”, and as far as information about potential Cossack betrayal was concerned, Gonta was called “to swear loyalty to the lord and the city.” The well-fortified city withstood the first attack. Yet, it was captured by deceit. Governor Mladanovitch allowed the gates to be opened, the units led by Gonta and Zheleznyak were greeted with “bread and salt” and despite this they started the “bloodshed.”²² Kostetskyj was shot and then, “when he was trying to pick up and eat the Host that had been thrown away by the rabble, he was stabbed by pikes and thrown into the ditch.” Next, Korczyński described the division of the spoils, throwing decomposed bodies into ditches and wells, the insidious arrest of Gonta and Zheleznyak by the Russians and punishing Gonta and other “rogues.”²³ To conclude, he wrote that the events in Uman were triggered by Ruthenian peasants (*czerni*), who were the cause of the “misery of their own and so many of their compatriots”, who hurt the homeland which “breastfed them” and whose material loss was significant when “its property gained by hard work fell into foreign hands.”²⁴

“The bloodshed” in Korczyński’s account was to derive from the way Russia and the Orthodox clergy reacted to the nobility’s and Basilians’ activities aimed at “the defence of unity with the Roman Catholic church.” But the most important thing was showing Koliyivshchyna as Ruthenia’s fight with Ruthenia and Uniates’ fight (though supporting Orthodox Cossacks) with Uniates. Although Poles and Jews lost their lives, Eastern Catholics were the target of the attack, the pogrom was triggered by Ruthenian, but the way the author understood it, Catholic peasants (*czerni*), and this “property” developed together got into foreign “hands,” i.e. the Russian-Orthodox ones. The work does not mention a national “issue” (being Ukrainian), a social one (fight between the classes), or an economic one (the nobility’s oppression), and the Orthodox-Catholic conflict played a crucial role.²⁵

21 *Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humanu...*, p. 122.

22 *Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humanu...*, p. 130.

23 *Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humanu...*, pp. 130–144.

24 *Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humanu...*, p. 145.

25 In this context, Korczyński’s narration is close to the findings of Barbara Skinner, showing Koliyivshchyna as a confessional conflict to a wide extent: B. Skinner,

Another author, Kornel Sroczyński, presents us with an interesting metaphor of the “massacre.” This description was based on Korczyński’s account, it was published many times and became for many authors the principal source showing the facts in question. Sroczyński (1731–1790)²⁶ was a Basilian, missionary, preacher, writer, but also a historian — a chronicler of Basilian monasteries in Krystynopol and Lavriv²⁷. In 1766, he was appointed superior and prefect of the mission in Krystynopol, the residence of a distinguished magnate, voivode of Kiev, Franciszek Salezy Potocki. The voivode entrusted him with managing the foundation devoted to the construction of a local Basilian monastery and Orthodox church. At the same time, Sroczyński conducted an ecumenical mission among Orthodox inhabitants, wrote a mission textbook for the use of the Uniate clergy, and authored a collection of missionary sermons.²⁸ In the monastery chronicle, he described the most important events of contemporary Poland, Ukraine, but also changeable fortunes of Potocki and his family,²⁹ which was used later on in the work of Jan Czerniecki.³⁰ Meanwhile, he mentioned the events of Koliyivshchyna.³¹ But the biggest amount of information about it can be found in the chronicle of the Uman monastery and the aforesaid description (which was published in 1838).³² Let us examine it in more detail. Let us notice that the author cared to emphasise the fact that Koliyivshchyna was an Orthodox reaction to the policy of national-confessional unity of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth (so he copied Korczyński). It was to be particularly

Borderlands of Faith: Reconsidering the Origins of a Ukrainian Tragedy, “Slavic Review” 64 (2005) no. 1, pp. 88–116.

- 26 On Sroczyński’s life and activity: R. Łukań, *Autor dziejopisu monasteru krystynopolskiego o. Korneliusz Sroczyński ZŚBW (ur. 17/XI 1731 † 21/III 1790). Krótki życiorys*, Kraków 1939.
- 27 М. Ваврик, О. Корнило Срочинський, ЧСВВ, *Історіограф і Проповідник (1731–1790)*, “Записки ЧСВВ” 3 (1960) issue 3–4, pp. 429–439.
- 28 See: I. Назарко, *Методичний підручник василіянських місій о К. Срочинського (у 200-ліття його появи: 1772–1972)*, “Записки ЧСВВ” 9 (1974), pp. 142–151.
- 29 *Лѣтопись монастыря оо. Василіянъ въ Крестинополи одъ его основаня в 1768 до 1889 року. Уложив Василь Чернецкій парох зі Сльця белского, Львовъ 1893.*
- 30 J. Czerniecki, *Mały król na Rusi i jego stolica Krystynopol*, Kraków 1939.
- 31 J. Czerniecki, *Mały król na Rusi...*, p. 14.
- 32 [K. Sroczyński], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego, byłego superiora krystynopolskiego*, “Przegląd Dziejów Polskich” 3 (1839), pp. 36–46.

noticeable in the Crown lands, where Basilians, supported by the Potocki family, were building the monastery, school, and carried on their missions in the Orthodox community. Everything was to change as a result of Melkhizedek's activity, who "began to address monks in Ukrainian monasteries, people and priests in villages, and dissuade them from the holy unity and encourage them to oppose Uniate bishops." The situation was exacerbated during the Bar Confederation, when Uman and Smiel Cossacks were not sent to help the confederates. It was even more serious as Cossacks led by Zheleznyak left Russia, spreading the news among Ukrainian people that the Russian "Empress" wanted to wipe out Poles, Ruthenian-Uniates, priests, Jews, and free peasants.³³ Further on, the author showed the merger of the Gonta and Zheleznyak military units, an attempt to defend the city, letting in haidamaks by Mładanowicz, and, above all, a bloody pogrom.³⁴ However, it is worth adding that he devoted most of his attention to the description of Basilian priests' death. It took place during their pastoral duties, and Irakli Kostetskyj's martyrdom was given a special dimension. Found by Koliyivshchyna rebels in the chapel while listening to someone at a confessional, he was tortured to give the whereabouts of the monastery's treasures, shot and stabbed with pikes.³⁵ The description follows the hagiographic convention — it reports the missionary work of monks and their martyrdom (omitting events recognized as miraculous, the so-called *miracula*).

Why was the "massacre" of the inhabitants of Uman so bloody in its character? Sroczyński explained it by comparing Uman to Jerusalem. He wrote that governor Mładanowicz, wanting to calm down the situation, allowed letting "rogues" into the city. The city dwellers, "accompanied by secular priests from three secular Orthodox churches" approached the haidamaks in a procession. However, this behaviour only "infuriated" the aggressors, who began to resemble fiends-devils³⁶ due to their cruelty and "wild ruthlessness." Sroczyński referred here to the preaching of St. John Chrysostom, and "Ukraine" was compared to the Biblical Jerusalem. During the Passion of Christ, as St. John Chrysostom preached, "hell entered Jerusalem," all the people being in the city then, except the apostles and "Christ's faithful," were possessed and they started to do evil.

33 [K. Sroczyński], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego...*, p. 37.

34 [K. Sroczyński], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego...*, p. 40

35 [K. Sroczyński], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego...*, pp. 42–43.

36 [K. Sroczyński], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego...*, p. 41.

In Sroczyński's opinion, a similar situation took place in Uman. "People" began to get evil, merciless, attacked the innocent. Let us notice that the aforesaid narration, although horrifying to an ordinary reader, justifies Koliyivshchyna participants' conduct. It did not depend on them as it was with the inhabitants of Jerusalem, they were possessed by fiends-devils. What is more, comparing them to Jews suggested a certain ecumenical-soteriological perspective. If the latter, after Christ's death, understanding their sins and accepting Christianity, the Orthodox Ruthenians were also to undergo such a change. In Sroczyński's narration, there is punishment for Koliyivshchyna rebels' sins. Their rebellion was suppressed by the Russian units' strategy, and afterwards "in various towns, villages, along various roads, they were hanged, beheaded, impaled..."³⁷

Therefore, as an important metaphor generating Sroczyński's reflections, the idea of unity took on a new meaning. Again, we are dealing with attempts to question the Basilian's missionary work and this "unity" by Orthodox Russians. But Sroczyński wanted to incorporate the colonisation of the Uman crownland, performed by Potocki, in his evangelical work of converting the Orthodox to Catholicism. It might have been caused by the magnate's willingness to provide financial support for the Basilians who were victims of the pogrom. Yet, there are also other elements in the narration. Kostetskyj shown as a Uniate martyr (on a par with Josaphat Kuntsevych) became... an icon of the "massacre" of Uman, and Uman, Potocki's property and the residence of the monastic mission and school, became an icon of an anti-Russian and anti-Orthodox Polish-Ruthenian sites of memory, sanctified by Catholic martyrdom.

Unity and the nobility

We know that the commemoration of these blood-shedding events was an important element of the didactic-educational programme propagated in the Uman school, and the infamous wells where murdered bodies were thrown constituted a characteristic type of Basilian memorial sites.³⁸ What is more, the monks developed a sort of educational path. They took their students to places linked with the pogrom and told them about the bloody events, becoming in this way cultural memory creators for these students. The aforementioned wells were such places, as well

37 [K. Sroczyński], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego...*, p. 43.

38 See: Т. Кузнецъ, *Уманське духовне училище: будинок та навчальний заклад*, in: *Архітектурна та культурна спадщина...*, pp. 169–175.

as spots where particular monks were murdered, city walls and the gate through which the haidamaks marched, an Orthodox church where Orthodox priests forcibly baptized Uniates and Roman Catholics.³⁹ However, the biggest impression must have been made by reading the reports of Uman students, i.e. a rhymed report, written by one Uman student and witness of the “bloody” events. There is not much information about him. In literature, he is known as M. Darowski. He was a student at the school in Uman. He was rescued from the pogrom by a Sich Cossack, Harmokracki. It is hard to say if he was a son of one of numerous tenants of Potocki’s property land located in Uman, or of a property owner, doubtlessly he came from the nobility of a Roman-Catholic family.⁴⁰ Let us treat Darowski’s poem as part of historiography. His readers perceived it as his schoolwork about a historical theme and associated it with an educational process developed by the Basilians. Being an eye-witness of the events, Darowski gave many details unknown before, thus his narration became an important element of Uman discourse.⁴¹ We shall also find there many references to the idea of political-confessional Polish unity and traces of Korczyński’s interpretation. The author described Ukraine as a land “risen from ashes.” He compared the community of Uman to the Israelites led by Moses to “the promised land.” Unfortunately, hard work aimed at economic and spiritual development (the construction of the Orthodox church and monasteries) did not bring any results due to Melkhizedek, who incited people “to rebel” and who showed the need to “slaughter Jews, Poles” as “the duty of faith” deriving from “the Empress’s blessing.”⁴² The massacre of “noblemen” bore a dimension of revenge on the Uniate

39 A. Giller, *O życiu i pracach F.H. Duchinińskiego, kijowianina, w jubileuszową rocznicę pięćdziesięcioletnich jego zasług naukowych*, Lwów 1885, p. 37.

40 P. Borek, *Zapomniany poemat o rzezi humańskiej 1768 roku*, in: P. Borek, *Od Piławiec do Humania*, Kraków 2005, p. 175.

41 *Krótkie opisanie wierszem polskim nieszczęśliwej klęski w całej Ukrainie a najszczególniej tyrańskiej rzezi w mieście Umaniu przez Maksyma Żeleźniaka Zaporozca, najpierwszego herszta, za poduszczeniem Melkhizedeka Jaworskiego, ihumena motrenins<kiego>, najprzód zbuntowanego, a potym przyłączeniem się Gonty, sotnika umańskiego, zmocnionego na polskim i żydowskim narodzie roku 1768 dopełnionej i spraktykowanej, przez studenta szkół umańskich dla wiecznopomnej całemu światu pamięci zebrane i złożone wiersze*, in: *Польська поема про уманську різню...*, pp. 1–40.

42 *Польська поема про уманську різню...*, p. 7.

clergy for their missionary work.⁴³ On the one hand, Darowski displayed the bravery of noblemen, mentioned by their surnames, on the other hand, he showed simple habits of vindictive Koliyivshchyna rebels, i.e. Ruthenian peasants. As Piotr Borek emphasised, a multisensual display of Uman tragedy in Darowski's work was to create a hyperbolic image of the disaster. The lack of justification for suffering (in the poem, the only fault of Poles turns out to be their Catholic faith) made it impossible to look for rational premises that might objectively interpret the pogrom's reasons. Yet, Borek noticed that at the time when the poem was written, it could have been read as a "manifesto" of noblemen-Catholic innocence, an accusation addressed towards peasant "subjects," but also an attempt to sanction the repressions that followed the events in Uman.⁴⁴

Also in that case, the narration was created from the perspective of the unity metaphor. However, Darowski's "ecumenical" Basilian narration turned into a secular nobleman vision, regarding Koliyivshchyna peasants as victims of Russian-Orthodox propaganda. Also here, we get an optimistic forecast for the future. Although the author did not write about deserved punishment for "peasants" for "innocently shed blood," he did not curse them but encouraged to pray for "the murderers and the murdered."⁴⁵ Since the "bloodshed" was triggered by an outer initiative, once it was suppressed, the Polish-Ruthenian community could come back to a previous "unity" and ...all the services rendered by peasants for the benefit of the nobility.

As we can see, the Basilians created particular sites of memory of the "bloodshed" but they also contributed to the creation of the cultural memory of their students. It is noticeable in the literary works of Józef Bohdan Zaleski, Seweryn Goszczyński, Michał Grabowski, the Groza brothers, in particular in a preface to a Romantic poem based on Darowski's report, written by Goszczyński, *Zamek kaniowski* (1828). The poem, a typical example of Polish black Romanticism, referred to the Koliyivshchyna events.⁴⁶ At the same time, Romanticism borderland writers created an image of a "dangerous and beautiful" Ukraine, and a deceptive image of the very Cossack-haidamak, who deserves

43 *Польська поема про уманську різню...*, p. 13.

44 P. Borek, *Zapomniany portret o rzezi...*, p. 187.

45 *Польська поема про уманську різню...*, p. 25.

46 S. Goszczyński, *Kilka słów o Ukrainie i rzezi humańskiej*, in: S. Goszczyński, *Zamek kaniowski. Powieść*, Gliwice 2004, pp. 59–62.

respect due to his love of freedom, and who is dangerous at the same time due to his tendency to follow external “instigations.” This image was far from the reality. It derived from an illusion of the Polish nobility that, convinced that their independence is guaranteed by the Russian “empire” (with their own government, law, education), created an image of a Polish-Catholic Ukraine (of two rites), the “land of milk and honey” and intriguing Ukrainians, who should be... colonised, civilised but also protected from a “Turanian Moscow” (as Adam Mickiewicz wrote, accompanied by another graduate of the Uman school—Franciszek H. Duchński).⁴⁷ This image had to collide with another one, created by Ukrainian Romanticism writers. Comparing the haidamaks of Taras Shevchenko to the works of Goszczyński or Zalewski, we can discern many similar accents (an “intriguing” and “freedom loving” haidamak).⁴⁸ However, the Ukrainian poet juxtaposed the nobility vision of the events of 1768 with his own one, peasant, Ukrainian, and above all, Orthodox. He was also trying to prove that the “bloodshed” was an answer... of the Orthodox Church Ukrainians to national, economic and confessional oppression from the side of Catholic Poles. This vision would constitute a historical memory of Orthodox and Uniate (Greek Catholic) Ukrainians (see: works of Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Volodymyr Antonovych, Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Ivan Franko),⁴⁹ as well as of Poles who wanted to debunk it (as we shall see further on in the narration).

Taking into account this context, we shall analyse the works of Eustachy Antoni Iwanowski (1813–1903), a friend of Grabowski and Aleksander Groza. He was a memoirist, columnist and historian. In the years 1825–1830, he attended the Krzemieniec Lyceum, a renowned Polish secondary school. After the outbreak of the November Uprising, he was forced

47 See: N. Morawiec, “Pany! ne bijte sia, to wse Moskali roblat — tatarszczyna!” *Agatona Gillera i Franciszka Henryka Duchńskiego konstruowanie “turańskości Moskali”*, in: *Wspólne dziedzictwo. Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów w polskiej, litewskiej i ukraińskiej historiografii XIX–XXI wieku*, ed. M. Hoszowska, et. al., Rzeszów 2019, pp. 175–197.

48 Л. Ромащенко, *Тарас Шевченко і Богдан Залеський*, in: *Київські полоністичні студії*, vol. 24, ed. Р. Радишевський, Київ 2014, pp. 126–132; Л. Ромащенко, *Коліївщина в художній інтерпретації Т. Шевченка і С. Гоцинського*, in: *Київські полоністичні студії*, pp. 133–141.

49 Y. Bilinsky, *Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century*, “Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.” 7 (1959) no. 1–2, p. 1545.

to abandon his education to turn towards farming, being a columnist and a collector. Under his pseudonym “Heleniusz” he wrote a number of papers and stories about the history of the south-eastern territories of the Commonwealth. On the one hand, he benefited from rich written sources, which usually came from private archives, on the other hand, he conducted his analysis in the context of Polish-Catholic ideology, leading to a clear bias which was noticed by Volodymyr Erszow. During the analysis of Iwanowski’s memoirist literature, he stated that the author’s story expressed a “tragedy of a patriarchal-aristocratic right bank,” i.e., in other words, nostalgia of a Polish aristocrat for the greatness of a lost Homeland.⁵⁰ According to Anna Grucel, Iwanowski’s works were supposed to present the history of Poland that the author considered true, but above all to develop love towards one’s homeland, God, crystallise strong faith and attachment to the Church. At the same time, the researcher points out that these works lack originality, and they “present the topic as a compilation, in a superficial way, and, what is more, they contain factual mistakes and completely thoughtless contradictions.”⁵¹

Iwanowski believed that the Basilians were the building force of Polish-Catholic culture. They spread education, developed science, cared about spiritual development, but also constituted a guarantee of state-confessional “unity” within Polish borders. However, Orthodox Russia’s aggression changed everything. “If it had not been for this abrupt, murderous attack,” he argued, “the sacred union and Basilians would have achieved the highest power, the most splendid development of faith and education via schools and missions.”⁵² Thus, the reader shall not be surprised that he looked for the reasons of Koliyivshchyna, similarly to Sroczyński, in “Russia’s instigation,” Melkhizedek’s actions, and also in the situation that took place during the Bar Confederation, when magnates did not send the Cossack army to help the confederates. However, Iwanowski adamantly opposed the poet (Shevchenko), or researcher (Antonovych), who combined the Haidamak movement and Koliyivshchyna

50 В. Єршов, *Герменевтична актуалізація конволютного принципу мемуаризації “Спогади минулих літ” Євстахія Івановського*, “Українська полоністика” (2006) no. 2: Філологічні дослідження, pp. 226–227.

51 A. Grucel, *Zbiory Eustachego Iwanowskiego – pamiętnikarza i publicysty historycznego w Bibliotece Jagiellońskiej*, “Nowa Biblioteka” (2011) no. 1 (8), pp. 38–39.

52 E. Iwanowski (Helleniusz), *Ostatnie czasy unii*, in: idem, *Wspomnienia narodowe*, Paryż 1861, p. 155.

with the Cossack movement, or discerned in them the beginnings of the Ukrainian state. The activities of the “bloodshed” participants were not politically motivated, but were carried out by a mindless mob instigated by a foreign power. They did not have a social-economic context either, and could not be linked with the conflict between the peasantry and land owners. He claimed that peasants had to pay a little, but had the freedom to settle and use land and pasture, were free from military service and were simply “best-equipped from all people.”⁵³ Interestingly, using Sroczyński’s narration, the researcher compared the “massacre” of Uman to Christ’s death in Jerusalem, when “Ukraine was attacked by devils” and the Koliyivshchyna participants were to resemble the “devils-fiends.” Also in this case, the fault of the pogrom perpetrators was reduced as their actions did not depend on them.⁵⁴ Helleniusz added his own remarks as well. He tried to prove that once the situation was appeased and Gonta was punished, the Ukrainian community was more aware of the inflicted damage and expressed attrition. Former Koliyivshchyna rebels frequented the Uniate Orthodox churches and their devotion to Russia and the Orthodox Church turned into the need to cultivate Catholic unity.⁵⁵

But the “massacre” of Uman also posed a question concerning the status of history and the role of the historian. If it was God who sent madness upon the Koliyivshchyna rebels, together with the urge to murder, followed by remorse and attrition, His decrees are unreadable, and a historian without divine revelation will not understand the aforesaid events, and will not comprehend God’s plan for the “bloodshed.” Thus, in Iwanowski’s opinion, to understand history and explain it, one must achieve divine revelation. Yet, its achievement shall not be attributed to “people’s theories, many years of writing experience, reading many works,” or “sharp, mature, strong, critical” judgement. Quoting St. Augustine, he proved that revelation had to be “attained from God through service”, humbleness and love, “working on one’s soul’s development,”

53 E. Iwanowski (Helleniusz), *O zgromadzeniu XX. Bazylianów w Humaniu tudzież kilka słów o stanie Ukrainy w ostatnich czasach*, in: E. Iwanowski, *Wspomnienia narodowe*, Paryż 1861, p. 203.

54 E. Iwanowski (Helleniusz), *O zgromadzeniu XX. Bazylianów w Humaniu...*, pp. 204–205.

55 E. Iwanowski (Helleniusz), *O zgromadzeniu XX. Bazylianów w Humaniu...*, pp. 210–211.

and “comprehension” is not the result of talent and work but it is given by God as “it is a prize for faith.”⁵⁶

Unity and “unification”

However, this romantic vision of Ukraine in the works of Polish intellectuals soon changed. The Russian reaction after the November Uprising led to the loss of this Polish “independence,” and to the liquidation of Basilian schools and monasteries, and finally to the “unification” of Uniates with the Orthodox Church in Połock (1839). For many Catholics this act was a huge shock. Not only did it change the confession of millions of the faithful but it contained a historical message that Ruthenians were Russians, who in the aftermath of the Roman-Catholic betrayal in 1596, were forced to join the union, but after the collapse of Poland, they could shed this Polish-Catholic supremacy, and thanks to the Russian tsar, they could return to the bosom of the Russian Orthodox Church. An attentive reader can notice that this message, created by the initiator of “unification”, a Uniate priest, Józef Siemaszko, constituted the reversal of the Catholic metaphor of unity. “Unification” became a “hot” topic among the Polish “Great Emigration.” The Poles established an order of Resurrectionists at the Holy See. It was supposed to explain the intricacies of anti-Catholic Russian policy to the pope. They created a figure of Mother Makryna Mieczysławska, a Basilian, who was supposed to be persecuted by Siemaszko for her loyalty to “the union, Ruthenia and Poland.” Her martyrdom described by monks was a theme exploited by poets, columnists and historians, and she became an icon of “unity.”⁵⁷ Julian Bartoszewicz (1821–1870), a columnist and historian, polymath and Slavist, as well as a creator of an interesting interpretation of the events in Uman, in 1768, was impressed by her work. In the years 1838–1842, he was the holder of a scholarship awarded by the Polish state at the Faculty of History and Philology of the University of St. Petersburg, there he worked as a teacher, and he was a candidate for the post of the Head of the Polish History Faculty at the Jagiellonian University (the post was given to Józef

56 E. Iwanowski (Helleniusz), *O zgromadzeniu XX. Bazylianów w Humaniu...*, pp. 211–212.

57 N. Morawiec, *Rzeczypospolita, katolicyzm, kresy. Makryna Mieczysławska w historiografii polskiej XIX wieku*, “Częstochowskie Teki Historyczne” 2 (2011), pp. 121–142.

Szujski).⁵⁸ He authored many research papers,⁵⁹ and as far as history was concerned, he shared the views of Joachim Lelewel, he was a representative of antiquarian writing.⁶⁰ Let us draw our attention to his treatise “The Outline of Ruthenian Church History in Poland.”⁶¹ He tried to prove that the Potockis’ colonization work in Ukraine was taken over by other land owners. This “land of milk and honey” encouraged various nationalities and confessional communities to settle down. Rev. Kostetskyj also marked his presence, “an apostle in the whole meaning of the word,” in the Uman area “he made simple people Christians, eradicated hatred towards Jews in them, pointed to the brotherhood of Ruthenian and Roman-Catholic rites.”⁶² And although in the 17th century Uman was still “the centre of Cossack life”, it was Polish and “marked in history as one of two centres of Polish civilization.” Yet, although Ukraine “revived and flourished with success,” there were forces reluctant to accept Polish and Catholic unity: “there came the Satan of Moscow contempt to sully all that was sacred,” Catherine II “tolerant in the apostolic spirit, tsarina,” and Melkhizedek, a “cunning ruler,” who was to stimulate the “base desires of human hearts” in order to “take away and play” and ... “to awaken socialism.” Bartoszewicz believed that it was Catherine II who ruined “unity.” Changing the terminology from “Ruthenian Orthodox Church followers” to “Russian ones”, she became the defender and the ruler of all of the Orthodox Church faithful in Poland.⁶³ Russia was supposed to “convert with love, i.e. in a Moscow style, union to schism,” but also to oppress Uniate priests as “they were the only ones who understood what was happening.” In the municipal archives of Zhytomyr, the researcher found the protest document of Jan Roska Kościuszko, a Uniate parish priest, which was signed by several hundred Uniate priests, against the “Moscow evangelization.” The priests

58 I. Florczak, *Z listów Zygmunta Glogera do Juliana Bartoszewicza*, “Przegląd Nauk Historycznych” 15 (2016) no. 1, p. 280.

59 J. Maternicki, *Julian Bartoszewicz (1821–1870)*, in: *Historycy warszawscy ostatnich dwóch stuleci*, eds. A. Gieysztor, J. Maternicki, H. Samsonowicz, Warszawa 1986, pp. 77–91.

60 I. Florczak, *Źródła do dziejów Podlasia w Archiwum rodziny Bartoszewiczów*, “Studia z Historii Społeczno-Gospodarczej” 15 (2015), pp. 161–176.

61 J. Bartoszewicz, *Szkic dziejów Kościoła ruskiego w Polsce*, Kraków 1880.

62 J. Bartoszewicz, *Szkic dziejów...*, p. 260.

63 J. Bartoszewicz, *Szkic dziejów...*, p. 263.

complained that “people’s conscience is violated, the empress ascribed Ukrainian people to schism.” The text was to show that “the union was a national order of the Commonwealth.” To demonstrate how long-lasting this national-confessional unity was in the Ruthenian community, Bartoszewicz referred to the figure of this Uniate, Kościuszko, and compared him with Tadeusz Kościuszko (1746–1817), the leader of the anti-Russian uprising of 1794. The first one, he emphasized, called for “the insulted rights of the nation,” defended Catholic unity, the latter fought as “the last one in its defence at the times of the Commonwealth, like a Ruthenian with his blood, but a cordial Pole, he was the last one who fought in defence of the whole Crown, Lithuania and Ruthenia.”⁶⁴

For Bartoszewicz, the pogrom was Orthodox Russia’s fault, both Ruthenians-Uniates and Roman Catholic Poles suffered in the name of their faith and fought for their homeland (Kościuszko’s example). There is no doubt that the researcher, while recalling the “unity” and common fight preceding the collapse of the Commonwealth (1768), referred to the fall of the November and January Uprisings and the Uniate Church (the act of Połock in 1839 was accompanied by the “unification” of the Chełmno Uniates in 1875), but he also suggested the necessity of continuing that fight. However, not all contemporary researchers saw such a necessity. After the fall of the January Uprising, the “Stancyks” of Cracow called for the need to abandon all thoughts about any other armed rebellion, and for loyalty towards the partitioner. In this spirit they conducted political activities, established journals, organized lectures, but also, in order to adjust politics to history and remembrance, they created the so-called Cracovian school (Józef Szujski, Rev. Walerian Kalinka, Michał Bobrzyński), explaining that the partitions of Poland result not from its neighbours’ fault but rather from the mistakes of the Polish nation itself, its anarchy, self-interest and the lack of respect for state authorities among the nobility. As far as this “new” philosophy of history was concerned, they tried to convince other Polish researchers to accept it.⁶⁵

One of them was rev. Edward Likowski (1836–1915), a Roman Catholic priest, an auxiliary bishop in Poznań (1887–1914), archbishop, Gniezno

64 J. Bartoszewicz, *Szkic dziejów...*, p. 265.

65 M. Hoszowska, “Polityka historyczna” stancyków, in: *Historia, mentalność, tożsamość. Miejsce i rola historii oraz historyków w życiu narodu polskiego i ukraińskiego w XIX i XX wieku*, eds. J. Pisulińska, P. Sierżęga, L. Zaskilniak, Rzeszów 2008, pp. 203–217.

and Poznań metropolitan bishop, the primate of Poland (1914–1915),⁶⁶ and also a well-known Polish historian of the Union of Brest. As Mirosław Filipowicz remarked, Likowski was a self-made historian, his works were based on professional archive studies, even though, looking at them from a methodological point of view, without any innovation.⁶⁷ On the other hand, Witold Kołbuk noticed that Likowski learned his trade while developing and printing his subsequent research treatises.⁶⁸ The subject matter analysed by us can be found in Likowski's work entitled *The History of the Ruthenian and Roman Church union*. He followed Bartoszewicz in his interpretation. The “slaughter” was to be initiated by Orthodox Russia, and Zheleznyak and Gonta, hoping for “spoils and trophies” pushed Ukrainian people to “plunder and murder.”⁶⁹ Yet, in other works by Likowski we discern significant interpretation changes. He introduced them under the influence of the Cracovian school of history. On the advice of rev. Kalinka, Resurrectionist, Likowski adopted a pessimist vision of Polish history and adjusted it to the confessional theme. He presented peaceful colonization, Ukrainian prosperity and Russian “intrigues” aiming at destroying that work. Also here we find a bloody description of Koliyivshchyna (“a mother hanged with her four children,” “women with cats sewn in their intestines”) and the “massacre” of Uman.⁷⁰ But the narration was above all to present Koliyivshchyna in the light of Polish fault and national sins. It is worth contrasting them in a study. Likowski blamed the Polish government for the outbreak of Koliyivshchyna. Regardless of the fact that all Ruthenian dioceses joined the union, it tolerated the existence of the only Orthodox Church diocese of Mohilev. It facilitated Konisskyj's policy aiming at the intensification of anti-Polish and anti-Catholic actions. The faithful were also under the influence of Gervasij (Lyntsevskyj), bishop of Pereiaslav, who would send his own

66 See: R. Kufel, *Edward Likowski 1836–1915. Sufragan poznański, metropolita gnieźnieński i poznański, prymas Polski*, Zielona Góra 2011.

67 M. Filipowicz, *Edward Likowski jako historyk Kościoła unickiego (komunikat)*, “Roczniki Humanistyczne” 41 (1993) issue 7, p. 61.

68 W. Kołbuk, *Unia brzeska w dziewiętnastowiecznej historiografii polskiej*, “Roczniki Humanistyczne” 41 (1993) issue 7, pp. 17–20.

69 E. Likowski, *Historia unii Kościoła ruskiego z Kościołem rzymskim*, Poznań 1875, pp. 141–142.

70 E. Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku uważane głównie ze względu na przyczyny jego upadku*, part 1, Poznań 1880.

priests to run the “schism” propaganda (Melkhizedek began his activity out of his initiative).⁷¹ The king was to blame. He could not oppose Catherine II, Konisskyj and Melkhizedek, and his policy resulted in the Bar Confederation, significantly contributing to Koliyivshchyna. Magnates were guilty too. Due to their disputes with the Bar confederates, they did not send any Cossacks. As a result, the latter were free to support the peasants led by Zheleznyak, which were not very valuable from a military point of view. Moreover, the Uniates were to blame as well. An official of archbishop, Rev. Grzegorz Mokrzycki, “instead of praising the clergy for their loyalty to the Church so far, award them and encourage to persevere,” as a result of faulty denunciation, ordered to flog them, and shave the beards and heads of Uniate priests. What was even worse, he sent his secular representatives accompanied by Cossacks to these priests, in order to collect the due rent. A ruthless execution led to a general dissatisfaction of the priests and their further support for the Orthodox Church and Koliyivshchyna.⁷² Moreover, Likowski noticed the harmful consequences of Wołodkowicz’s activities. He was a Uniate metropolitan bishop. For supporting the Orthodox Church, he took certain starostwo commissioners (of Chyhyryn, Smila, Korsun) to court. In return, they took their revenge and supported Melkhizedek.⁷³ The nobility was “sinful.” It did not support the Uniate clergy (materially or militarily), did not ensure that certain decrees were passed in parliament (Sejm) and regional assemblies (sejmiks), did not organize any army, so even those Orthodox Church followers that did not want to rebel had to join Koliyivshchyna in fear of losing their lives and property. The nobility was also responsible for the Bar Confederation and its national-confessional radicalism, scaring “schismatics” and forcing them to support the Koliyivshchyna rebels. Finally, the Ruthenian peasants themselves were guilty too. Despite the Basilian efforts to introduce education and culture, they gave in to the “schism propaganda” of Melkhizedek, and later on to the wild desire of murder and plunder.

Therefore, Likowski believed that the Roman Catholic Poles and Uniate Ruthenians were responsible for the weakness of the union, the Haidamak movement and Koliyivshchyna. What is more, leaving the issue of the opponents of the Union (Dysuniates) unresolved contributed to the

71 E. Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła unickiego...*, pp. 109–110.

72 E. Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła unickiego*, p. 114.

73 E. Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła unickiego*, p. 115.

fall of Poland and the subsequent so-called unification of the Uniates and the Orthodox Church (1839, 1875). The Poles neglected their mission in Ruthenia-Ukraine, yet to get back their homeland and the political and confessional unity with Ruthenia, they had to confess their own sins and — following the sacrament of Penance — “promise to improve.”⁷⁴

Unity and nation

The end of the 19th century was accompanied with further changes in mnemonic constructions of the Poles, and what follows, an interpretation of their history. Dreaming about regaining their lost homeland, they kept asking about “Polish sins” and the necessity of “fighting for our and your freedom.” At the same time, Poles adopted a different perspective while looking at Ukraine and Ukrainians as well as at the confessional unity of two Catholic rites.⁷⁵ It was not only about the fact of promoting the necessity of Ukrainian independence by Ukrainian activists, e.g. like in the first years of the 20th century, in the federation context (Russia) or the national one (Galicia),⁷⁶ but it was also about their reconstruction of history, often being hostile towards Poles.⁷⁷ What is more, they perceived the Cossack-Haidamak “pogroms” not only as a confrontation of two nations (Poland and Ukraine), but two conflict-ridden social classes (the nobility and the peasantry).⁷⁸ Also, Austrian policy deepened the divide between Roman Catholic Poles and Greek Catholic Ukrainians, the whole concept

74 N. Morawiec, *Ks. Edward Likowski jako historyk Unii Brzeskiej*, in: *Wokół archeologii słów i ich funkcjonowania. Księga Jubileuszowa ofiarowana Profesorowi Andrzejowi Bańkowskiemu*, eds. S. Podobiński, M. Lesz-Duk, Częstochowa 2001, pp. 767–785.

75 See: П. Антонюк-Кисіль, *Теорія “культуртрегерства” в польській романтичній історіографії XIX ст.*, in: *Наукові записки*, вип. 13, Кіровоград 2010, pp. 208–215 (Серія: Історичні науки).

76 S. Plochy, *Between Poland and Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky's Dilemma, 1905–1907*, “Journal of Ukrainian Studies” 33–34 (2008–2009): *Tentorium Honorum: Essays Presented to Frank E. Sysyn on His Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. O. A. Andriewsky, Z. E. Kohut, S. Plochy, L. Wolff, p. 398.

77 Ł. Adamski, *Nacjonalista postępowy. Mychajło Hruszewski i jego poglądy na Polskę i Polaków*, Warszawa 2011.

78 J. Herlth, *Of Slaveholders and Renegades: Semantic Uncertainties in Volodymyr Antonovych's Conversion to Ukrainianness*, “Sprawy Narodowościowe. Seria nowa/Nationalities affairs. New series” 49 (2017), p. 9. <https://ispan.waw.pl/journals/index.php/sn/article/view/sn.1305/3146>.

of national-confessional unity was deconstructed (it did not exist anymore within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but within the Catholic Austrian state).⁷⁹ What is more, the religious leader Andrey Sheptytsky propagated the mission of Greek Catholics among the Orthodox Church faithful (excluding Polish Roman-Catholic bishops).⁸⁰ These changes affected historians in many ways. Let us consider the figure of Jan Marek Giżycki (pseudonym “Wołyniak,” “Marek Gozdawa”) (1844–1925). He came from a family of land owners.⁸¹ He studied law in Odessa, was a professor at the University of Dorpat and Mitawa, junior high-school teacher, state counsellor state, and Bogdanówka property owner. His research interests were the history of the Polish education system, especially monastic one, and the history of monasteries.⁸² After 1895 he lived in Cracow, but from 1918 he used to leave for Volhynia quite often, in order to look through private, school and monastic archives, which are usually inaccessible nowadays. He left quite an impressive scientific heritage which is studied by contemporary historiography, especially Ukrainian.⁸³

Reading Giżycki’s works, we can discern his longing for the Poland of the past, but also awareness of its loss. He admired its territorial greatness, thriving activity of state-church institutions, he listed the cultural advantages of the development, civilization developments in the East, only in order to... present its demise. As Dobrosława Świerczyńska remarked, the researcher’s studies devoted to education were usually crowned with bitter remarks, such as “the fall of 1831,” “the plunder of 1864” led to “the

79 J.-P. Himka, *The Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Nation in Galicia*, in: *Religious Compromise, Political Salvation. The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-building in Eastern Europe*, ed. J. Niessen, Pittsburgh 1993, p. 10.

80 У. Безпалько, *Деякі аспекти унійної діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького на початку ХХ ст.*, “Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: Історія” (2013) no. 1, p. 105.

81 J. Warmiński, *Giżycki Jan Marek*, in: *Encyklopedia katolicka*, ed. L. Bieńkowski, vol. 5, Lublin 1989, pp. 1096–1097.

82 See: D. Świerczyńska, *Jan Marek Giżycki jako historyk szkolnictwa zakonnego*, in: *Київські полоністичні студії*, ed. Р. Радишевський, vol. 26, Київ 2015, pp. 325–331.

83 І. Ярмошик, *Історія міста Старокостянтинова в дослідженнях Яна Марєка Гіжицького (1844–1925)*, in: *Болохівщина: осягнення історії. Матеріали Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції*, ed. О. Журко, Хмельницький 2009, part 1, pp. 96–101.

dissipation of students,” material loss and the institution’s collapse.⁸⁴ This strategy is noticeable in other works.⁸⁵ In his work entitled “On Basilians in Uman” he emphasized that while writing about monks and their school, it is “impossible to silently ignore and walk past these graves and people and events.” Meanwhile, he began his reflections with a quote from *The Life of Agricola* by Tacitus: “Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant” (they make a desert [out of a country] and they call it peace), diplomatically pointing at Orthodox Russia being guilty of this “miserable past.”⁸⁶ Nevertheless, following in Likowski’s footsteps, he wanted to explain it also in the light of “our faults.” Thus, he proved that Uman, though in the 18th century it was an area of haidamak attacks, plunder, pogroms of Jews, did not only survive but also considerably developed. Certainly, apart from political and economic issues, it also had to face social-confessional ones. The Synod of Zamość (1720) contributed to the implementation of the union all over Poland. However, there were disputes between higher Uniate hierarchy (a dispute of Leon Szeptycki and bishop Wołodkowicz concerning the affiliation of the Braclaw land).⁸⁷ The division of power, disputes in the circles of the Uniate clergy, wrote Giżycki, had a detrimental impact, “schism” merely strengthened the propaganda and attracted Uniates under its command. Gervasij and Melkhizedek acted with this aim in mind. The wellbeing of the contemporary Uniate Church (two thousand Uniate parishes), “made its enemies angry and stimulated them to act violently.” Then came the year 1768, “the time of the Uman massacre that made Ukraine sodden with blood, the time of cruel tortures inflicted on defenceless Catholics of both rites.” At the same time, this year forecast the fall of Poland and the fall of “unity.”⁸⁸

Not all researchers limited their scope to describing the greatness of Poland and bewailing its fall. They would rather attempt to explain the process leading to it, to give a substantial prognosis for the future. It is visible in the works of Franciszek Ravita-Gavrinsky (1846–1930), a Polish amateur-historian, novel writer, and columnist. Contrary to Likowski,

84 D. Świerczyńska, *Jan Marek Giżycki...*, p. 331.

85 I. Ярмошик, *Волинезнавчі дослідження Яна Марека Гіжицького (1844–1915 рр)*, “Часопис Української Історії” (2010) no. 18, p. 94.

86 J. M. Giżycki, *O bazylianach w Humaniu*, “Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki” 27 (1899), p. 456.

87 J. M. Giżycki, *O bazylianach w Humaniu*, p. 462.

88 J. M. Giżycki, *O bazylianach w Humaniu*, p. 463 and on.

he was against searching for “our faults.” He was convinced that Poles unfairly accused themselves of the fall of their country as it was rather caused by unfavourable coincidences and their neighbours’ possessiveness. But he also opposed Polish romantic messianism and did not believe “poets-historians.”⁸⁹ Thus, he concentrated on collecting and critically processing information on facts. However, as Eugeniusz Koko noticed, Ravita did not always comply with these rules. He often demonstrated little criticism towards his sources, and following nationalistic views, did not hide his dislike for other nations, especially Ukraine.⁹⁰ Analysing Ravita’s look at Ukraine and Ukrainians, it is worth mentioning the evolution of his views. His first reflections pointed to emphasizing a common Polish-Ruthenian heritage, cooperation for shaking off the yoke of Russia, and national-confessional unity. Of course, his outlook on Ukraine was not much different from this of the borderland nobility. On the one hand, as Mirosław Szumiło convinced his readers, he perceived it as his “private and ideological homeland,” was proud of his provenance from the Ruthenian nobility in accordance with the formula, “Gente Ruthenus natione Polonus.” On the other hand, he stressed the Polish character of the right-bank Ukraine (“For me it was Poland. The history of Ruthenia was the history of Poland”).⁹¹ Nevertheless, the activity of contemporary Ukrainian intellectuals concerning the historical explanation of Ukraine’s existence must have influenced Ravita’s perception of Ukrainian national-state aspirations.⁹² Thus, he negated the legitimacy of using the term “Ukrainians” (acknowledging that only Ruthenians exist and that they are not a nation but an ethnic group), the fact of the existence of the

89 A. Kudła, *Swawolni Kozacy i dzicy hajdamacy w twórczości Franciszka Rawity-Gawrońskiego*, in: *Galicyskie dylematy, zbiór rozpraw*, ed. K. Karolczak, H. W. Żaliński, Kraków 1994, pp. 93–105.

90 E. Koko, *Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930). Wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości. Studium anachronizmu*, Gdańsk 2006, pp. 151–152. See: L. Łazurko, *Bohaterowie i antybohaterowie: Eugeniusz Koko o Franciszku Rawicie-Gawrońskim*, “Sensus Historiae” 12 (2013) no 3, pp. 145–155.

91 M. Szumiło, *Rec. “Eugeniusz Koko, Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930) wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości,” Gdańsk 2006*, pp. 276, “Res Historica” 26 (2008), p. 176.

92 Especially due to rigorous scientific criticism from the side of Hrushevskyy: Vitalii Telvak and Viktoriia Telvak, *Ukrainian historiography in the mirror of Polish journalism (Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi Contra Francishek Ravita-Gavronsky)*, “Східноєвропейський історичний вісник” (2018) no. 7, p. 48.

Ukrainian national movement, and he wanted to prove his “negation” scientifically.⁹³ In his reflections, the Russian community was Turanian, similarly to the Cossack-Haidamak-Ukrainian one. Koliyivshchyna was the work of a barbarian “horde” devoid of state-citizen and economic-legal flair, without any sense of management, love of land and agriculture, loving the “steppe” and the “horse” instead, together with freedom and armed robbery comprehended in an archaic way.

Influenced by his own experiences, his attitude to Uniates-Greek Catholics and this “unity” analysed by me, evolved as well. He bought a farm in Tarnawa near Dobromyl. It was mostly inhabited by a Ukrainian community and it did not have any Roman-Catholic church. Ravita wanted to repay the kindness of a Greek-Catholic priest (for “the roof above his head” during the construction of his own house), presenting him with a painting of St. Nicolas for a newly built Orthodox church. However, the priest turned down the gift, saying that it was a “Polish Nicolas,” and the gift was of a “Lachian” character.⁹⁴ Thus, if Ruthenians-Ukrainians themselves forgot about former state-church unity, it had to be rejected and one should focus on Polishness and Catholicism, both when describing the past, constructing the present and making plans for the future. It can be seen in Ravita’s treatise on haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna. He blamed Russia and the Orthodox clergy for the “bloodshed,” and Melkhizedek, wanting to prove that the “union was the source of people’s discontent” tried to provide Repnin with “testimony in actions.”⁹⁵ But Ravita also wanted to question Antonovych’s conviction that the conflict was caused by the economic exploitation of Ukrainian peasants by Polish “lords.” Thus, he tried to prove that on the south-eastern territories of Poland, “villeinage was exceptionally small,” and the conflict was caused by the particular nature of Ruthenians-Ukrainians.⁹⁶ Also, in this case we find the praise of Basilian missionary work. Yet, Ravita regretted that it did not fall on fertile ground and was not welcome by primitive Ruthenians-Ukrainians devoid of Christian axiology (particularly noticeable in Haidamak songs). They were characterised by “eastern fatalism,” “constant discontent,” but also “robbery, riotous, aimless life, idleness and

93 M. Szumiło, *Rec. “Eugeniusz Koko...”*, pp. 176–177.

94 E. Koko, *“Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński...”*, pp. 55, 60, 78–81.

95 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich w XVIII wieku*, vol. 2, Lwów 1899, p. 172.

96 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich*, p. 148.

wildness accompanied with hatred fuelled by communism, the fanaticism of a simple man merely capable of seeing a difference in religious forms.”⁹⁷ Therefore, he saw no sense in continuing missionary work if Ukrainians could communicate only with Orthodox priests of the same moral stance. He even tried to prove that the clergy played the role of “agents of more known Cossack headmen, recruiting haidamaks for them.”⁹⁸ During the “massacre“ of Uman haidamaks were specially cruel towards the Basilians, and Rev. Kostetskyj was shot, “stabbed with pikes and thrown into the ditch.”⁹⁹ It is difficult though to discern any aim in these actions, it is also difficult, he added, to “describe wildness awakened by greed, fuelled by religious ignorance, and the debauchery of wilfulness, not hampered by any clear political objective.”¹⁰⁰ Ravita did not find any remorse and reflection in the perpetrators of the “massacre”, even in the face of the bloody but, as he emphasised, fair judgement conducted by the Poles. He wrote that “The echoes of the Haidamak movement died slowly, they were still heard in the middle of the 19th century, and were always devoid of national and moral ideals, they never brought its own nation any gains or benefits.”¹⁰¹

Conclusion

The object of my reflections was not to study the origins, course and consequences of Koliyivshchyna, to prove the actual or acknowledged guilt, or to give a specific number of murdered people. I aimed to show in which way a given idea (in this case the vision of the national-confessional Catholic unity of two rites developed at the times of the Union of Brest) influenced historians’ way of thinking, i.e. made their narrations metaphorical. The metaphor of unity (national and confessional) developed in this vision assumed that Ruthenians were Catholics (they were supposed to form one nation with Poles, they constituted, in the researchers’ opinion, part of Ruthenia’s Christian tradition, confessionally uniform with Rome, but with a different rite). This unity was not a result of a single political (the Union of Lublin) or religious (the Union of Brest) act, but derived from a general Slavic community, the Polish-Ruthenian

97 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich*, pp. 287–288.

98 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich*, pp. 169–170.

99 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich*, p. 241.

100 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich*, pp. 242–243.

101 F. R. Gawroński, *Historia ruchów hajdamackich*, p. 282.

brotherhood, and Catholic tradition. Of course, Russia was excluded from the “community” and “brotherhood”, and the Russian Orthodox Church was excluded from “tradition.” This metaphor, constituting an important element of Uniate identity and Basilian intellectual output, created Uniate memorial sites (Josaphat Kuntsevych, and the Marian shrines). Thus, it does not come as a surprise that after the pogrom of Uman in 1768, we can find it in the narration of the Basilians, Korczyński and Sroczyński. The first of them tried to convince his readers that Koliyivshchyna was Orthodox Russia’s reaction to the peaceful colonisation of Ruthenia and organising a Catholic mission among the Orthodox Church faithful. The issue was that condemning the very perpetrators, i.e. Ruthenian peasants, might have equalled discrediting missionary activities conducted among them. Therefore, Sroczyński blamed “impure forces” for the pogrom, concentrated on praising Potocki’s activity, created the vision of rev. Kostetskyj’s death, written in a hagiographic way, and made Uman a martyrdom memorial site. Describing the “massacre” and creating its image (school, well, Orthodox church), the Basilians developed a cultural memory of their students. It is noticeable in the narration of Darowski as a nobleman. The metaphor of unity supported with a bloody image of the “massacre” served him to justify the punishment inflicted on the Koliyivshchyna rebels. What is more, since the massacre did not have any deeper, socio-political reasons and was caused by foreign influence (Orthodox Russia), Ruthenian peasants could come back to their prayers in Basilian missions and ... to cultivating the noblemen’s land. In a different context, we can see the metaphor of unity in Haidamak treatises by Heleniusz. As a borderland land owner, he treated the “massacre” as a part of God’s plan, compared Uman to Jerusalem, and pointed out that the awareness of the sinful pogrom was to bring Ruthenians to state-church unity. The secular researcher went in for a certain theology of history and historiography as he defined the limits of scientific historical cognition dependent on God’s revelation. In the period between the two uprisings, serious interpretative changes occurred, which were derived from different mnemonic constructions influencing the researchers. The Poles took steps to explain the methods of gaining independence, they were also worried about Russia’s policy towards the Uniates (1839). Thus, they had to proclaim the necessity of opposition, fight, and write about Russian “manipulation” in history. It is noticeable in Bartoszewicz’s narration, when he tried to prove the Russian-Orthodox origins of Koliyivshchyna, together with the need of continuing a common fight. On the other hand, Likowski, who shaped by pessimism of the “Cracow school,” did not see

such a necessity. He wrote that Koliyivshchyna was caused by the Polish and Ruthenian nation, Catholic and Orthodox, the king, magnates, the nobility, parish priests and the church hierarchy. Likowski-priest believed that the only way to regain one's homeland and Catholic unity was the awareness of one's sins, revealing them, and a strong resolution to get better. "Pessimism" can be also found in the works of Giżycki. It had a different dimension as it was generated by "new" mnemonic constructs of the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. This manner (development – fall) noticeable in the author's actions and reflections, which was supposed to create a longing for one's homeland, created the image of Poland and the Uman pogrom as an element of its fall. On the other hand, Ravita-agronomist had reflections of a different nature. The "massacre" was written in the image of "Turanian" Ruthenia-Ukraine and Ruthenians-Ukrainians devoid of Christian axiology. Let us notice that while Ravita-historian negated the existence of this national-confessional unity in history, Ravita-agronomist denied the right to own Ruthenian land to Ukrainians loving the "horse" and the "steppe" and gave it to Poles.

I think that such scientific reflections are very important. They make us aware of the fact that historical images of the Haidamak movement and Koliyivshchyna do not depend solely on a given historian's expertise and adopted methodological assumptions, but they are also (and maybe above all) the cultural outcome of mnemotechnics, and a perception of the past by the present. It may turn out that Polish, Ukrainian or Russian historical narrations are filled with culturally constructed metaphors. They should be (de)constructed, in the company of Ukrainian, Russian and Polish researchers if possible, but in the new, post-war and post-Putin reality.

References

- Adamski Ł., *Nacjonalista postępowy. Mychajło Hruszewski i jego poglądy na Polskę i Polaków*, Warszawa 2011.
- Assmann J., *Collective Memory and Cultural Identity*, “New German Critique” 65 (1995), pp. 125–133.
- Bartoszewicz J., *Szkic dziejów Kościoła ruskiego w Polsce*, Kraków 1880.
- Bilinsky Y., *Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century*, “Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.” 7 (1959) no. 1–2, pp. 1542–1566.
- Borek P., *Zapomniany poemat o rzezi humańskiej 1768 roku*, in: P. Borek, *Od Piławiec do Humania*, Kraków 2005, pp. 173–191.
- Butterwick R., *Deconfessionalization? The Policy of the Polish Revolution towards Ruthenia, 1788–1792*, “Central Europe” 6 (2008) no. 2, pp. 91–121.
- Czernecki J., *Mały król na Rusi i jego stolica Krystynopol*, Kraków 1939.
- Filipowicz M., *Edward Likowski jako historyk Kościoła unickiego (komunikat)*, “Roczniki Humanistyczne” 41 (1993) issue 7, pp. 59–63.
- Florczak I., *Źródła do dziejów Podlasia w Archiwum rodziny Bartoszewiczów*, “Studia z Historii Społeczno-Gospodarczej” 15 (2015), pp. 161–176.
- Florczak I., *Z listów Zygmunta Glogera do Juliana Bartoszewicza*, “Przegląd Nauk Historycznych” 15 (2016) no. 1, pp. 278–295.
- Gawroński F. R., *Historia ruchów hajdamackich w XVIII wieku*, vol. 2, Lwów 1899.
- Giller A., *O życiu i pracach F.H. Duchńskiego, kijowianina, w jubileuszową rocznicę pięćdziesięciolecia jego zasług naukowych*, Lwów 1885.
- Giżycki J. M., *O bazylianach w Humaniu*, “Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki” 27 (1899), pp. 456–464.
- Goszczyński S., *Kilka słów o Ukrainie i rzezi humańskiej*, in: S. Goszczyński, *Zamek kaniowski. Powieść*, Gliwice 2004, pp. 59–62.
- Grucl A., *Zbiory Eustachego Iwanowskiego — pamiętnikarza i publicysty historycznego w Bibliotece Jagiellońskiej*, “Nowa Biblioteka” (2011) no. 1 (8), pp. 35–49.
- Herlth J., *Of Slaveholders and Renegades: Semantic Uncertainties in Volodymyr Antonovych's Conversion to Ukrainianness*, “Sprawy Narodowościowe. Seria nowa/ Nationalities affairs. New series”

- 49 (2017), pp. 1–12, <https://ispan.waw.pl/journals/index.php/sn/article/view/sn.1305/3146>.
- Himka J.-P., *The Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Nation in Galicia*, in: *Religious Compromise, Political Salvation. The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-building in Eastern Europe*, ed. J. Niessen, Pittsburgh 1993, pp. 7–26.
- Hoszowska M., „Polityka historyczna” stańczyków, in: *Historia, mentalność, tożsamość. Miejsce i rola historii oraz historyków w życiu narodu polskiego i ukraińskiego w XIX i XX wieku*, eds. J. Pisulińska, P. Sierżęga, L. Zaskilniak, Rzeszów 2008, pp. 203–217.
- Iwanowski E. (Helleniusz), *O zgromadzeniu XX. Bazyliańców w Humaniu tudzież kilka słów o stanie Ukrainy w ostatnich czasach*, in: E. Iwanowski, *Wspomnienia narodowe*, Paryż 1861, pp. 199–261.
- Iwanowski E. (Helleniusz), *Ostatnie czasy unii*, in: E. Iwanowski, *Wspomnienia narodowe*, Paryż 1861, pp. 154–191.
- Koko E., *Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930). Wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości. Studium anachronizmu*, Gdańsk 2006.
- Kołbuk W., *Unia brzeska w dziewiętnastowiecznej historiografii polskiej*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne” 41 (1993) no. 7, pp. 13–21.
- Korzo M. A., *Reality Invented: How Uniate Josaphat Kuntsevych Supposedly Contributed to the Conversion of Nikon, Patriarch of Moscow*, „Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio FF: Philologiae” 38 (2020) issue 1, pp. 35–45.
- Kudła A., *Swawolni Kozacy i dzicy hajdamacy w twórczości Franciszka Rawity-Gawrońskiego*, in: *Galicyjskie dylematy, zbiór rozpraw*, ed. K. Karolczak, H. W. Żaliński, Kraków 1994, pp. 93–105.
- Kufel R., *Edward Likowski 1836–1915. Sufragan poznański, metropolita gnieźnieński i poznański, prymas Polski*, Zielona Góra 2011.
- Likowski E., *Historia unii Kościoła ruskiego z Kościołem rzymskim*, Poznań 1875.
- Likowski E., *Dzieje Kościoła unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku uważane głównie ze względu na przyczyny jego upadku*, part 1, Poznań 1880.
- Łazurko L., *Bohaterowie i antybohaterowie: Eugeniusz Koko o Franciszku Rawicie-Gawrońskim*, „Sensus Historiae” 12 (2013) no. 3, pp. 145–155.
- Łukań R., *Author dziejopisu monasteru krystynopolskiego o. Korneliusz Sroczyński ZŚBW (ur. 17/XI 1731 † 21/III 1790). Krótki życiorys*, Kraków 1939.
- Marcinkowska M., *Wydarzenia roku 1768 w Humaniu w świetle rękopisów Biblioteki Kórnickiej*, in: *Архітектурна та культурна спадщина*

- історичних міст країн Центрально-Східної Європи: кол. Монографія, eds. Р. Димчика, І. Кривошеї, Н. Моравця, Умань–Познань–Ченстохова 2016, pp. 204–214.
- Maternicki J., *Julian Bartoszewicz (1821–1870)*, in: *Historycy warszawscy ostatnich dwóch stuleci*, eds. A. Gieysztor, J. Maternicki, H. Samsonowicz, Warszawa 1986, pp. 77–91.
- Morawiec N., *Ks. Edward Likowski jako historyk Unii Brzeskiej*, in: *Wokół archeologii słów i ich funkcjonowania. Księga Jubileuszowa ofiarowana Profesorowi Andrzejowi Bańkowskiemu*, eds. S. Podobiński, M. Lesz-Duk, Częstochowa 2001, pp. 767–785.
- Morawiec N., *Rzeczypospolita, katolicyzm, kresy. Makryna Mieczysławska w historiografii polskiej XIX wieku*, “Częstochowskie Teki Historyczne” 2 (2011), pp. 121–142.
- Morawiec N., “*Pany! ne bijte sia, to vse Moskali roblat — tatarszczyna!*”. *Agatona Gillera i Franciszka Henryka Duchinińskiego konstruowanie “turańskości Moskali”*, in: *Wspólne dziedzictwo. Rzeczypospolita Obojga Narodów w polskiej, litewskiej i ukraińskiej historiografii XIX–XXI wieku*, ed. M. Hoszowska, et. al., Rzeszów 2019, pp. 175–197.
- Nowicka-Jeżowa A., *Udział bazylianów w kształtowaniu kultury chrześcijańskiej na wschodnich Kresach Rzeczypospolitej*, “Warszawskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze” 4–5 (1997), pp. 240–251.
- Opis krótki rzezi w mieście Humaniu od czerni ukraińskiej dnia 20 miesiąca czerwca 1768 roku zdziałanej*, in: *Bunt hajdamaków na Ukrainie r. 1768 opisany przez Lippomana i dwóch bezimiennych*, ed. E. Raczyński, Poznań 1854, pp. 121–146.
- Pidhupczak-Majerowicz M., *Bazylianie w Koronie i na Litwie: szkoły i książki w działalności zakonu*, Wrocław 1986.
- Plokhly S., *Between Poland and Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky's Dilemma, 1905–1907*, “Journal of Ukrainian Studies” 33–34 (2008–2009): *Tentorium Honorum: Essays Presented to Frank E. Sysyn on His Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. O. A. Andriewsky, Z. E. Kohut, S. Plokhly, L. Wolff, Toronto 2010, pp. 387–400.
- Radwan M., *Bazylianie w zaborze rosyjskim w latach 1795–1839*, “Nasza Przeszłość” 93 (2000), pp. 153–225.
- Skinner B., *Borderlands of Faith: Reconsidering the Origins of a Ukrainian Tragedy*, “Slavic Review” 64 (2005) no. 1, pp. 88–116.
- Sokyrska W., Srogosz T., *The haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna in the Polish and Ukrainian historiography. The Polish-Ukrainian duet*, “Review of Historical Sciences” 16 (2017) no. 3, pp. 7–40.

- [Sroczyński K.], *Rękopis X. Kornelego Sroczyńskiego, byłego superiora Krystynopolskiego*, "Przegląd Dziejów Polskich" 3 (1839) 3, pp. 36–46.
- Stern D., *The Making of a Marian Geography of Grace for Greek Catholics in the Polish Crownlands of the 17th–18th Centuries*, "Religions" 12 (2021) issue 6, pp. 1–29, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12060446>.
- Stetsyk Y. O., *Monasteries of western dioceses of Kyiv union metropoliya (90th years of XVII 90th years of XVIII centuries): jurisdictional conversions*, in: *Relevant research of historical sciences: collective monograph*, ed. V. M. Andreyev, et al., Lviv–Toruń 2019, pp. 164–182.
- Szumiło M., *Rec. "Eugeniusz Koko, Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930) wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości"*, Gdańsk 2006, pp. 276, "Res Historica" 26 (2008), pp. 175–177.
- Świerczyńska D., *Jan Marek Giżycki jako historyk szkolnictwa zakonnego*, in: *Київські полоністичні студії*, ed P. Радишевський, vol. 26, Київ 2015, pp. 325–331.
- Warmiński J., *Giżycki Jan Marek*, in: *Encyklopedia katolicka*, ed. L. Bieńkowski, vol. 5, Lublin 1989, pp. 1096–1097.
- Woźniak M., *Metafora jako narzędzie badań historycznych. Kilka uwag na marginesie pracy R. Stobieckiego "Bolszewizm a historia. Próba rekonstrukcji bolszewickiej filozofii dziejów"*, "Historyka" 30 (2000), pp. 89–112.
- Tamm M., *History as Cultural Memory: Mnemohistory and the Construction of the Estonian Nation*, "Journal of Baltic Studies" 39 (2008) issue 4, pp. 499–516.
- Telvak V. [Vitalii], Telvak V. [Viktoria], *Ukrainian historiography in the mirror of Polish journalism (Mykhailo Hrushevskyi Contra Francishek Ravita-Gavronsky)*, "Східноєвропейський історичний вісник" (2018) no. 7, pp. 46–53.

- Антонюк-Кисіль П., *Теорія "культуртрегерства" в польській романтичній історіографії XIX ст.*, in: *Наукові записки*, вип. 13, Кіровоград 2010, pp. 208–215 (Серія: Історичні науки).
- Безпалько У., *Деякі аспекти унійної діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького на початку XX ст.*, "Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: Історія" (2013) no. 1, pp. 104–109.

- Ваврик М., О. Корнило Срочинський, ЧСВВ, *Історіограф і Проповідник (1731–1790)*, “Записки ЧСВВ” 3 (1960) issue 3–4, pp. 429–439.
- Єршов В., *Герменевтична актуалізація конволютного принципу мемуаризації “Спогади минулих літ” Євстахія Івановського, “Українська полоністика”* (2006) no. 2: Філологічні дослідження, pp. 225–234.
- Кривошея І., *Василіанський орден на Правобережній Україні в др. пол. XVIII – пер. трет. XIX ст.* in: *Архітектурна та культурна спадщина історичних міст країн Центрально-Східної Європи: кол. Монографія*, eds. Р. Димчика, І. Кривошеї, Н. Моравця, Умань–Познань–Ченстохова 2016, pp. 115–132.
- Кузнець Т., *Уманське духовне училище: будинок та навчальний заклад*, in: *Архітектурна та культурна спадщина історичних міст країн Центрально-Східної Європи: кол. Монографія*, eds. Р. Димчика, І. Кривошеї, Н. Моравця, Умань–Познань–Ченстохова 2016, pp. 169–175.
- Льтопись монастыря оо. Василиянъ въ Крестинополи одъ его основаня в 1768 до 1889 року. Уложив Василь Чернецкій парох зі Стъльця белского, Львовъ 1893.*
- Назарко І., *Методичний підручник василіанських місій о К. Срочинського (у 200-ліття його появи: 1772–1972)*, “Записки ЧСВВ” 9 (1974), pp. 142–151.
- Польська поема про уманську різню, подав др. Іван Франко*, “Записки Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка” 62 (1904), pp. 1–40.
- Ромашенко Л., *Коліївщина в художній інтерпретації Т. Шевченка і С. Гоцинського*, in: *Київські полоністичні студії*, vol. 24, ed. Р. Радишевський, Київ 2014, pp. 133–141.
- Ромашенко Л., *Тарас Шевченко і Богдан Залеський*, in: *Київські полоністичні студії*, vol. 24, ed. Р. Радишевський, Київ 2014, pp. 126–132.
- Россия и Речь Посполитая накануне разделов*, 10.12.2021, <http://www.spbiiiran.nw.ru/kruglyi-stol-tairova-7-12-21/>
- Старостенко В. В., *Проблема Брестской церковной унии в белорусской общественно-философской мысли конца XVI в. — начала XVII в.*, in: *750 определений религии: история символизаций и интерпретаций*, ed by Е. И. Аринин, Владимир 2014, pp. 429–459.
- Стецик Ю., *Ченці-педагоги уманських василіанських шкіл (1769–1774 рр.): біографічний огляд*, “Емінак” (2016) no. 2 (1), pp. 22–27.

- Таїрова-Яковлева Т. Г., *Колиївщина: великі ілюзії*, Київ 2019.
- Таїрова-Яковлева Т. Г., *Участие запорожцев в восстании гайдамаков 1768 г. (Колиивщина)*, “*Quaestio Rossica*” 7 (2019) no. 3, pp. 969–980.
- Таїрова-Яковлева Т. Г., *Между Речью Посполитой и Россией: Правобережная Украина в эпоху гайдамаков*, Санкт-Петербург 2020.
- Таїрова-Яковлева Т. Г., *Колиивщина в исторической памяти*, “Диалог со временем” (2019) issue 66, pp. 37–53.
- Шевченко В., *Православно-католицька полеміка та проблеми унійності в житті Русь-України доберестейського періоду*, Київ 2001.
- Ярмошик І., *Історія міста Старокостянтинова в дослідженнях Яна Марека Гіжицького (1844–1925)*, in: *Болохівщина: осягнення історії. Матеріали Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції*, ed. О. Журко, Хмельницький 2009, part 1, pp. 96–101.
- Ярмошик І., *Волинезнавчі дослідження Яна Марека Гіжицького (1844–1915 рр)*, “*Часопис Української Історії*” (2010) no. 18, pp. 94–99.

Abstract

Norbert Morawiec

“Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant”. Koliyivshchyna: a Polish historiographic reflection and a metaphor of unity

The subject of the analysis is looking for historical metaphors which construct the Polish historiography of Koliyivshchyna. Analysing the events of 1768 in the works of Jerofeusz Korczyński, Kornel Sroczyński, (M.) Darowski, Eustachy Iwanowski, Joachim Bartoszewicz, Edward Likowski, Jan Marek Giżycki or Francishek Ravita-Gavronsky, one can notice a historical (historiographical) metaphor of state-national and confessional unity constructing their scientific narrations. Although these narrations ooze blood and murder, they do not regard the Ukrainian community as the only one guilty of the bloodshed.

Keywords:

Haidamaks, Koliyivshchyna, metaphor, historiography, Uman

Abstrakt

Norbert Morawiec

“Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant”. Koliszczyzna: polska refleksja historiograficzna i metafora jedności

Przedmiotem analiz jest poszukiwanie metafor historycznych konstruujących polską historiografię koliszczyzny. Analizując wydarzenia 1768 roku w twórczości Jerofeusza Korczyńskiego, Kornela Sroczyńskiego, (M.) Darowskiego, Eustachego Iwanowskiego, Joachima Bartoszewicza, Edwarda Likowskiego, Jana Marka Giżyckiego, czy Franciszka Rawity-Gawrońskiego, zwrócono uwagę na – konstruującą ich uczone narracje – metaforę państwowo-narodowej i konfesyjnej jedności. Choć narracje te epatują krwią i mordem, nie ukazują społeczności ukraińskiej jako jedynie winnej krwawych wydarzeń.

Słowa kluczowe:

hajdamacy, koliszczyzna, metafora, historiografia, Human