

Polish-Croatian relations in the context of the activities of the Krakow Slavic Society at the beginning of the twentieth century¹

Tomasz Jacek Lis 

Jagiellonian University, Kraków 

tomlis88@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The article explores the activities of Krakow Slavists at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, focusing on their stance toward the Croats, particularly their culture, history, and mutual relations. The aim of the article is to illustrate how Slavic enthusiasts from Galicia perceived the role of Poles in the broader Pan-Slavist movement. This is a crucial topic because South Slavic historiography often propagated the claim that Poles were opposed to the idea of Slavic cooperation. Figures such as Marian Zdziechowski, Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski, and Jan Magiera contradict this assertion. Opposing Pan-Slavism or Neo-Slavism did not imply that Poles rejected Slavic collaboration, but rather the role of Russia. In their opinion, Russia did not act in the Slavs' interest but against them, pursuing the Greater Russian goals of the Tsarist regime. Consequently, they proposed alternative solutions, emphasising the central role of Polish culture and advocating for collaboration among Slavic nations on equal terms. Thanks to their knowledge of Slavic languages and cultures, Krakow Slavists maintained numerous contacts with individuals from various Slavic countries, including Croatia. After World War I, some Poles and South Slavs continued this line of thought, believing that Poland should become the cultural centre of Slavic heritage. A section of the article is dedicated to demonstrating the stance of key representatives of the Krakow Slavophile community towards Croats, supported by a detailed analysis of texts concerning Croats published in the monthly journal *Świat Słowiański*. This publication served as the press organ for this community, featuring contributions from foreign authors. The journal aimed to promote the Polish concept of Slavic unity and familiarise the Galician public with the issues of Slavs within and outside the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

Keywords: Polish Slavophilism; Slavs; Austria-Hungary; *Świat Słowiański*; Klub Słowiański Kraków; Towarzystwo Słowiańskie Kraków; Marian Zdziechowski

¹ The article was written thanks to the author receiving a scholarship from the Lanckoroński Foundation in Brzezine.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0188-5755> [Tomasz Jacek Lis]

 <https://ror.org/03bqmcz70> [Jagiellonian University]

Introduction

In 1901, a group of Krakow scholars connected with the Jagiellonian University decided to establish the Slavic Club (*Klub Słowiański*), the aim of which was to bring the Polish nation closer to other Slavic nations. This way, they responded to the need for greater integration of Poles with other Slavs living in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The activities of the Club and its leaders were the expression of certain needs that existed in Galicia at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. This matter concerned building the position of Poland among the Slavic lands in Austria-Hungary. The activities of the Club were part of a number of activities aimed at the better integration of Poles with Western (Czechs, Slovaks) or Southern (Croats, Serbs, Bosniaks, Slovenians) Slavs. These included, among others, the Congress of Slavic Journalists (*Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich*),² the Neo-Slavist Congress in Prague (*Zjazd neosłowiański w Pradze*),³ and the numerous formal and less formal contacts between scholars, pedagogues,⁴ linguists,⁵ and other intellectuals.⁶ The activities of the Krakow Slavophile community stood out against this background because, apart from establishing the Club, they published *Świat Słowiański* from 1905 and launched the Slavic Society soon after.

In this work, we would like to focus on the activities of the Krakow Slavophile community, emphasising the relations of this community with Croats in particular. Even though Croatia was not in the centre of its interests, it occupied one of the leading places. The leaders of this community, for example Marian Zdziechowski, Tadeusz Grabowski or Jan Magiera, not only often visited Dalmatia or the King-

² Adam Świątek, »II Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Krakowie w 1899 roku«. *Prace Historyczne*, no. 147/2, (2020), pp. 375–399; Ibid., »Polacy na uroczystościach ku czci Františka Palackiego i I Zjeździe Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Pradze w 1898 roku«. *Galicja. Studia i Materiały*, no. 6, (2020), pp. 450–491; Mieczysław Dąbrowski, *Przewodnik krakowski dla uczestników II. Zjazdu Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich*, Kraków 1899; *Drugi Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Krakowie*, Kraków 1900; Slaven Kale, *Poljaci, naša braća na sjeveru. Hrvatska javnost o Poljacima 1860–1903*, Zagreb 2020, pp. 103–108.

³ Damir Agičić, »Chorwaci a Zjazd Neoslawistów w Pradze w 1908 roku (na podstawie ówczesnej prasy chorwackiej)«. *Prace Historyczne*, no. 147/2, (2020), pp. 361–373; Antoni Giza, *Neoslawizm a Polacy (1906–1910)*, Szczecin 1984, pp. 101–140; *Neoslawizm. Odbitka z »Myśli Wszehpolskiej*«, Kraków 1909, pp. 9–11.

⁴ Hrvatski školski muzej, Skender Fabković, Letter from Paulin Świącicki, 12 March 1871, box 4004.

⁵ Compare: Josip Hamm, *Vatroslav Jagić i Poljaci*, Zagreb 1951.

⁶ One of the Croats who had the closest contacts with Poles was Bishop Strossmayer. Lvivska nacionalna naukova biblioteka Ukrajinі imeni W. Stefaniка [Львівська національна наукова бібліотека України імені В. Стефаника], fond. 103, Archiwum Sapiehów z Krasieczyna, Adam Sapieha's correspondence with Konstanty Wojnowicz and bishop Józef Strossmayer 1882–1888, sign. 738.

dom of Croatia, but thanks to this they also spoke Croatian well and maintained a wide network of contacts.⁷

The Krakow Slavophile community is worthy of further attention, not only due to its Slavist legacy in the form of publications⁸ or organised lectures, but also due to the fact that the group created a coherent vision of Poland as a centre of the Slavic lands, which, additionally, influenced future generations of Slavists (Polish and foreign ones). This idea, contrary to the vision of Russia as the »mother« of Slavic nations, was supposed to challenge the Neo-Slavist movement emerging at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. Even though it did not gain such popularity as the above-mentioned idea, we can still find its mentions in the interwar period.⁹

Poland as the centre of Slavic culture

The increasingly closer cooperation between Austria-Hungary and the German Empire, as well as the growth of nationalism among the Austrian Germans, meant that the Slavs living in the Habsburg Monarchy began to feel more and more concerned about their safety. The common threat caused Poles and other Slavs living in Austria-Hungary to seek closer cooperation. One of the suggestions was to transform the Monarchy into a state that would take into account the Slavs' rights in the same way as it had those of the Hungarians. However, Austro-Slavism did not mean

⁷ Zbigniew Opacki, *W kręgu Polski, Rosji i Słowiańszczyzny*, Gdańsk 1996, pp. 48–50; Nevenka Košutić-Brozović, »Hrvatsko-slavenski književni odnosi u doba hrvatske moderne«. *Radovi. Razdio lingvističko-filološki*, vol. 11, (1972/1973), pp. 180–182.

⁸ *Slavic Library* publishing, for example, the book of Leon Wasilewski, *Słowianie: ich rozsielenie i liczba*, Kraków 1913, or Edmund Kołodziejczyk, *Prądy Słowianofilskie wśród Emigracji Wielkiej (1830–1863)*, Kraków 1914, or Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski, *Rosya jako »opiekunka« Słowian*, Kraków 1916. The *Yugoslav Library*, published by Julije Benešić in Poland in the interwar period, was a reference and continuation of the *Slavic Library*, which published books about the Slavs in the period before World War I. Z »Towarzystwa Słowiańskiego«, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 2, (1913), p. 752.

⁹ During the interwar period Slavic studies were established at the Jagiellonian University in 1925, with the involvement of individuals associated with the Slavic Club, such as Kazimierz Nitch and Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski. This initiative attracted numerous students from Yugoslavia, including figures like Josip Hamm and Petar Đorđević, who came to Krakow. For more details on the genesis and beginnings of the Slavic studies at Jagiellonian University, refer to Mirosław Skarżyński's work titled »Geneza i początki studium słowiańskiego UJ«, published in *LingVaria*, Volume 14 (2019), p. 12. Additionally, insights into the educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation between the Kingdom of SCS/ Yugoslavia and Poland between the two world wars can be found in Dragomir Bondžić's contribution »Prosvetna, naučna i kulturna saradnja Kraljevine SHS/Jugoslavije i Poljske između dva svetska rata« in the book *Jugoslavija i Poljska u XX veku*, edited by M. Pavlović, A. Zaćmiński and P. Wawryszuk, Belgrade 2017, pp. 97–114.

the same for all Slavs. It was perceived by the Czechs¹⁰ and Southern Slavs¹¹ in different ways. For the Poles it was an idea that was supposed to support their supremacy, due to the position which Galicia and its politicians occupied in Austria-Hungary.¹² However, in order to achieve it, it was necessary to take steps towards stronger cooperation with other Slavic nations, such as to learn more about their culture, history, and language, but also to encourage them to have their own vision of the future. Therefore, various events aimed at bringing Poles and other Habsburg Slavs closer were frequently initiated.

One of them was the ceremony of transferring the remains of Adam Mickiewicz to the Wawel Royal Castle in Krakow in 1890, which reverberated through the whole Monarchy.¹³ It was then that Krakow students became active and invited their friends from other Slavic countries to the ceremony and, in a proclamation issued on that occasion, demanded greater federalisation of the Monarchy and appreciation of the role of the Slavs.¹⁴ Even more significant in its consequences (because it was organised quite regularly) was the initiative of the Slavic journalists, who from 1898 organised joint meetings. In 1898, the second such event took place in Krakow. The meetings were aimed at better understanding of the problems that the Slavs living under Habsburg rule struggled with on a daily basis. The meetings, about which one could read in the press as the next one was taking place in Dubrovnik in 1901, were a result of »the need to create and maintain the sense of solidarity based on national individualism«.¹⁵

¹⁰ Jan Rychlik, Władimir Penczew, *Historia Czech*, Wrocław 2020, pp. 373–375; Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire. A New history*, London 2016, pp. 206–207.

¹¹ Anna Boguska, »Austroslawizm (Chorwacja)«. In: *Leksykon idei wędrownych na słowiańskich Bałkanach XVIII-XXI wiek*, vol. 10, [ed. Grażyna Szwat-Gylybowa], Warszawa 2020, pp. 11–12; Tihomir Čipek, »Ideja Srednje Europe Františka Palackog«. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, vol. 36/2, (2004), pp. 599–603.

¹² For more about this topic, see: Jerzy Kochan, »Oblicze ideowo-polityczne „Świata Słowiańskiego”«. *Kwartalnik Historii Prasy Polskiej*, no. 18/2, (1979), pp. 56–59.

¹³ Paweł Sierżęga, »W trosce o pamięć wieszczą. Lwów w obchodach sprowadzenia zwłok Adama Mickiewicza do Krakowa – 4 lipca 1890«. *Galicja. Studia i materiały*, no. 7, (2021), pp. 300–315; »Adam Mickiewicz«, *Montags-Revue aus Böhmen*, no. 27, (7 July 1890), p. 4; »Für Mickiewiczfeier«, *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, no. 28, (11.07.1890), p. 1; Adam Mickiewicz und Panславismus, *Pester Lloyd*, no. 186, (08 July 1890), p. 2.

¹⁴ Jarosław Rubacha, *Bułgaria na przełomie XIX i XX wieku. Bułgarskie metamorfozy w publikacjach »Świata Słowiańskiego« (1905–1914)*, Olsztyn 2012, p. 35.

¹⁵ »Zjazd dziennikarzy słowiańskich«, *Kurjer Warszawski*, no. 108, (20 April 1901), p. 1; Comp. »III Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich«. *Dziennik Polski*, no. 103, (09 April 1901), p. 1.

One of the hosts of the Krakow meeting was professor of the Jagiellonian University Marian Zdziechowski, a leading figure of Galician Slavophilism.¹⁶ During the gathering, the main topic was the problem of Polish-Czech relations, which was influenced by the negative attitude of Poles towards Russia.¹⁷ Representatives of the Croats were also present at the meeting, including Juraj Biankini, representing Dalmatia, and Šime Mazzura as a representative of the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia.¹⁸ There were more people willing to participate in it, but the Hungarians prevented the gathering of a more numerous delegation.

The meeting was a success, despite some negative voices.¹⁹ Krakow presented itself as a city that could serve as the centre of the Galician Slavophile thought. It seems that, for the first time since the congress in Prague, which had taken place over half a century earlier, it was in 1899 that Poles so clearly presented their opinion on the Polish-Russian problems, which overshadowed all Polish activities in the Slavic movement.²⁰ This was extremely important because it made the representatives of the Slavic nations from other countries, especially from the southern parts of the Monarchy, realise what the Polish-Russian problem was. At the same time, the speeches of Croats, Slovaks, and Czechs helped others better understand the problems which those nations faced on a daily basis.

The congress of journalists made Poles realise the importance of a platform where they could share their experiences with representatives of other Slavic nations. While demands to establish a common journal in Vienna,²¹ or even to organise consecutive meetings, were met with the reluctance of other state authorities, in 1901 a decision was made to launch the Slavic Club in Krakow. Although at first it was supposed to be just a place where one could talk freely, the genesis of the Club was definitely more profound. The decision to establish it resulted from several important factors. The first were the opportunities provided by the wide autonomy

¹⁶ Marian Zdziechowski was the author of the first monograph on the history of the Illyrian movement. *Odrodzenie Chorwacji w XIX wieku. Illiryzm – Stanko Vraz. – Iwan Mažuranić. – Piotr Preradović*, Kraków 1902. He was considered one of the most outstanding experts of Hungary and Croatia. He opposed the collapse of Austria-Hungary, which is why he was considered an opponent of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia after World War I. Henryk Ułaszyn, *Z Kopiaowanej na katedry uniwersyteckiej. Wspomnienia*, Kraków 2010, pp. 294–295.

¹⁷ Adam Świątek, »II Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Krakowie w 1899 roku«. *Prace Historyczne*, no. 147/2, (2020), p. 386.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 389.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

²⁰ *Drugi Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Krakowie*, Kraków 1900, p. 27.

²¹ Adam Świątek, »II Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich...«, pp. 393–396.

that Galicia had.²² The autonomous authorities were Polish, so there was no need to deal with Hungarian reluctance, which was the case in Zagreb, or that from Austria, which was experienced during the meeting in Dubrovnik.²³ It also did not arouse suspicions of supporting Pan-Slavism, like the meeting in Belgrade. Moreover, Krakow with its university and Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences had the proper intellectual base to organise events such as the meetings of the Club. Finally, it was realised that it was Galicia that was supposed to play the role of a kind of unifying force, uniting at least the Slavs who lived in Austria-Hungary.²⁴ During the inaugural lecture at the Jagiellonian University in 1901, while talking about the role Poland should play in the unified Slavic lands, Zdziechowski, one of the Club's founders and then its president, referred to the tradition of Polish-Croatian relations, looking for confirmation of his belief that Poland, not Russia, should take on the responsibility of leading the Habsburg Slavs.²⁵

This belief, formulated by Zdziechowski, was based on several criteria. According to him, it was Poles who had created the culture and literature at the highest level among the Slavs. In addition, Polish activities had inspired other Slavs for centuries, especially the Southern Slavs to fight the Ottoman Empire.²⁶ In general, Polish politicians in the Viennese Parliament were regarded as supporters of the emperor and, consequently, as opponents of Austrian Slavs. However, the situation changed in 1897, when Kazimierz Badeni was prime minister. At that time, Polish politicians were seen as advocates of Slavic interests in the Viennese Imperial Council, with the most notable evidence being Badeni's efforts to establish equal rights for

²² The autonomy was a set of concessions aimed at placating the Polish population in the Austrian partition, particularly in Galicia. The privileges included the use of the Polish language in higher education, the establishment of Polish administration, education in Polish, and the freedom to observe national holidays. However, these privileges were limited and subject to the will of the Austrian authorities. Galician autonomy was a political compromise to calm tensions in Galicia, where national and cultural unrest were significant. Despite these privileges, the situation of Poles in Galicia remained complex, and aspirations for greater autonomy or independence persisted in social and political life. See: Stanisław Pijaj, *Między polskim patriotyzmem a habsburskim lojalizmem: Polacy wobec przemian ustrojowych monarchii habsburskiej, 1866–1871*, Kraków 2003; Józef Buszko, *Galicja 1859–1914. Polski Piemont?*, Kraków 1989; Stanisław Grodziski, *W Królestwie Galicji i Lodomerii*, Kraków 1976; Larry Wolff, *Idea Galicji: historia i fantazja w kulturze politycznej Habsburgów*, Kraków 2020.

²³ »Kongres dziennikarzy słowiańskich«, *Kurjer Lwowski*, (11 April 1901), pp. 1–2.

²⁴ Aleksander Ćuk, »Słowiańszczyzna południowa na przełomie wieków XIX i XX z perspektywy Klubu Słowiańskiego«, *Galicja. Studia i materiały*, no. 5, (2019), p. 57.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Anita Gostomska, »Polskie dwudziestowieczne przekłady Osmana Ivana Gundulića«, *Przekłady Literatur Słowiańskich*, vol. 9, (2009), p. 30; Joanna Rapacka, *Osman Ivana Gundulića. Bunt świata przedstawionego*, Wrocław 1975.

the Czech language alongside the German language in Czechia.²⁷ Therefore, Poles were to be the centre around which a strong anti-German front was supposed to be built, as Zdziechowski saw Germany as the greatest threat. It is easy to guess that the concept did not take Russia into account. Krakow Slavists did not agree as to the role of this country. Zdziechowski, as an expert on the Russian political reality, believed that the imperial policy of the tsars excluded their leading role, because they were not led by the good of the Slavs, but by Russian chauvinism: »I write bitter things, but in the tone of a pained man, not one who hates Russia«, he wrote in a letter addressed to his Czech friend Adolf Černý.²⁸ Later, after the defeat of the Russian Empire in the war with Japan, in one of his letters to Vatroslav Jagić, he stated that the defeat of the Russians should signify the decline of their authority among Slavs, especially the Southern ones: »What I mean is that the Russians should know about the decline of their prestige and influence in the Slavic lands, and this decline is most visible among denationalised and Catholic groups.«²⁹ It seems that Zdziechowski was very torn about his attitude towards Russia, which meant that he had many enemies among both Russophiles and Russophobes. This was due to the fact that, on the one hand, he was a committed opponent of Russian imperialism (which exposed him to all supporters of Russia, especially the Czechs),³⁰ but on the other, he loved Russian culture and literature, which is why he was often perceived as a Russophile in Galicia.³¹ His friend, editor-in-chief of *Świat Słowiański*, Feliks Koneczny, went even further and claimed that Russians are representatives of the Turanian civilisation, so they are closer to Asia than to Europe,³² which is why they should not be taken into account at all when discussing Slavic lands.

When it comes to the south Slavic issues, Zdziechowski was of the opinion that the unification of Serbs and Croats was not the best idea due to cultural and

²⁷ Marian Zdziechowski, *Węgry i dookoła Węgier; szkice polityczno literackie*, Kraków 1933, p. 106; Janusz Gruchała, *Koło Polskie w austriackiej Radzie Państwa wobec kwestii czeskiej i Śląska Cieszyńskiego (1879-1899)*, Wrocław-Kraków-Warszawa 1982, pp. 58–59.

²⁸ Marian Zdziechowski's letter to Adolf Černý, 26 December 1898. In: Piotr Biliński, Marek Ďurčanský, Tomasz Krzyński, »Nieznana korespondencja Mariana Zdziechowskiego z Adolfem Černým«. *Kwartalnik Nauki i Techniki*, no. 52/2, (2007), p. 18.

²⁹ Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u Zagrebu, Zbirka rukopisa i starih knjiga, Korespondencija Vatroslava Jagića, Letter from Marian Zdziechowski, 04 June 1909, sign. R. 4610b.

³⁰ Marian Zdziechowski' letter to Adolf Černý 19 April 1901. In: Piotr Biliński, Marek Ďurčanský, Tomasz Krzyński, »Unknown correspondence of Marian Zdziechowski with Adolf Černý«, *Kwartalnik Nauki i Techniki*, no. 52/2, (2007), p. 23.

³¹ For that reason, students in Lviv made it impossible for him to give a lecture. Zbigniew Opacki, *W kręgu Polski, Rosji i Słowiańszczyzny. Myśl i działalność społeczno-polityczna Mariana Zdziechowskiego do 1914 roku*, Gdańsk 1996, p. 201.

³² See Feliks Koneczny, *Cywilizacja Turańska Rosji*, Komorów 2020.

religious differences: »I am trying to treat the whole thing objectively«, Zdziechowski wrote to Jagić, »and I understand that as a result of this, neither Croats nor Serbs might like my work. I myself stand on the ground of Serbo-Croatian harmony, but I don't believe in it much; in my opinion, these are two different psychological types—two nations.«³³ Instead, the Austrian Slavs, including the Southern ones, were supposed to form a third Slavic group, apart from Austria and Hungary, by uniting with Poles. At the same time, he was critical of Hungary, believing that its policy towards the Slavs was inadequate, because instead of uniting the nations, it was dividing them to the benefit of Germany.³⁴

The opinions of the Krakow Slavophile community could be treated merely as an interesting fact if it were not for the influence of their ideas on the young generation of Slavists, and not only Polish, but also South Slavic ones. Obviously, not everyone who had contact with this community thought that Poland should become the centre of Slavic culture—some, like Stjepan Radić, accepted Russian supremacy.³⁵ However, this experience left a mark on many young people cooperating with the Slavic Club. Some of them became fascinated with Polish culture and literature, while others adopted political ideas. The first group was composed of Julije Benešić and Zdenka Marković, whose interest in Poland was connected to Krakow Slavists. Benešić's legacy includes not only numerous items of correspondence with Zdziechowski and Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski, but also invitations to lectures organised by the Slavic Club. It should be mentioned that Benešić lived and studied in Krakow for some time,³⁶ while Zdenka Marković, who was keen on Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski,³⁷ attended the Club's meetings. Both Benešić and Marković were regarded as the most important ambassadors of Polish culture and literature in Yugoslavia in the interwar period. They initiated many events for scholars and for the broader public.³⁸

³³ Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u Zagrebu, Zbirka rukopisa i starih knjiga, Korespondencija Vatroslava Jagića, Letter from Marian Zdziechowski of 04 June 1909, sign. R. 4610b.

³⁴ Opacki, op. cit., p. 202.

³⁵ Ivan Očak, »Stjepan Radić i Rusija«. *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest*. no. 25, (1992), pp. 103–122.

³⁶ Tea Rogić Musa, »Protumodernost modernoga – pjesnički protusvijet Julija Benešića«. *Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne*, no. 17, (2019), p. 226; Josip Jagodar, *Hrvatsko-poljske veze u prvoj polovici i sredinom 20. stoljeća*, Zagreb 2021, pp. 93–96.

³⁷ Arhiv Odsjeka za povijest hrvatske književnosti Zavoda za povijest hrvatske književnosti, Zdenka Marković, Letters from Tadeusz Grabowski, box 19, sign. HR-AHAZU-KN-135.

³⁸ Ana Batinić, . »Polonistička veza Julija Benešića i Zdenke Marković«. *Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne*, no. 9, (2015), pp. 470–472; Compare: Josip Jagodar, *Zwiazki chorwacko-polskie w latach 1918–1965*, Kraków 2022.

Not everyone who had contact with the Krakow Slavophile community limited their fascination with Polishness only to literature and culture. Some Southern Slavs took the ideas presented by Zdziechowski much deeper to heart. By that I mean two Slovenians, Leopold Lenard and Fran Ilešić. Both of them came to Krakow at a similar time, but only Lenard enrolled at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University, where he was taught, among others, by Marian Zdziechowski, who has already been mentioned several times.³⁹ Ilešić, however, was never a student at the Krakow university. Their arrival to Galicia left a strong mark on the views of both Slovenian Slavists. Before he began his studies, Lenard became famous for his work *Der Panславизм. Eine national-politische Betrachtung*,⁴⁰ in which he presented his creed, which was very close to what the Krakow Slavists proclaimed regarding the mission of Poland in the Slavic community.⁴¹ It was obviously met with great enthusiasm among the editors of *Świat Słowiański*, who praised his approach. Later, he spoke on these matters several times, clearly criticising Neo-Slavism as a return to Pan-Slavist ideas and contrasting it with the Polish idea, which was also supposed to be beneficial to the rest of Slavs living in the Habsburg Monarchy.⁴² After World War I, Lenard, however, did not make such a career as his numerous talents might indicate (he supposedly knew 10 languages). Perhaps this is the reason why he is a somewhat forgotten figure.

In turn, Fran Ilešić's Polonophilism evolved slowly. He came to Galicia as an eager supporter of Neo-Illyrianism, with which he is still strongly associated in Slovenia.⁴³ However, influenced by the Krakow community, he became even more fascinated than Lenard with the Polish point of view on a united Slavic land. He was written about as the best friend of Poland because he showed his affection on many occasions, as a lecturer of Polish literature, by promoting Polish culture, and by helping individual people who asked for it, like Józef Gołąbek or Henryk Batowski.⁴⁴ However, above all, he adopted political concepts of the Slavic Club. Zdravka Zlodi presents in her article one of the lectures by Ilešić, delivered in Zagreb, in which he

³⁹ Antoni Cetnarowicz, »Leopold Lenard – słoweński polonofil z początku XX wieku«. *Prace Historyczne*, no. 147/2, (2020), p. 316.

⁴⁰ Leopold Lenard, *Panславизм. Eine national-politische Betrachtung*, Cilli 1906.

⁴¹ Cetnarowicz, op. cit., pp. 319–323.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Krešimir Nemeč, »Slavenstvo, novoilirstvo, slovenstvo, (iž povijesti zagrebačke slovenisti-ke)«. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, vol. 7/1, (2011), p. 184.

⁴⁴ W. Wisłocki, »Prof. dr. Franc Ilešić«. *Słowo Polskie*, no 208, (01 August 1931), p. 8; Compare: Tomasz Jacek Lis, »Działalność Frana Ilešića słoweńskiego polonofila«. In: *Polska-Jugosławia w XX wieku. Polityka, społeczeństwo, kultura* (ed. Momčilo Pavlović, Paweł Wawrzeszuk, Andrzej Zaćmiński), Bydgoszcz 2018, pp. 317–332; *ibid.*, »Odnosi Frana Ilešića i Henryka Batowskiego u svjetlu njihove korespondencije (1926-1939)«. *Historijski zbornik*, vol. 73, no. 1, (2020), pp. 139–152.

referred to the special role of Poland in Central and Eastern Europe. He argued that building a common alliance of the Baltic states and the countries of Central and Southern Europe, with Poland playing a leading role, could constitute a proper obstacle to German and Soviet imperialism.⁴⁵ He also defended Poland's good name against criticism from Yugoslav public opinion on many occasions. He wrote brochures, in which he explained, among others, the Sanation policy, as well as Józef Piłsudski himself, claiming that he cannot be compared to Benito Mussolini.⁴⁶ What distinguished the Slovene from the Krakow Slavists was his approach to Yugoslavism. Here, Ilešić was an uncompromising supporter of the unity of Serbs, Slovenes and Croats.

Croatia and *Świat Słowiański*

For people founding the Slavic Club, as it was written about on the third anniversary of its establishment, »It was extremely important, when reviving Polish Slavophilism, not to reduce it to the role of a substantial oratorical topic, but to introduce it to the only reasonable path, namely, research and studies. It was a complete success [...]«. ⁴⁷ Indeed, for several years of its existence, the Club became a leading place of exchanging views between Poles and other representatives of the Slavic nations. After the publication of the *Świat Słowiański* journal, it was time for the next step. This was the founding of the Slavic Society (*Towarzystwo Słowiańskie*) in 1912, which was more formal than the Club, and had its own statute, which claimed that its aim was to »[...] get to know the Slavic nations living within the borders of the Monarchy and mutually acquaint them with the cultural and social relations of the Polish nation«. ⁴⁸ According to Barbara Jaroszewicz-Kleindinst, the Society was supposed to be more institutional in nature, capable of bringing together a larger number of people. The direct factor influencing the decision to establish the Society was the visit of Zdenka Marković on the 100th anniversary of Zygmunt Krasiński's birthday.⁴⁹ The organisers were the same people who had previously formed the Club. Both of the establishments operated at the same time. Although the aims of the Club and the Society were similar, the former served more as a discussion club, while the latter was a specific organisation whose activities were task-oriented. The organisers were ma-

⁴⁵ Zdravka Zlodi, »Idea Frana Ilešića o uređenju srednjo-istočne Europe iz 1930-ih godina«. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, vol. 36, no. 3, (2004), pp. 983–985.

⁴⁶ Fran Ilešić, *Maršal Jozef Piłsudski*, Zagreb 1936; *Ibid.*, *Današnja Poljska*, Beograd 1927.

⁴⁷ Klub Słowiański w Krakowie, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 1/1, (1905), p. 6.

⁴⁸ Statut Towarzystwa Słowiańskiego w Krakowie, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 8/96, (1912), p. 846.

⁴⁹ Barbara Jaroszewicz-Kleindinst, »Towarzystwo Słowiańskie w Krakowie. Zarys działalności«, *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, no. 24, (1974), pp. 151–154.

inly interested in Polish Slavophilism, which was a response to Neo-Slavism, as well as a free Poland,⁵⁰ as understood in their own Galician way.

However, in order for Polish Slavophile thought to gain more supporters, it was necessary to own their own press, which could help reach a wider audience than meetings or lectures. For this purpose, in 1905, the *Świat Słowiański* journal was launched, which for the more than 9 years of its existence became one of the most important journals writing about Slavic issues in the Habsburg Monarchy. The reputation it enjoyed is best evidenced by the fact that, just before World War I, Robert William Seton-Watson came to Galicia in order to meet the editors of the journal, because he wanted to encourage them to cooperate on a very similar journal addressed to the British public.⁵¹ The journal covered a wide range of topics, including political, economic, historical, and cultural ones. Initially, it did not have a clear ideological profile of its own, but at the turn of 1906 to 1907, the editorial staff declared that the »national« matter would guide the authors of the periodical.⁵² It was a kind of a competition to the pro-Russian Czech journal *Národní listy*, which promoted Neo-Slavism.⁵³ The editor-in-chief of the Krakow monthly paper was Feliks Koneczny. Many Slavic authors cooperated with the editorial staff, including Czechs, Ruthenians, Slovaks, and Southern Slavs, including Croats. In the first issue of the journal, one of the people who published their work there was Julije Benešić.⁵⁴ »Your article is widely approved, and I would be very happy if I could share something from your writing with our readers«, Koneczny wrote to him in one of the letters.⁵⁵ Stjepan Radić,⁵⁶ who sometimes visited Krakow,⁵⁷ also published two texts about the Croatian countryside (in 1908 and 1912). In the journal, there was also a foreign correspondent on current events in various Slavic countries. However, in most cases, short texts were not signed or signed only with initials, which is why it is difficult to determine how many foreign collaborators *Świat Słowiański* had.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 155.

⁵¹ Zdziechowski, *Węgry i dookola Węgier...*, pp. 92–93.

⁵² Zbigniew Solak, »Marian Zdziechowski i Klub Słowiański«. *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, no. 30, (1987), p. 224.

⁵³ Paul Vyšný, *Neo-Slavism and Czechs 1898–1914*, Cambridge 1977, pp. X–XI.

⁵⁴ J. Benešić, Wrażenia belgradzkie, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 1/1, (1905), pp. 35–41.

⁵⁵ Arhiv Odsjeka za povijest hrvatske književnosti Zavoda za povijest hrvatske književnosti, Julije Benešić, Letter from Feliks Koneczny, 30 January 1905, box 45, sign. HR-AHAZU-KN 18-56.

⁵⁶ Stjepan Radić, Zadrugi wiejskie w Chorwacji, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 8/85, (1912), pp. 370–375.

⁵⁷ Stjepan Radić's letter to Marija Radić, 11 July 1908. In: *Korespondencija Stjepana Radića* [ed. B. Krizman], vol. 1, Zagreb 1973, p. 449.

When it comes to the topic of Croatia, even though it was not a major one, sometimes one can come across articles concerning Croatian matters. Apart from the two mentioned Croats, and individual authors appearing as guests in *Świat Słowiański*, Croatian topics were mainly dealt with by Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski. He was an outstanding specialist who spoke Croatian perfectly, thanks to which he had a wide range of contacts. Grabowski often visited Croatia before World War I. His closest friends included Zdenka Marković. The Polish Slavist greatly appreciated the young Croat, who in turn was fascinated with him. Their connection started in 1902, survived two world wars and continued even when Grabowski was no longer able to exchange letters due to his age. It was then that his grandson Adam Krzyształowicz wrote letters to Marković on his behalf.⁵⁸ This Krakow Slavist published a number of articles in *Świat Słowiański*, which mainly pertained to history,⁵⁹ culture⁶⁰ and the current situation⁶¹ in the Croatian lands. He was also familiar with writing biographies.⁶²

In addition, we can look for information on Croatia in the regular column about the most important events in the Slavic countries as well as in the column regarding the Slavic press. Croatia had always been present there, which is why we will skip this issue and briefly present an outline of the topics concerning Croatia that appeared in the *Świat Słowiański* journal during the 9 years of its existence (apart from Grabowski's literary output mentioned above). In the first year, when the journal began to be published, Aleksander Jabłonowski, a Warsaw historian and expert on Southern Slavic lands,⁶³ wrote a short article about Josip Juraj Strossmayer

⁵⁸ Arhiv Odsjeka za povijest hrvatske književnosti Zavoda za povijest hrvatske književnosti, Zdenka Marković Letter from Adam Krzyształowicz, 30 January 1973, box 18, sign. HR-AHAZU-KN-135.

⁵⁹ Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski, Dubrownik w poezji i historii, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 4, no. 1, (1908), pp. 357–385.

⁶⁰ Ibid., Śmierć Dubrownika (Ivo Vojnović: Dubrovačka trilogija), *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 4, no. 2, (1908), pp. 749–792; Ibid., Stjepan Miletić i jego zasługi dla chorwackiej sceny, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 4, no. 2, (1908), pp. 966–981; Ibid., Z powieściowej twórczości J. Vojnovića, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 5, no. 2, (1909), pp. 299–308; Ibid., Dramat polski na scenie zagrzebskiej 1850–1910, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 1, (1913), pp. 131–138, Ibid., O nowym dramacie serbskim i chorwackim, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 1, (1913), pp. 362–375.

⁶¹ Ibid., Nauczycielki chorwackie, „*Świat Słowiański*”, vol. 2, no. 1, (1906), pp. 405–412; Ibid., Chorwat na morzu, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 5, no. 2, (1909), pp. 125–128; Ibid., Komisaryat Królewski Chorwacyi, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 8, no. 1, (1912), pp. 429–456.

⁶² Ibid., Isydor Kršnjavi, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 3, no. 2, (1907), pp. 105–110; Ibid., Nicola Tommaso, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 3, no. 2, (1907), pp. 235–240; Ibid., Ljudevit Gaj, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 5, no. 2, (1909), pp. 69–79;

⁶³ Franciszek Bujak, »Autobiografia Aleksandra Jabłonowskiego«. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, no. 53/1, (1939), p. 10.

in which he shared his personal reflections from his meeting with the bishop.⁶⁴ The text, published in several parts, was intended to remind people about Strossmayer's important role for the Slavic people on the occasion of his death. Two articles in the following year deserve attention. The first, by Henryk Glück, was about the perception of Ivan Gundulić among Poles.⁶⁵ Each year, the number of texts devoted to Croatia grew. In 1907, the readers of *Świat Słowiański* could read an extensive article by Zygmunt Stefański on Croatian-Hungarian relations, in which he was very critical of Hungarians, condemning their policies of chauvinism towards the Croats.⁶⁶ A year later, Stjepan Radić⁶⁷ published an article on a similar topic. In 1910, an article about the beginnings of Croatian drama was published by Roman Wagnerowicz, who in the same year also published a review of Strossmayer's paper.⁶⁸ Two outstanding experts on the subject, Roman Zawiliński and Jan Magiera, wrote about Croatia in the following year. The first quoted the accounts of Aleksander Sapięha's journey on the Dalmatian coast at the beginning of the nineteenth century,⁶⁹ while the other wrote about Roger Joseph Boscovich.⁷⁰ The year 1912 brought the readers of *Świat Słowiański* a number of articles about Croatian topics. The journal once again featured Stjepan Radić with his text about the *Zadruga* movement, which I have already mentioned. Apart from this, there was an extensive article about Zdenka Marković,⁷¹ which was the result of her visit in Krakow in the same year, and a short text by Jan Magiera about the Croatian »pragmatic sanction«.⁷² The following year was rich in texts regarding Croatia. Apart from the usual Grabowski, W. Reszkiewicz,⁷³ Feliks Koneczny⁷⁴ and two anonymous authors wrote about the Croatian

⁶⁴ Aleksander Jabłonowski, Książd Józef Jerzy Strossmayer, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 1, no. 1, (1905), pp. 119–124; Ibid., Josip Juraj Strossmayer, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 1, no. 1, (1905), pp. 169–178.

⁶⁵ Henryk Glück, Gundulić w Polsce, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 2, no. 1, (1906), pp. 22–39.

⁶⁶ Zygmunt Stefański, Konflikt chorwacko-madjarcki, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 3, no. 2, (1907), pp. 7–22.

⁶⁷ Stjepan Radić, Współczesna Chorwacya wobec Austryi i Węgier, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 4, no. 2, (1908), pp. 729–736.

⁶⁸ N. R. Wegnerowicz, Początki dramatu chorwackiego, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 6, no. 1, (1910), pp. 162–185; The same, Pisma pisana Dru Ljudevitu Gaju, ed. Velimir Deželić, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 6, no. 2, (1910), pp. 47–51.

⁶⁹ Roman Zawiliński, Dalmacya przed stu laty w oświeceniu podróżnika Polaka, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 7, no. 2, (1911), p. 362–370.

⁷⁰ M. J. Rudjer Bošković S. J., *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 7, no. 2, (1911), pp. 51–54.

⁷¹ Władysław Dobromilski, Zdenka Marković, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 8, no. 1, (1912), pp. 272–282.

⁷² Jan Magiera, Chorwacka sankcja pragmatyczna, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 8, no. 1, (1912), pp. 261–268.

⁷³ W. Reszkiewicz, Sprawa Rjeki, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 1, (1913), pp. 346–362.

⁷⁴ F. K. W sprawie neoiliryzmu, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 2, (1913), pp. 520–526.

political scene⁷⁵ and spoke about culture and contemporaneous politics. In 1914, the journal stopped to operate due to the outbreak of World War I. However, before this happened, several issues had been published. Among them there was an article by Jan Magiera about the new course in Croatian politics⁷⁶ and a short anonymous note about expropriations near Rijeka.⁷⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVES

- Lvivska nacionalna naukova biblioteka Ukrajini imeni W. Stefanika (Львівська національна наукова бібліотека України імені В.Стефаніка),
- fond. 103, Archiwum Sapiechów z Krasieczyna, sign. 738.
- Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u Zagrebu, Zbirka rukopisa i starih knjiga,
- Korespondencija Vatroslava Jagića, sign. R. 4610b.
- Arhiv Odsjeka za povijest hrvatske književnosti Zavoda za povijest hrvatske književnosti,
- Zdenka Marković, sign. HR-AHAZU-KN-135.
- Julije Benešić, sign. HR-AHAZU-KN 18-56.
- Hrvatski školski muzej,
- Skender Fabković, box 4004.

PAPERS

- Montags-Revue aus Böhmen* (1890)
Arbeiter-Zeitung (1890)
Pester Lloyd (1890)
Kurjer Warszawski (1901)
Dziennik Polski (1901)
Kurjer Lwowski (1901)
Świat Słowiański (1905–1914)

⁷⁵ Najnowszy rozłam chorwacki, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 1, (1913), pp. 375–379; IV-ty Katolicki Zjazd słoweńsko-chorwacki w Lublanie, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 9, no. 2, (1913), pp. 608–613.

⁷⁶ Jan Magiera, O nowym »nowym kursie« w Chorwacyi, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 10, no. 1, (1914), pp. 110–126.

⁷⁷ Wywłaszczenie na chorwackim Pobżerzu, *Świat Słowiański*, vol. 10, no. 1, (1914), pp. 202–204.

LITERATURE

- Agičić, Damir. 2020. »Chorwaci a Zjazd Neoslawistów w Pradze w 1908 roku (na podstawie ówczesnej prasy chorwackiej)«. *Prace Historyczne*, 147/2, 361–373.
- Batinić, Ana. 2015. »Polonistička veza Julija Benešića i Zdenke Marković«. *Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne*, 9, 467–492.
- Biliński, Piotr, Ćurčanski, Marek, Krzyński, Tomasz. 2007. »Nieznamą korespondencją Mariana Zdziechowskiego z Adolfem Černym«. *Kwartalnik Nauki i Techniki*, 52/2, 7–50.
- Boguska, Anna. 2020. »Austroslawizm (Chorwacja)«. In: *Leksykon idei wędrownych na słowiańskich Bałkanach XVIII–XXI wiek*, vol. 10 (ed. Grażyna Szwat-Gylybowa), 11–12. Warszawa.
- Bondžić, Dragomir. 2017. »Prosvetna, naučna i kulturna saradnja Kraljevine SHS/Jugoslavije i Poljske između dva svetska rata« In: *Jugoslavija i Poljska u XX veku* (eds M. Pavlović, A. Zaćmiński, P. Wawryszuk), 97–114. Beograd.
- Bujak, Franciszek. 1939. »Autobiografia Aleksandra Jabłonowskiego«. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 53/1, 8–49.
- Buszko, Józef. 1989. *Galicja 1859–1914. Polski Piemont?* Kraków.
- Cetnarowicz, Antoni. 2020. »Leopold Lenard – słoweński polonofil z początku XX wieku«. *Prace Historyczne*, 147/2, 315–345.
- Cipek, Tihomir. 2004. »Idea Srednje Europe Františka Palackog«. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 36/2, 597–607.
- Ćuk, Aleksander. 2019. »Słowiańszczyzna południowa na przełomie wieków XIX i XX z perspektywy Klubu Słowiańskiego«. *Galicja. Studia i materiały*, 5, 57–68.
- Dąbrowski, Mieczysław. 1899. *Przewodnik krakowski dla uczestników II. Zjazdu Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich*. Kraków.
- Drugi Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Krakowie*, Kraków 1900.
- Giza, Antoni. 1984. *Neoslawizm a Polacy (1906–1910)*. Szczecin.
- Gostomska, Anita. 2009. »Polskie dwudziestowieczne przekłady Osmana Ivana Gundulića«. *Przekłady Literatur Słowiańskich*, 9, 29–53.
- Grabowski, Tadeusz Stanisław. 1916. *Rosya jako »opiekunka« Słowian*. Kraków.
- Grodziski, Stanisław. 1976. *W Królestwie Galicji i Lodomerii*. Kraków.
- Gruchała, Janusz. 1982. *Koło Polskie w austriackiej Radzie Państwa wobec kwestii czeskiej i Śląska Cieszyńskiego (1879–1899)*. Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa.
- Hamm, Josip. 1951. *Vatroslav Jagić i Poljaci*. Zagreb.
- Ilešić, Fran. 1936. *Maršal Jozef Pilsudski*. Zagreb.
- Ilešić, Fran. 1927. *Današnja Poljska*. Beograd.
- Jagodar, Josip. 2021. *Hrvatsko-poljske veze u prvoj polovici i sredinom 20. stoljeća*. Zagreb.
- Jagodar, Josip. 2022. *Związki chorwacko-polskie w latach 1918–1965*. Kraków.
- Jaroszewicz-Kleindinst, Barbara. 1974. »Towarzystwo Słowiańskie w Krakowie. Zarys działalności«, *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, 24, 151–170.
- Judson, Pieter M. 2016. *The Habsburg Empire. A New history*. London.
- Kale, Slaven. 2020. *Poljaci, naša braća na sjeveru. Hrvatska javnost o Poljacima 1860–1903*. Zagreb.
- Kochan, Jerzy. 1979. »Oblicze ideowo-polityczne „Świata Słowiańskiego”«. *Kwartalnik Historii Prasy Polskiej*, 18/2, 41–62.
- Kołodziejczyk, Edmund. 1914. *Prądy Słowianofilskie wśród Emigracji Wielkiej (1830–1863)*. Kraków.
- Koneczny, Feliks. 2020. *Cywilizacja Turańska Rosji. Komorów*.

- Košutić-Brozović, Nevenka. 1972/73. »Hrvatsko-slavenški književni odnosi u doba hrvatske moderne«. *Radovi. Razdio lingvističko-filološki*, vol. 11, 153–198.
- Krizman, Bogdan (ed.). 1973. *Korespondencija Stjepana Radića*, vol. 1. Zagreb.
- Lenard, Leopold. 1906. *Panslawismus. Eine national-politische Betrachtung*. Cilli.
- Lis, Tomasz Jacek. 2018. »Działalność Frana Ilesića słoweńskiego polonofila«. In: *Polska-żugosławia w XX wieku. Polityka, społeczeństwo, kultura* (ed. Momčilo Pavlović, Paweł Wawryszuk, Andrzej Zaćmiński), 317–332. Bydgoszcz.
- Lis, Tomasz Jacek. »Odnosi Frana Ilesića i Henryka Batowskog u svjetlu njihove korespondencije (1926-1939)«. *Historijski zbornik*, 73(1), 139–152.
- Nemec, Krešimir. 2011. »Slavenstvo, novoilirstvo, slovenstvo, (iz povijesti zagrebačke slovenistike)«. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, 7/1, 181–192.
- Neoslawizm. Odbitka z »Mysli Wszechpolskiej»*, Kraków 1909.
- Očak, Ivan. 1992. »Stjepan Radić i Rusija«. *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest*, 25, 103–122.
- Opacki, Zbigniew. 1996. *W kręgu Polski, Rosji i Słowiańszczyzny. Myśl i działalność społeczno-polityczna Mariana Zdziechowskiego do 1914 roku*. Gdańsk.
- Pijaj, Stanisław. 2003. *Między polskim patriotyzmem a habsburskim lojalizmem: Polacy wobec przemian ustrojowych monarchii habsburskiej, 1866–1871*. Kraków.
- Rapacka, Joanna. 1975. *Osman Ivana Gundulića. Bunt świata przedstawionego*. Wrocław.
- Rogić Musa, Tea. 2019. »Protomodernost modernoga – pjesnički protusvijet Julija Benešića«. *Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne*, 17, 221–235.
- Rubacha, Jarosław. 2012. *Bulgaria na przełomie XIX i XX wieku. Bułgarskie metamorfozy w publikacjach »Świata Słowiańskiego« (1905–1914)*. Olsztyn.
- Rychlik, Jan, Penczew, Władimir. 2020. *Historia Czech*, Wrocław.
- Sierżega, Paweł. 2021. »W trosce o pamięć wieszczki. Lwów w obchodach sprowadzenia zwłok Adama Mickiewicza do Krakowa – 4 lipca 1890«. *Galicja. Studia i materiały*, 7, 300–315.
- Skarżyński, Mirosław. 2019. »Geneza i początki studium słowiańskiego UJ«. *LingVaria*, 14, 11–33.
- Solak, Zbigniew. 1987. »Marian Zdziechowski i Klub Słowiański«. *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, 30, 219–238.
- Świątek, Adam. 2020. »II Zjazd Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Krakowie w 1899 roku«. *Prace Historyczne*, 147/2, 375–399.
- Świątek, Adam. 2020. »Polacy na uroczystościach ku czci Františka Palackiego i I Zjeździe Dziennikarzy Słowiańskich w Pradze w 1898 roku«. *Galicja. Studia i Materiały*, 6, 450–491.
- Ułaszyn, Henryk. 2010. *Z Kopiozowanej na katedry uniwersyteckiej. Wspomnienia*. Kraków.
- Vyšný, Paul. 1977. *Neo-Slavism and Czechs 1898–1914*. Cambridge.
- Wasilewski, Leon. 1913. *Słowianie: ich rozsiadlenie i liczba*. Kraków.
- Wisłocki, W. 1931. »Prof. dr. Franc. Ilesić«. *Słowo Polskie*, 208, (1 August), p. 8.
- Wolff, Larry. 2020. *Idea Galicji: historia i fantazja w kulturze politycznej Habsburgów*. Kraków.
- Zdziechowski, Marian. 1902. *Odrodzenie Chorwacji w XIX wieku. Iliryzm – Stanko Vraz. – Iwan Mažuranić. – Piotr Preradović*. Kraków.
- Zdziechowski, Marian. 1933. *Węgry i dookoła Węgier; szkice polityczno literackie*. Kraków.
- Zlodi, Zdravka. 2004. »Ideja Frana Ilesića o uredenju srednjo-istočne Europe iz 1930-ih godina«. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 36/3, 981–995.

POLJSKO-HRVATSKI ODNOSI U KONTEKSTU DJELOVANJA KRAKOVSKOG SLAVISTIČKOG DRUŠTVA POČETKOM XX. STOLJEĆA

Tomasz Jacek Lis

Jagiellońskie sveučilište, Krakow

tomlis88@gmail.com

SAŽETAK: U članku se istražuje djelovanje krakovskih slavista na prijelazu iz XIX. u XX. stoljeće, s fokusom na njihov odnos prema Hrvatima, posebice njihovoj kulturi, povijesti i međusobnim odnosima. Cilj je članka prikazati kako su entuzijasti slavizma iz Galicije doživljavali ulogu Poljaka u širem panslavenskom pokretu. To je ključna tema jer su južnoslavenske historiografije često propagirale tvrdnju da su Poljaci bili protivnici slavenske suradnje. Osobe kao što su Marian Zdziechowski, Tadeusz Stanisław Grabowski i Jan Magiera proturječe ovoj tvrdnji. Suprotstavljanje panslavizmu ili neoslavizmu nije impliciralo da Poljaci odbacuju slavensku suradnju, već ulogu Rusije. Po njihovu mišljenju, Rusija nije djelovala u interesu Slavena, nego protiv njih, slijedeći velikoruske ciljeve carskog režima. Stoga su predlagali alternativna rješenja, ističući središnju ulogu poljske kulture i zalažući se za ravnopravnu suradnju među slavenskim narodima. Zahvaljujući svom poznavanju slavenskih jezika i kultura, krakovski slavisti održavali su brojne kontakte s pojedincima iz raznih slavenskih zemalja, pa tako i s Hrvatima. Nakon Prvog svjetskog rata, neki Poljaci i Južni Slaveni nastavili su tako razmišljati, vjerujući da bi Poljska trebala postati kulturno središte slavenske baštine. Dio članka posvećen je prikazivanju stava ključnih predstavnika krakovske slavenofilske zajednice prema Hrvatima, a potkrijepljen je detaljnom analizom tekstova o Hrvatima objavljenih u mjesečniku *Świat Słowiański*. Ta je tiskovina služila kao glasilo ove zajednice, a sadržavala je priloge stranih autora. Časopis je imao za cilj promovirati poljski koncept slavenskoga jedinstva i upoznati galicijsku javnost s pitanjima Slavena unutar i izvan Austro-Ugarske Monarhije.

Ključne riječi: poljsko slavenofilstvo; Slaveni; Austro-Ugarska; *Świat Słowiański*; Klub Słowiański Kraków; Towarzystwo Słowiańskie Kraków; Marian Zdziechowski



Članci su dostupni pod licencijom Creative Commons: Imenovanje 4.0 međunarodna (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Sadržaj se smije umnožavati, distribuirati, priopćavati javnosti, preradivati i koristiti u bilo koju svrhu, uz obavezno navođenje autorstva i izvora.