

УДК 821.161.2-92.09”17”

Danchenko M.

UKRAINIAN PATRIOTIC NARRATIVE IN THE XVIII CENTURY: TRANSITION FROM UKRAINIAN BAROQUE TO RUSSIAN CLASSICISM

This article explores the issue of perception of Ukraine and Russia in Ukrainian polemical discourse in the 18th century. The problem itself concerns interpretation of Russia as a new sovereign by Ukrainian educated military elite. The author of the poem analyzed here is Semen Divovych (circa 1730 – after 1764), a chief translator of Cossack Hetman Chancellery, and he was an eye-witness of the political perturbations he depicted in his poem. His poem “A Discourse Between Great And Small Russia” is remarkable in view of the chronological period it belongs to. In the 1760s, Baroque style in literature was majorly replaced with classicism even in Central and Eastern European literatures; yet Divovych’s poem represents one of the latest examples of Ukrainian literary Baroque due to the author’s Kyiv-Mohyla educational background. Thus, this poem makes a transitional bridge between Baroque and Classicist tendencies of representation of state-suzerain. Our piece of research proceeds further with highlighting the next stylistic and ideological phase of construction of Ukraine-Russia relations represented by the poem of Vasyl Kapnist (1758–1803). Vasyl Kapnist belongs to Divovych’s junior contemporaries, and his poem “Ode on Slavery” is already written in pure Classicist style and implies harsh criticism of Russian imperial strategy on enslaving Ukrainian Cossack land.

Keywords: ukrainian baroque, classicism, Semen Divovich, Vasyl Kapnist.

My theme concerns the issue of Ukrainian self-narrative in the second half of XVIII century, the period of the last years of Ukrainian autonomy. I want to explore the issue, how the discourse of Ukrainian self-identity and state ideology was transformed and who will intercept it after the abolishment of Ukrainian autonom administrating. The major fragment of my research represents a sort of a case study, which is dedicated to a little known polemic poem “A Discourse Between Great And Small Russia”, written in September 1762 by Semen Divovich, who occupied an office of chief translator in the General Chancellery during the reign of hetman Kyrylo Rozumovskiy. The major significance of this literary work is determined by the fact it was the last piece of writing, which had been created by

the actual Cossack, who was a representative of the highest administrative circles. Next year in 1764 the hetmanian rule will be abolished and most of the Cossack state functionaries will lose their functions in political and cultural structure.

The sources concerning Semen Divovich’s life are scarce, yet the presumable dates of his life (circa 1730 – after 1764) are quite trustworthy. He took studies in Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and later in the university of Saint-Petersburg.

The poem itself is remarkable both from a point of stylistics and ideas expressed by the author. A discourse of Great and Small Russia represents a formal dialogue between these two countries, where Great Russia just asks questions or opposes common accusations in disloyalty, pettiness or cow-

ardice of Cossacks. In its turn, Small Russia recites its history, which touches Cossack period from sixteenth century onwards, and the period of Bogdan Khmelnytskyi is described most amply. Yet the actual historical content of the poem is just a background to express the actual Cossack claims.

The poem is created according to traditional canons of Ukrainian baroque poetry with observing of all common places and maintenance of classical dialogue form, which had always been intrinsic to polemical writings. The first particular sign is an absence of any introductory part, since the “Discourse...” starts at once from the actual dialogue between the protagonists. Great Russia asks the Small one, what is the origin of the latest and demands about her past allegiances and old names. Small Russia acknowledges its’ bygone commonwealth with Poland and receives a reproach from its interlocutor for disloyalty to its former suzerain. While explaining the reasons of this break off with Poland, Small Russia displays its history.

There are a few stylistic features, which distinguish this composition from others created in Baroque style, mainly the total absence of any references to God, which is absolutely uncommon to the polemical literature of XVI–XVII centuries. Secondly, Russian monarchs were mentioned just four times in the whole text, what is peculiar as well. Two references out of four are made about Elisabeth Petrovna, who had been deceased less than two years before the poem was written.

At the time our source was created hetmanian rule in Ukraine, seemingly legal, had actually been but a product of certain reconstruction and its very existence was simply a consequence of monarch’s favor. The deprivation of Cossack administrative autonomy was consecutive since the time of Peter I, when the juridical and financial functions were abolished in 1720, and since 1722 the activity of Chancellery had been controlled by Small Russian Collegium. To prevent the potential conflict at the time of uneven monarch rule in 1725–1730, hetman Danylo Apostol (1654–1734) was allowed to restore the Chancellery, yet after his death in 1734 Anna Ioanovna (1730–1740) dismissed the General Chancellery, since in her pursuit to consolidate the empire she suppressed any remnants of autonomous administrating. Anna Ioanovna is mentioned as well in the poem, but the hostile attitude to Small Russia is attributed to Minih’s personal hate to the people of Small Russia. Her successor was Elisabeth Petrovna, (1742–1762), whose apparent sympathy to Ukraine could be explained with her unsteady political position, because she got the power with coup d’Etat and had to avoid internal conflicts for which

goal keeping the allegiance of loyal military force was essential. So the last Ukrainian hetman appointed directly by Elisabeth Petrovna was a brother of her minion Alexey Rozumovskiy, who really descended from a peasant family of petty Cossacks. Kyrylo Rozumovskiy (1728–1803) received an excellent education in Europe and was married to the empress’ close relative Ekaterina Naryshkina. New hetman was a courtier, in most cases absentee in Ukraine, yet his administrative attitude was rather an absolutistic pro-European one, with the provisional delegation of certain parliamentary and constitutional authorities to Ukraine. On the other hand, the old Cossack nobility represented by functionaries like Mykhailo Khanenko and Andrew Bezborodko, tended more to the approximation of Ukrainian structure of social administrating to the Polish pattern. Shortly after the demise of Elisabeth Petrovna, Catherine II abolished hetmanship in 1764. What as for Catherine II, her prior vista was to unify the Empire. Yet the reasons of suppression of the Cossacks and Ukrainian autonomy was not only Catherine’s II doctrine of Enlightened absolutism, which required a maximum accumulation of power in the monarch’s hands, but the fact that by 1760th the need of keeping combat-ready rear, which neighbored with the Ottoman Empire, had fallen away.

The representatives of Cossack officials of the first half of XVIII century had the interests very different from those of their Zaporoshyan peers. First of all, Cossack majors who worked as state functionaries, were concerned not that much with the recognition of their noble status, since there was such, but with their right were equivalent to those of Russian nobility. The brightest example is his citation that his direct superior, Mikhailo Khanenko, the head of General Chancellery was labeled by French ambassadors with the status of Chancellor, while the actual title of this post is Supreme scribe, although the word “general” is used in its title in Ukrainian “heneralniy pysar”. Anticipating our further review, we find it essential to mention, that Andrew Bezborodko, Divovich’s superior, although will have to resign, will not disappear from political scene. His son Alexander (1747–1799) will be one of the first actual ministers of foreign affairs of Russian Empire. It is worth to emphasize that he will be one of the last state functionaries of Russian Empire, who would have accomplished his education in Kyiv-Mohyla academy in 1765. Andrew Bezborodko’s daughter will marry Pavlo Kochubei, another nobleman of Cossack origin, whose family will sustain a princely ennobling and will become one of the wealthiest and most powerful aristocrat clans in Russian Empire.

The key political clew of the poem is the statement that Small Russia subordinated herself to the Great one by its own initiative and, moreover her loyalty belongs to Great Russia as it is, but to Russian tsar exclusively. This statement was declared in a poem directly by Small Russia itself. To the author the equality of allegiance denounced the equality of rights for Russian and Ukrainian nobility. Another important hint is that two Russias in Dyvovich's view make two parts of the one single unit. The author emphasizes a few times, that Great Russia exceeds her authority in her attempts to "rule me as republic does" "А не ты республикою повелеваешь мною". The most painful point the author troubles about is the title difference of Russian and Cossack officials, since Russian emissars, sent from Russia, obviously neglected the status equality with the representatives of local military nobility. Divovich proclaims an ardent speech concerning the posts' equation in different countries with drawing the examples of Asia, the Muslim priests and nobles of which would be supposed being regarded as the representatives of the analogous social class in Russia. Semen Divoich's indignation is expressed in the passage following his reflection concerning the status equality, where he drew examples of disreputable behavior of Russian officials in Ukraine. Here we could observe evident remnants of baroque tendencies, so particular to polemic literature of XVI century, where irony and sometimes harsh mocking upon the imagined adversaries was a common stylistic instrument.

To illustrate, Semen Divoich's describes a captain from Russia, who, in his pursuit to the prior entrance into a Church, stumbles and smashes his face and becomes later an object of derision. Then a comical situation with this captain repeats, when he tries again to push into the church first – his pompous uniform caught a nail and he managed to disentangle himself only having left a huge piece of his clothes torn off. After this passage the author changes immediately his register from a comical into indignant one, claiming directly, that these insults would have been easy to bear, had they been caused by actual order of things. Yet these offences, are according him, nothing else than impudent violation of monarch's will.

The issue of possible (yet only military) independence was also raised in the discourse of two countries. Great Russia asks the Small one, whether she is capable to win the war by its own and without assistance, for which question an answer follows, that wars were won as well before their union, so as a few of them they won together. Making Small Russia tell about its most glorious time of Bogdan Khmelnytsky, Divovich inserted a long

recital about the grief after Khmelnytsky's death. Describing the events preceding hetman's decease, the author makes an encomium to Khmelnytsky. Let's remember, that tradition of encomia was very particular to Baroque, and training in Kyiv-Mohyla classes of rhetoric and poetics stipulated creating of verses in classical genres. Encomium to Bogdan Khmelnytsky corresponds to all classical canons, and bears no stylistic difference with those by XVII century, so in certain stylistic points the text is quite archaic. For instance, Semen Divovich integrated a remade version of Ovidius' VII elegy into the record of Khmelnytsky's death. The encomium is followed by description of ritual cry, expressed by Cossack who lost their leader. This moment is peculiar, since in this cry the loss of a talented commander is emphasized much more than the genre requires to. An appeal to follow the steps of the deceased hetman although rhetorical, is evidently inciting "we shall no leave your step, which we did follow, Arise and lead us our former path!" "You shall no resurrect, our pastor? The perfidious will strike us. Our fame will vanish so the flower of our army will, the audacity of us will disappear, we, those who terrified the countries, will trampled be by base scavengers..." (Translation is mine).

History of Small Russia is explicitly described in the poem. It's traced from Leslav Lyantsokorskiy, who really was one of the first Ukrainian hetmans, Venzhyk Khmelnytsky and Bogdan Rushynskiyy are also mentioned. Apparently Semen Divovich used the Cossack chronicle by Grygoriy Grabyanka, which covered the events from XVI century till 1709. In the historical section of the poem there are as well references to Petro Sagaidachniy, Bogdan Khmelnytsky, and Ivan Mazepa. Once the last one was called, a remark of Great Russia followed that in was a treachery from the Small one. The response was that Mazepa was the only traitor, who was not supported by most of Cossacks. And moreover, adds Small Russia, "you found by your need one single traitor in me, but I can show you hundred of yours who are alike". The description of historical events mentioned in reference with Cossack leaders is focused on battles and their detailed analyze. The most crafty maneuvers and war ruses are described in a way which approaches the narrative of poem to the standards of encomium.

Regular attempts of suppression of hetmanian rule in Ukraine caused the formation of Cossack officials' clandestine unions. These unions were not actually political units, but rather informal fraternities of the intellectuals, who shared common cultural and political views. But in several periods the activity of such fraternities could fluctuate to political dissidence as well. Some historians argue there

was such a Novhorod-Siverskiy fraternity in a region of Starodubshchina, which was close to hetman capital in Hluhiv. A few generations of intellectuals worked for years in this fraternity. Among them was presented as well Semen Divovich and his brother Oleksa, who also worked in General Chancellery, yet outlived his brother for many years. The source which Divovich used for the description of Ukrainian historical events was a "Short Description of Malorossia", which had been written in 1734 by Mikhailo Khanenko, another Divovich's colleague, who occupied a post of supreme bannerman (генеральный хорунжий). A brilliant intellectual, Khanenko belonged to this fraternity as well. Mikhailo Khanenko was keeping a detailed private diary for many years, and his writings present a precious source of Ukrainian daily, political, economic and cultural life. The full volume of the diaries exceeds ten tomes, and its full edition doesn't exist yet, although there were three attempts to publish it. After the abolishment of hetman's power the ex-state functionaries mostly withdrew from political life, yet didn't deny their dreams about Ukrainian independence.

The link, which joins the period of late Hetman-ship, when Ukrainian nobility could exercise some semi-independent political activity, and the period, when Ukrainian political culture was totally implemented into a Russian one, is represented by a figure of Vasyl Kapnist, (1758-1803), another member of Novhorod-Syverskiy fraternity. Vasyl Kapnist was an ethnic Greek, whose ancestors were awarded by land properties on the territory of Ukraine. He received outstanding education and started writing satirical poems in Russian language styled in Enlightened classicism. In 1783 he wrote an "Ode On Slavery", which prior concern was a critique of the recent legal initiative, which attached the peasant population of Ukraine to the lands they settled in without the right to leave it. This decree signified the last and ultimate eradication of Ukrainian civil liberties, granted beforehand by many decades of Cossack rule. The serfdom, eradicated in 1648 by Bogdan Khmelnytsky's riot, was restored, and this fact became a subject of Vasyl Kapnist's indignation. In his poem he described favorably Cossack liberties and privileges and denounced this royal initiative. Here we can see the evolution of pro-Ukrainian patriotic narrative, and how Ukrainian intellectuals transplanted their legacy into Russian linguistical and reader's domain. So, we can see how within the twenty years Ukrainian cultural discourse changed even its language, saying nothing about stylistic rupture with Baroque and transfer to classicism. The poem was published in 1806 only, after Vasyl Kapnist's death. Some scholars assume

that Vasyl Kapnist's sympathies towards Ukraine were not only theoretical, but that he had in 1791 secret negotiations with the chancellor of Prussia Ewald Friedrich von Hertzberg concerning possible assistance of Prussia to Ukraine in case of war with Russian Empire. But the expertise of the documents which attested the fact of this meeting and the chancellor's evasive answer, has not confirmed their authenticity.

As we can see, the poem "A Discourse Between Great And Small Russia" reflects a noble-oriented attitude of Semen Divovich. For this author Small Russia consisted of impersonal Cossack community, which is headed by educated and distinguished by military service leaders. Such a social stratification bears no major difference with that of previous century. In addition, in his writing he demonstrates his classical schooling, which was very common for Baroque school literature. As a state functionary, he displays loyalty to the ruling and past monarchs yet denounces the foreign oppression through the critique of the attitudes and administrative activity of Russian superiors. In his narrative his actual opponent is not Great Russia, but Russian officers and functionaries. The author's mockery upon them is very similar to those exercised by the authors of late Renaissance and Baroque polemic writings, what attests the cultural affinity of this poem to the style of Baroque. Secondly, it's apparently the last piece of writing which belongs to Baroque tradition, since we can see on the example of Vasyl Kapnist's poem how within just twenty years the cultural narrative of Ukraine changed from the voice of Cossack state functionary defending his stratum's privileges, into a voice of compassion, expressed by liberal Russian noble.

The idea of Ukrainian state is expressed clearly "we make two parts of one single whole, and thus we are equal". Peculiar feature is that the author doesn't bring the argument of historical continuity between Kyivan Rus and Small Russia, but he started the history of Ukraine from the reference to Lithuanian period. I suggest it was done to avoid the protest way of argumentation, since such a reference would raise the question of legitimacy of Moscow supremacy upon more ancient state unit, and it was the way which the author did not want to follow. The poem displays the legalist direction of Ukrainian political thought, which discarded separatist ideology, yet supported the ideas of restitution of economical and legal privileges for military servants. Such a point of view was lately supported by the later unknown author of XVIII century Cossack chronicle "History of the Rus", written presumably in 1769.

This last composition of Ukrainian baroque in literature makes a precious historical and literary source, which requires more scholars' attention to be paid.

References

1. Дівович Семен. Разговор Великороссии с Малороссиею [Електронний ресурс] / Семен Дівович. – Режим доступу: http://litopys.org.ua/old18/old18_31.htm. – Назва з екрана.
2. Оглоблин О. П. Люди старої України / О. П. Оглоблин. – Мюнхен : Дніпрова хвиля, 1959. – 328 с.
3. Аполлонова лютня: київські поети 17–18 ст. / ред. В. Крехотня. – К. : Молодь, 1982. – 310 с.
4. Апанович О. М. Ще одне джерело з історії України XVIII сторіччя [Електронний ресурс] / О. М. Апанович. – Режим доступу: <http://izbornyk.org.ua/chernlet/chem05.htm>. – Назва з екрана.
5. Апанович О. М. Військові канцеляристи – вихованці Києво-Могилянської академії / О. М. Апанович // Києво-Могилянська академія в історії України. Тези доповідей міжнародної наукової конференції. – К. : НАУКМА, 1995. – С. 39–40.

Данченко М. Л.

УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ПАТРІОТИЧНИЙ НАРАТИВ У XVIII СТОЛІТТІ – ПЕРЕХІД ВІД УКРАЇНСЬКОГО БАРОКО ДО РОСІЙСЬКОГО КЛАСИЦИЗМУ

Статтю присвячено проблемі сприйняття України і Росії в українському полемічному дискурсі XVIII століття. Предмет дослідження – поема козацького канцеляриста Семена Дівовича «Разговор Великороссии с Малороссией». Поема є цікавою як останній зразок українського літературного бароко, оскільки наступного після її написання року інститут українського гетьманства було скасовано. Це джерело досліджено в аспекті переходу європейських літератур від бароко до класицизму, і за матеріал для такого порівняння використано поему Василя Капніста «Ода на рабство», написану на двадцять років пізніше. На матеріалі порівняння цих двох поем ми можемо простежити, як театралізований дискурс полеміки між двома країнами, властивий бароко, за двадцять років змінюється на дискурс помірної громадянської критики закріпачення вільних людей, властивий стилю класицизму.

Ключові слова: українське бароко, класицизм, Семен Дівович, Василь Капніст.

Матеріал надійшов 29.06.2017

УДК 1"652"(510+470):221.7

Капранов С. В.

ВИПУСКНИК КИЇВСЬКОЇ ДУХОВНОЇ АКАДЕМІЇ ДАНИЇЛ КОНІСІ ЯК ІНТЕРПРЕТАТОР КИТАЙСЬКОЇ ФІЛОСОФСЬКОЇ ДУМКИ

Статтю присвячено інтерпретації китайської філософської думки у спадщині випускника Київської духовної академії Конісі Масутаро (у хрещенні Даниїл Конісі). Розглянуто переклади конфуціанських («Да сюе», «Чжун юн» та «Сяо цзін») і даоського («Дао де цзін») канонічних текстів російською мовою, виконані Конісі у 1892–1896 рр., а також його статтю про філософію Лао-цзи, написану в той самий період. Вперше зроблено спробу проаналізувати весь зазначений корпус текстів як єдине ціле. Особливу увагу приділено питанню про вплив Л. М. Толстого на китаєзнавчі праці Конісі. Показано новаторський характер діяльності Конісі як перекладача та інтерпретатора китайської філософії, запропоновано нову оцінку його внеску в діалог філософських культур Заходу і Сходу.

Ключові слова: китайська філософія, конфуціанство, даосизм, китаєзнавство, діалог культур, Конісі Масутаро.

Конісі Масутаро (小西増太郎, 1862–1940), у хрещенні Даниїл Конісі (або Коніссі), є найвідомішим із православних японців – випускників Київської

духовної академії. В основному його згадують або як перекладача і популяризатора творчості Л. М. Толстого у Японії, або, в контексті історії