

Giovanna Brogi Bercoff (University of Milan)

Does a Literary Canon of Ukrainian Baroque Literature Exist?

Preliminary remarks, theoretical premise and state of the arts.

0.0 – After 1991 no discourse on literature in the newly independent or ‘re-occidentalized’ countries of Eastern Europe could be undertaken without the discussion of literary canon: among the most important issues one may mention the de-construction of established canons and – more important – the re-construction of new canons, that brought to new paradigmes of evaluation for authors and works that functioned as bearers of a well established tradition, and to the integration into a new literary system of writers that had been excluded from the ‘official’ canon, because they were either in emigration or in the ‘underground’, or plainly condemned to silence because of bannishment or prison.

The question of the literary canon has acquired a determinant function in today’s literary discourse, first: for the self-consciousness of a period and a literary movement spread all over the world in ‘national’ or ‘supra-national’ forms by both the writing ‘subjects’ and the reading ‘addressees’; second: as a methodological instrument for re-assessing through literature one’s own existence as a ‘conscious’ society or nation. Both cases concern contemporary world. It is only apparently idle to posit the question whether it is possible to apply the idea of a ‘canon’ to pre-modern literatures. I will try here to focus some elements that may help for delimiting a ‘canon’ of Ukrainian literature of the time of Baroque.

0.1 – Though since antiquity poets and readers offered a ‘canon’ of poetry or rhetorical and historical prose considered as ideal ‘models’ for *imitatio*,¹ and a rather

¹ The Alexandrian Canon of Lyric poetry is generally considered a universal exemplum of the following search for literary canons. The Homeric poetry, the Ciceronian rhetorical output or the Livian historiographic model were no less paradigmatic for the developement of the whole literature of the Western world.

rigid set of rules were determinant for any poet or prose writer to be accepted by the established high-literature system, it was only the 18th century that made the first attempts to formulate in theoretical terms the concept of a canon and the practical implications of its ‘actualisation’ in a certain context. In the 16th-17th century, the canon was formed by the universal, still dominant models of classical and renaissance rhetorics or poetics, but some theoretical treatises began to introduce the ‘local’ (in modern language: national) orators and poets to underline the excellency of the people and the country whom they belonged to. If we take into consideration the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with the literary systems functioning in it (comprising the Ukrainian lands as well), a first attempt to establish a literary canon applied to a proto-national self-perception may be found in the 17th century erudite “encyclopedia” of illustrious men, the *Ekatontas* by Szymon Starowolski.² He adapted to the Polish culture some antecedents known in the Italian and European Renaissance and laid the ‘foundation’ for establishing a Polish literary canon. Acknowledging the ‘absolute’ priority of Jan Kochanowski, but including some other Polish poets together with European Renaissance “stars”, Sarbiewski created a ‘tradition’ that laid the ground of the Polish literary system until Romanticism (whereas – *ça va sans dire* – Romanticism itself footed on that tradition, both in continuity and opposition).

Quite different was the situation with the Eastern neighbour of Ukraine, the Muscovite Tsardom: Though the 17th century represents the so-called “first occidentalization”, it is mostly not simple to distinguish a Russian from a Church

² Szymon Starowolski, *Scriptorum Polonicorum ‘Ekatontàs’ seu centum illustrium Poloniae scriptorum Elogia et vitae*, Frankfurt 1625, Venetiae 1627, and ff. (G. Brogi Bercoff, *Polonia culta. Szymon Starowolski i nowy wizerunek narodu*, “Pamiętnik literacki”, LXXVIII, 1987, Z. 2, pp. 3-22). An interesting example of valorization of local, even folkish tradition already in the 16th c. is in *De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici* by the Dalmatian Juraj Sisgoreus (Juraj Šižgorić) (cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *Królestwo Słowian. Historiografia Renesansu i Baroku w krajach słowiańskich*, Izabelin 1998, pp. 30-31;).

Slavonic ‘canon’, the latter being still bound to Medieval syncretic use and religious-liturgical patterns of supranational Church Slavonic literature.³

The issue I will touch upon now concerns the possibility of establishing a literary canon for Ukrainian literature of the 17th century. If a Polish erudite could write an encyclopedia of poets and writers including Polish ones, and publish it in two such prestigious international centers as Frankfurt and Venice in the 17th c., is it possible to sketch *a posteriori* a literary system forming such a coherent structure to be considered by today’s literary criticism a ‘canon’ of Ukrainian literature of 17th c.? If such a ‘canon’ exists, is it possible to select the works of its poets and writers as belonging to that ‘canon’ exclusively and/or specifically? Which are the criteria we should follow for the ‘construction’ of a Ukrainian canon of Early-Modern literature? Would such a ‘construction’ imply a ‘de-construction’ of another literary canon (following the same principle that the ‘construction’ of a new ‘nation’ implies a de-construction of a former existant political body)?

It is self-evident that in this paper I will not be able to take into consideration all the authors and works of the period of Baroque, nor all the aspects of the problem. I will make limited, but possibly significant choices in both the material to be analyzed and the methodological issues and tools at our disposal.

0.2 – Following contemporary literary theory, the concept of ‘canon’ offers a useful grid of taxonomy and evaluation, a heuristic tool for the establishment of the complex of “works that are recognized in a certain national culture as the most valuable and outstanding, the ones which transmit in perfect way the values, ideas and convictions of that national culture”. This complex “responds to the ‘imagination’ of what is most

³ Cf. for example R. Picchio-H. Goldblatt, *On Old and New Russian Literature in the Seventeenth century*, in: *Freedom and Responsibility in Russian Literature. Essays in Honor of the R.L. Jackson*, Evanston, Ill, 1995, pp. 6-19, 267-273; G. Brogi Bercoff, *La cultura letteraria barocca in Russia*, in: *Il Barocco letterario nei paesi slavi*, a cura di G. Brogi Bercoff, NIS, Roma 1996, pp. 223-260, with the quoted bibliography.

valuable from the aesthetic point of view” and becomes “a factor that insures the cultural continuity”⁴ of the community where the complex ‘functions’.

This conceptualisation of the term ‘canon’ is based on and referred to a community united by a modern consciousness of national identity and culture, modeled on Romanticism. The question arises how far is it possible to apply this kind of conceptualisation to the literature of Baroque time in Ukraine, a system that was governed by a pre-modern political, cultural, linguistic and social system.

Głowiński’s definition quoted above offers further considerations, that will be useful for our discussion. Indeed, the formation and the perception of a literary canon – he continues – may be influenced by “*social phenomena and historical processes*”, as well as by “the modifications of consciousness, changes of *taste*, evolution of contemporary literature, which influence the formation of tradition”.⁵ Taste is a complex of “preferences” of a certain social community in a certain epoch, it “influences not only the spreading of works in society, but acts on their creation as well, since it posits a sort of *desideratum for the artist*”. Taste is *socially differentiated*, relates to the general level of culture of the social group where it acts and forms the literary life of the given socium.⁶ These simple premises, if used in various combinations, permit to explore some characteristics of 17th C. Ukrainian literature both as a ‘canonic’ autonomous system, and as a part of a broader system encompassing the neighboring ‘canons’ and the broader literary ‘canon’ of European literature.

0.3 – The amount of books and collections of sources concerning Ukraine in the time of Baroque published in Imperial and Soviet Russia is considerable, but attempts to consider Ukrainian Baroque literature as a system are recent and scanty. A process of conceptualization of a possible Ukrainian pre-modern canon is even less advanced.

⁴ Cf. M. Głowiński, *Kanon*, in: *Słownik terminów literackich*, Wrocław etc. 1998, p. 234.

⁵ *ibidem*.

⁶ Głowiński, *cit.*, p. 514. Italics are mine – GBB.

The history of critical literature on the subject is instructive. In the 19th c. 'high' literature, theatre, popular or semi-popular tradition and folklore generally appeared as separate domains. Works of both 'high' or 'popular' literature were either incorporated in the respectively pan-orthodox ecclesiastic or imperial culture, or seen as sources for the elaboration of 'low' genres, mainly comedy, idyllic or satirical poetry, or included in a local 'sentimental' or 'curious' narrative (the fact that these were first sources of inspiration for both 'national' writers of Ukraine and Russia, for Shevchenko and Hohol/Gogol', is another discourse).

A first attempt to see Ukrainian literature as a complex corpus of works belonging to various, high and low genres, bound to different social milieux, representing a system connected to a cultural entity bearing the name of Ukraine was made by M. Voznjak in L'viv in the 1920s: it was the time of "ukrainization", but the 3 volumes appeared out of Soviet Ukraine. The importance of Baroque became central in the conception of Ukrainian and Russian literary development of Dmytro Tschizhevs'kyj⁷. The impact of the latter was fundamental in Western European scholarship in the 2nd half of the 20th c., though it remained ignored (or polemically blamed) in the Soviet block.

Beginning with the 1960s 'baroque-friendly' innovations began to appear in the Soviet space, but the most impressive works about Ukrainian Baroque literature were written first in Poland. In the works of I. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, D.S. Lixachev, A. Morozov (just to mention some of the most important scholars) the Russian point of view remained dominant, while R. Łużny and his followers stressed the role of Ruthenian authors in transmitting the Polish Renaissance and Baroque heritage to Russia, but did not fail to underline the Ukrainian specificity of this literature. They tended rather to exclude Ukrainian Baroque literature from the Polish canon, even when it was written in Polish: this apparently surprising attitude, as we will see later,

⁷ The volume concerning the period of our interest was recently published in German: M. Voznjak, *Die Geschichte der Ukrainischen Literatur im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert*, aus dem Ukrainischen von A.-H. Horbatsch, München 2001. The English versions of D. Čyževs'kyj's *History of Russian literature* and *A History of Ukrainian Literature* were published only in resp. 1960 and 1975, but footed on materials printed earlier in Ukraine or Europe.

probably had a positive effect on the formation of both Ukrainian and Polish self-consciousness in the last decennies.

In the 1980s and 1990s we assist to a real boom of Baroque studies. Russian scholars succeeded in reconstructing the lines of developement and main characteristics of the movement in Russia and its connections with the Ruthenian tradition. The first Ukrainian publications in the 1990s began to offer a new conceptualization of Ukrainian Baroque literature as a coherent system footed in a specific social and cultural context. The intertextual connections with other literatures (mainly the Polish one) were not forgotten, but not always duly considered. There is no space here for more details on this subject: pathbracking books were published by A. Panchenko, L. Sazonova, R. Radyszewskýj, L. Ushkalov and many other scholars whom it is not possible to mention here.⁸

I will now describe in a very synthetical way some phenomena of Ukrainian literature of the period of Baroque trying to cope with the permanent interplay of languages, religious confessions, historical and political 'vectors', variety of social and cultural levels, melting of heritages coming from East and West.

1 – Building collective memory: Religious and Panegyric literature.

1.1 – In order to trace possible boundaries of a literary system that may be called Ukrainian, I will pinpoint some 'markers': they should permit to give informations about self-perception of 'identity' and thus help to construct a Ukrainian 'canon' for the 17th-18th centuries. Given the cultural situation of the Ukrainian lands and

⁸ A.A. Morozov, *Problema barokko v russoj literature XVII-nach. XVIII veka. Sostojanie voprosa i zadachi izuchenija*, in: "Russkaja literatura", 1962, 3, pp. 4-38; R. Łużny, *Pisarze kręgu Akademii Kijowsko-mohylańskiej a literatura polska*, Kraków 1966; D.S. Lixachev, *Barokko i ego russkij variant XVII veka*, in "Russkaja literatura", 1969, 2, pp. 18-45; A. M. Panchenko, *Russkaja stichotvornaja kul'tura XVII veka*, Leningrad 1973; L.I. Sazonova, *Poezija russkogo barokko*, Moskva 1991; R. Radyszewskýj, *Polsko-j XVIII wieku*, 1-2, Kraków 1996-1998; L. Ushkalov, *Z istoriji ukrajins'koji literatury XVII-XVIII stolit'*, Xarkiv 1999. The book on scholastic theatre by P. Lewin, *Ukrainian drama and theater of the 17th-18th centuries*, CIUS, Edmonton 2007, was published recently, but footed on reasearch connected with the tradition of R. Łużny's school. Many others could be added.

society, most ‘markers’ are implicit: they may come from prefaces to the reader, hints to one’s own ideas, expectations, religious, social and ‘ethnic’ allegiance, indications of the social milieu of the addressee of the ‘message’, rhetorical and stylistic level, choice of language, printing typology, authorial intentions, content, place and function in the hierarchy of values of the time, and similar tools of evaluation.

My choice of examples of single works, authors or genres should help delimitate a Ukrainian system, but also show how the latter constantly interacted with the neighboring systems of Polish and Russian literatures, sometimes with other systems as well, e.g. the German or the Italian, the whole *respublica litterarum* represented by European Classical, Renaissance and Baroque heritage, in Latin or vernacular languages.

1.2.1 – *Between religion and history*. The 17th century is remarkable for a considerable amount of works written in various languages, representing different cultural centers, social milieux and religious instances. What makes them recognisable as belonging to a socium different from the neighbouring societies? How do they interact with analogous literary works, issued from neighbours who were also political dominators?

Syl’vestr Kosov’s *Paterikon abo żywoty SS. Oycow Pieczarskich* (Kyiv 1635) und Afanasii Kal’nofois’kyi’s *Terateturgēma* (Kyiv 1638), though different in beauty and method, represent the kind of erudite genre of historical, ecclesiastic and encyclopedic character that was cultivated at large in Catholic countries to fulfill the expectations of the Roman Church of the Counterreformation, but also the local pride and missionary intent of monastic orders and highly venerated religious centers⁹. The choice of the Polish language responds to more than one reason. Polish was the

⁹ For some Polish examples and their relationship to Roman prototypes, cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *O typologii polskiego piśmiennictwa w XVII wieku na przykładzie historiografii erudycyjnej*, in: Eadem, *Królestwo Słowian. Historiografia Renesansu i Baroku w krajach słowiańskich*, Izabelin 1998, 156-171.

language of education and state in the Commonwealth, its ‘cultural pressure’¹⁰ was incremented by social prestige and literary refinement (the latter deriving from already existing ‘canonical’ poets, beginning with Kochanowski), it ensured ‘intelligibility’ and ,‘visibility’ in the relevant social milieux (the Polish establishment) that had to be convinced of the cultural and sacral ‘dignity’ of the newly re-established Orthodox church and – through it – of the society (mainly the intellectual and ecclesiastical leaders and the Cossack *šljaxta*) that was the bearer of that religious and cultural code. The two mentioned works are excellent examples of a consciously chosen set of religious, intellectual and literary values intended to foster a ‘(proto)-national’ community. Relevant is Kossov’s choice to write a glorification of the Kyivan Cave Monastery not *ex novo*, but footing on the pre-existent *Kievskij Paterik*, the well known Church-slavonic collection of lives of monks dating back (presumably) to the 13th century Kyivan tradition: this is one of the first testimonies of a conscious ‘appropriation’ of the own past history by the ‘proto-national’ Cossack society.

Kossov’s search for historical roots in the sacred sphere of history is functionally similar to the search of ancient (Roman, Sarmatians, Illyres, Thracians, etc.) forefathers and glorious past deeds of Renaissance historiography in Poland or other Western Slavic or European countries. This ‘fashion’ had some followers in the so-called Cossack historiography of the 17th-18th c. that draw lines of political development from the late Kyivan to Galician and later Cossack ‘state organization’. This led to ‘dynastic’ successions (e.g. from Rjurik to Gedimin and the Polish kings) or mythic Sarmatian or Khazar ethnogenesis, similar to Polish or Western Renaissance history writing, where the ‘nation’ was represented by a dynasty or ‘political’ entity. Such ‘back-projections’ in the mythical past expressed different

¹⁰ Cf. A. Martel, *La langue polonaise dans les pays Ruthènes, Ukraine et Russie Blanche*, Lille 1938; G. Brogi Bercoff, *Plurilinguism in Russia and in the Ruthenian Lands in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. The Case of Stefan Javors'kyj*, in: *Speculum Slaviae Orientalis. Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages*, Moscow, Novoe Izdatel'stvo, 2005, pp. 9-20.

kinds of social consciousness, but possessed strong ‘markers’ of a proto-national identity¹¹.

The works by Kosov and Kalnofojs’kyj, written several decades before, had an ecclesiastic character: this was coherent with the peculiar political situation of Ukraine at the time. Being part of the Polish Commonwealth, a part of the nobility being culturally polonized or in any case bound to political or military ties of loyalty to the Polish king or institutions, Ukraine lacked a lay political center representing it as a ‘nation’; hence, it was the Orthodox church that, up to a high degree, exerted the functions of a centripetal force for Cossacks and other strata of the population which – more or less consciously – were the bearers of self-identity.¹² Thus, from the point of view of function, content, situation, set of images and forms of expression, works having a predominantly religious character may contain – independently from the language used – important signs of belonging to the peculiar set of values recognised by the community were the works ‘function’.

The tradition represented by Kossov and Kalnofojs’kyj had a vigorous and long-lasting life through such works as Galjats’kyj’s *Nebo novoe* and Dmytro Tuptalo’s *Runo oroshennoe*, written in the 1670s. Unfortunately, the literary genre devoted to venerated religious centers or “miracle working” items or places have been investigated very poorly. It is not always easy to recognize the ‘markers’ making of them part of a Ukrainian canon. The evolution of genre and situation of communication posits the issue of belonging to other possible canons, more

¹¹ Cf. the works mentioned above (Footnote 9) with the quoted bibliography, and the synthetic but clear Chapter One in: S. Ploky, *Tsars and Cossacks. A Study in Iconography*, Cambridge Mass., 2002, esp. 10-15. Some tentative comparative remarks are in my: *Renesansni istoriohrafichni mify v Ukrajinі*, in: *Ukrajina XVII stolittja. Suspil'stvo, filosofija, kul'tura*. Zbirnik pam'jati Valeriji Nichyk, Kyjiv 2005, pp. 421-435.

¹² Among the most important works about these issues cf.: F.E. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600 – 1653*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1985; Idem, *The Cultural, Social and Political Context of Ukrainian History-Writing: 1620-1690* “Europa Orientalis”, 5, Roma 1986. P. 297-302; S. Ploky, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 111-144; Яковенко Н., Паралельний світ. Дослідження з історії уявлень та ідей в Україні XVI – XVII ст., Київ, Критика 2002; Drozdowski M., *Religia i Kozaczyzna w Rzeczypospolitej w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo DiG, 2008.

specifically the Russian and Church Slavonic ones. *Runo oroshennoe*, devoted to miracle working icons of the Virgin of Chernyhiv, was the author's first published work. The basically Church Slavonic, though still ruthenized language indicates that the intent of the work was to reach first Ukrainian believers, but Russian and other orthodox readers were certainly addressed as well. The highly sophisticated work, commissioned by and devoted to the archbishop L. Baranovych, is deeply rooted in the realia of the Chernyhiv eparchy through its main subject. It is equally rooted in the syncretism of Ukrainian 'neo-scholastic' learning and the Ukrainian society of the time represented in some "miracles" by specifically Ukrainian 'acting persons'. The intention of both 'patron' and author, however, aimed at including each miracle of the Chernyhiv icon in the framework of the most sacred and ancient tradition of universal orthodox church history, thus conveying sacral prestige and historical mythopoietic background to the Virgin of the Elijah monastery and – through that – to Baranovych's eparchy, at the same time including them in a Russian and a pan-orthodox system of values.

The coexistence of a pan-orthodox and a local perspective, so evident in *Runo oroshennoe*, is coherent with the religious and ecclesiastic worldview of Baranovych, his ambitious anti-ottoman programs and his desire to influence the court of the czar. The 'reception-history' brings to analogous conclusions: *Runo oroshennoe* had many editions and circulated widely with progressive 'russianisation' until the last edition issued in the 1750s (probably connected with Tuptalo's sanctification)¹³. The work thus represents the peculiar situation of the Hetmanate in the time of Samojlovych and Mazepa, with both a local, an Eastern-pan-slavic and a pan-orthodox "situational functioning", and the progressive russianisation of the Ukrainian heritage. In an ideal

¹³ For more details about the issues connected with this work cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *Old and New Narrative: "Runo Oroshennoe" by Dimitrij Tuptalo, Metropolitan of Rostov*, in: "Starobălgarska literatura" (Jubileen sbornik v chest na 60-godishninata na Krasimir Stanchev i Aleksandăr Naumov), kn. 41-42, Sofija 2009, pp. 359-366. About the canonisation of Dmytro Tuptalo cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *La canonizzazione del primo santo del Settecento russo: storia e funzione*, in: *Liturgia ed agiografia tra Roma e Costantinopoli. Atti del 1. e 2. Seminario di Studio (Analekta Grottaferrata)*, Roma-Grottaferrata 2000-2001, a cura di K. Stantchev, S. Parenti, Grottaferrata, Monastero Esarchico, 2007, pp. 381-393.

‘canon’ of Ukrainian literature, though written by a Ukrainian son of a *sotnik*, for a Ukrainian bishop and his printing press in Ruthenian Church Slavonic, *Runo* may be considered less ‘central’ than Kossov’s previous achievement, though the latter was written in Polish.¹⁴

The history of reception of *Runo* has its parallel in the evolution of the author’s self-perception in diacronic perspective: after the turmoils of the 1660s-1670s, in the 1680s and – mostly – 1690s, the Kyivan learned monks could feel secure in a strong and flourishing Hetmanate, though now depending from the Muscovite patriarchate; they were aware of their cultural superiority with respect to Muscovy and contrast between religious universalism and regional pride was mostly latent, in spite of the conflicts between Muscovite Patriarchs and Kyivan learned tradition. The situation changed radically when, after 1700, the same learned monks lived and worked in Russia and felt that the Petrine reforms made their cultural background rapidly obsolete, even ostensibly ‘unwanted’, so that they could not be published. As we will see later, in the first years of the 18th c. the sense of ‘otherness’ dominates letters and non-official writings of the learned monks. Varlaam Jasyns’kyj’s death (1707)¹⁵ is a symbolical date to mark the beginning of the sense of extraneousness which may be considered for us (to-day) a further paradigm of evaluation of Ukrainian specificity in the literary heritage of the 17th-18th century. Baranovych escaped this experience, but Dimitrij Rostovskij had to experiment all the bitterness of the advancing process of russianization (or “malorossianisation”).

1.2.2 – *Panegyric literature*. Panegyric genres were dominant in Ukrainian printings: according to the catalogue by Zapasko and Isajevych, panegyric works are almost 140, while the second most represented genre (polemical works) has only about 50 items, sermon collections have 28, hagiography 19 titles. As a matter of fact

¹⁴ The iconography of some of *Runo*’s editions give also interesting indications, cf. S. Plochy, *Tsars and Cossacks*, cit., pp. 41-42, 53.

¹⁵ T.G. Tairova-Jakovleva (*Ivan Mazepa i Rossijskaja Imperija. Istorija “predatel’sstva”*, Moskva-Sankt-Peterburg 2011) has shown how crucial 1707 was for the political evolution of Mazepa’s hetmanate.

the Zapasko-Isajevych catalogue does not represent a totally exact differentiation. Besides opacity concerning religious literature typical of Soviet times, a great amount of panegyrics have a doubtful status as to their “ukraineness”. They are not only written in Polish, but are commissioned by, devoted to and destined to circulation among Polish personalities. Ukraine as a place of printing is probably in several cases a feeble marker of a ‘national canon’ (even for pre-modern standards).

However, many panegyrical works have a high status in the definition of a ‘Ukrainian canon’ of the time of Baroque. The most beautiful editions are famous for complicated playing with words and images, typical of European Baroque; the formal aspects – partition of “chapters”, versification, images, syncretism of arts, rhetoric and poetic figures – elaborate Polish models and apply the dominant rules of rhetorics and poetics; intermingling of biblical quotations and classical *exempla* connect these works with pan-European Baroque and with the syncretism of Christian and ancient symbolism peculiar to the Polish Commonwealth. Moreover, the issue of ascribing works (or a whole genre) to one literary canon or another is made complex by the existence of internal differentiations inside singular literary canons. Indeed, according to recent scholarship, Polish language panegyric literature presents strong areal differentiations even inside the broad literary canon defined as Polish: abundant ornamentation and exceedingly long dimensions characterize Polish panegyrics contained in manuscripts of the Lithuanian lands of the Commonwealth¹⁶. Inside the Commonwealth, areal specificity is even more evident in Ukrainian panegyrics, regardless of the language used: images based on heraldic symbols create perceptible connections with the *realia* of the place and time; printing and engraving methods are typical products of Ukrainian typographers; syncretism of Christian and

¹⁶ Cf. J. Niedźwiedź, *Nieśmiertelne teatru sławy. Teoria i praktyka twórczości panegirycznej na Litwie w XVII-XVIII w.*, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2003, and also the interesting proposal of an “internal comparatistic approach” in K. Ziemia, *Projekt komparatystyki wewnętrznej*, in: “Teksty drugie”, 91/92, 2005, 72-82. For the declamatory origin of the complex compositions of heraldic panegyric poetry see: W. Kroll, *Heraldische Dichtung bei den Slaven*, Wiesbaden 1986, pp. 17 ss., 1107-118.

ancient symbolism are not only constant in Ukrainian panegyric literature, but express specific symbolism of Kyivan devotion and ‘mythology’.

So: what makes 17th c. panegyrics Ukrainian, rather than Polish or Russian?

We may agree with M. Erdmann, the editor of *Stolp cnot Syl'vestra Kossova* (1658) that the ‘specificity’ of Ukrainian Baroque texts lay less in language or formal devices, than in the content and in their religious-polemic orientation, while the choice of the language is apparently not always determinant¹⁷. Among the Christian virtues of the deceased Metropolitan the author¹⁸ of *Stolp cnot* extols first patience and ability to convince the others (i.e. rhetoric skills), but most remarkable seems to be his large and “up to date” culture footed on learning and religion of the very heart of the Kyivan tradition: thanks to his learning he fostered and made its ‘people’ known among the other peoples, thus gaining the highest appreciation for himself and for his “Rossian” country – even enemies recognised his merits. Culture and religion are inseparable, the Orthodox *ecclesia* represents the center of self-identification, but the author compares the authority and excellence of the Metropolitan to that of emperors and kings,¹⁹ thus giving a ‘political’ significance to religious culture. The unity of Kyivan and “Halyckyj kraj” (p. 96) is reminded of in several places: ecclesiastic unity matches the (almost) constant political idea of uniting the Ukrainian lands, which nurtered Ukraine after Kosov until the end of Mazepa’s time. In the final “Threny” the author stresses the importance of Kosov not just as Metropolitan, but as Exarch of the Patriarch: significantly enough, the Exarchate is mentioned in the final parts, thus acting as “conclusions”; the *ornatus* confers the passage particular pathos and rhetoricity. Most important is the link to the “apostolic” nature of the Church were Kosov served as Exarch: playing with ambiguity between the Constantinopolitan and the Kyivan Sees, the author makes the “Kyivan New

¹⁷ M. Erdmann, *Heraldische Funeralpanegyrik des ukrainischen Barock. Am Beispiel des “Stolp cnot Syl'vestra Kossova”*, (Vorträge und Abhandlungen der Slavistik, Bd. 37), München 1999, pp. 15 ff.

¹⁸ The young Baranovych as main author probably had numerous fellows participating in the ‘construction’ of the text (cf. M. Erdmann, *Heraldische Funeralpanegyrik...*, cit., pp. 18-19).

¹⁹ E.g., p. 28-29 in the reprint of the text by M. Erdmann, *Heraldische Funeralpanegyrik ...*, quoted above.

Jerusalem” both dependent and equal to Constantinople. Kossov is told to have occupied the “ravnoapostolnyj prestol” (p. 98), thus introducing the image-symbols of Volodymyr and Constantine in a sort of equal dignity.²⁰ Apostolic origin was fundamental in the affirmation of the Orthodox Kyivan church (let us remind the legend of the five baptisms, the first being by st. Andrew the Apostle). The very fact of recalling the medieval Kyivan Christian foundation “myth” evokes the author’s conscious will to legitimate the past heritage of the Ukrainian lands (no less important was Mohyla’s restoration of the Church of Tith founded by Volodymyr) and matches Baranovych’s almost constant opposition to submission to the Muscovite Patriarchate²¹. All these features adapt excellently to Baranovych as a possible (main?) author.

Similar markers of Ukrainian specificity appeared earlier in the *Funeral Panegyric for hetman Petro Konashevych Sahajdachnyj*,²² who died 1622 in the service of the Polish king because of the injuries received in the battle of Xotyn. This panegyric is a collection of short poems written by (or in the name of) prominent citizens of both laic and ecclesiastic status, edited by Kasijan Sakovych. The imprint of Polish verse and frequent antique reminiscences place the poems in the frame of Renaissance culture. The topoi and images match the laic character of the protagonist, giving the hetman a gygantic moral and civic dimension. His virtues are military (skills as chief of the Cossack community, endurance in war), civic (faithfulness to the ‘homeland’ and the sovereign, indefatigable activity), and religious (faultless devotion to the defense of “holy faith” against “pagan Tatars and Turcs” ‘). This ideal image of the perfect ‘lycar’ is very similar to the Polish ‘rycer’.

²⁰ Reminiscencies from Ilarion’s “Slovo o zakone i blagodat” have been observed (Erdmann, cit., p. 127).

²¹ For the ‘long duration’ of the idea of the Constantinopolitan jurisdiction of Kyiv, cf. V. Zhivov, *Iz cerkovnoj istorii vremen Petra Velikogo*, NLO, Moskva 2004. On Baranovych cf.: T. Chynczewska-Hennel, *Pojednanie polsko-ukraińskie w wierszach Łazarza Baranowicza*, in: *Kultura staropolska – kultura europejska. Prace ofiarowane Januszowi Tazbirowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, Warszawa: Semper, 1997, pp. 325-329; D.A. Frick, *Lazar Baranovych, 1680: The Union of Lech and Rus*, in: *Culture, Nation and Identity. The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600-1945)*, Eds. A. Kappeler, Z. E. Kohut, F. E. Sysyn, and M. von Hagen. Edmonton-Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 2003, pp. 19-56.

²² I quote from the edition *Ukrajins’ka literatura XVII st.*, red. O. Myshanych, Kyiv 1987.

Nonetheless, the personality of Sahajdachnyj conveys the main moral and civic ideals of Ukrainian society: He is the pillar of the Cossack host without which Ukraine would not exist (p. 221), he belongs to the noble ‘seed’ of Japhet, his ancestors arrived as conquerors to Constantinople with the “Rossian monarch” Oleh and were baptised with Volodymyr (p. 221). Not only a warrior, he was taught the “good orthodox letters” at the glorious school of Ostrog: “it would not be easy to find another similar Zamojski, who knew how to use the sword and the pen” and engaged his high intellect to ask “his lord-king on behalf of our true holy faith” (231). Here too, no less important is the reminding of the unity of Ukraine: his immortal glory “will last until the Dnipro and the fishy Dnister will flow”. Greece glorifies Nestor, Achill, Pericles, Troy glorifies Hector, Rome the Curtiuses and Pompeus – the author continues – we may be proud of our hetman who lies in this grave for the defence of the fatherland (234). I will not engage here on the meaning of “ojchyzna”, but the consciousness of a centuries old culture sustained by both military-civil and religious values gives unquestionable evidence of the ‘Ukrainian nature’ of the panegyric and may be considered as a contribution to the consciousness of a ‘proto-national’ identity existing side by side (or in spite of) a co-existing political Polish loyalty. A special traditional flair is given by details such as the rivers “rich in fishes”; the Greec, Roman, Trojan parallels of the glorification of the hetman remind the 11th century glorification of Volodymyr by Ilarion; some images hint to folkish tradition, e.g. the “Germans eating white bread with butter” while the Cossack hetman endures privation and hard warrior virtues, or the metaphors of battles – well-known in many chronicles and war accounts – as breakfast and lunch that the pagans wanted to eat, while it was the Cossacks who sent the Infidels to Pluton’s realm for dinner (p. 231).

Kosov’s and Zahajdachnyj’s panegyrics were written in *prosta mova*. In the last decades of the 17th century the existence of a splendid princely court around Mazepa and his ambitions to unite Left and Right Bank Ukraine in a centralized, hereditary autonomous Hetmanshchyna, fostered the appearance of many remarkable panegyrics. They were all extremely long, elaborated and filled with ancient

allegories and biblical referencies. The dominant language of these panegyrics was no longer *prosta rus'ka mova*, but Polish, frequently alternated by Latin.

Indeed, Polish remained a broadly used language in Ukraine still in the 18th century, though it acquired different functions in society. The existence of a court is fundamental for the developement of a cultural and literary system in a proto-modern society. The Mazepian culture and literary system were 'products' of the court no less than of the Mohylean College, literature was united by a set of generally recognised values, where religion, tradition, civic, juridical and war customs transmitted by some generations, and the construction of a collective memory reaching Middle Ages began to be consciously perceived as a coherent system of reference for the dominant part of both laic and ecclesiastic elites. As an expression of the culture of that period and part of that system, literature was plurilingual: since that system thought, spoke, learned and communicated in 4 languages, it is natural that the literary canon was expressed in the same four languages. Even if teaching and cultivating "the sciences in our Slavonic writing"²³ – as Sakovych put it – was considered as the highest intellecual achievement and the majority of polemical literature was written in (more or less 'slavonicized') *prosta mova*, the use of several languages remained a constant feature of Ukrainian culture and literature until at least the 1720s. The variability in the choice and functions of the language depends on multifarious factors, related to the kind of cultural training of each writer (his schooling, his readings, his familiar ties), mainly to the situation of communication.

In the time of Mazepa's hetmancy the main language practiced for laudatory literature at the court for the new "prince" was apparently Polish. The spoken language of courtiers was certainly Ukrainian, but poets felt themselves as the receivers of the inspiration of the Muses, endowed with the gift to distribute eternal glory to their Mecenas. Such a high duty and pleasure needed a prestigious language with adequate rhetoric and poetic means to be used, and with the whole system of Classic mythological referencies at one's disposal for creating the necessary

²³ "*Ukrain's'ka literatura*", cit., 229. The term "pys'mo slovenske" probably encompasses both *prosta mova* and (Ruthenian) Church Slavonic.

historical narrative for the present glory. The names of Jan Ornovs'kyj and Pylyp Orlyk are the most famous, but several others could be added. Besides courtiers, Polish was used with no less ease and mastery by monks who were trained in Polish Jesuit colleges: the most famous was Stefan Javors'kyj, the author of long and extremely elaborated panegyrics for the glorification of the hetman and of Metropolitan Jasyn'skyj. Jasyns'kyj himself was trained in Cracow and certainly appreciated Polish written panegyrics (though, for purposes of communicating with the flock of orthodox believers he wrote his sermons in *prosta mova*)²⁴. Polish (and partially Latin) was also the language of the memorial writing devoted to Joasaph Krokovs'kyj in 1708, just to quote a text that has remained practically unknown²⁵. Thus, Polish gained in functional importance in Ukraine during Mazepa's hetmanship, it became a sort of official "ceremonial language" for the hetmanate. This was due to personal tastes and to the fact that the elites, both laic and ecclesiastic, were mostly trained in Polish high schools. However, the fact that monastic elites as well used Polish when dealing with official life may be a symptom of the "symphonic" cooperation between state and church that found its last harmonious fulfillment in the Ukrainian hetmanate until 1707 (the year of Varlaam Jasyns'kyj's death)²⁶. For ecclesiastic purposes (religious literature, sermons) the languages used were Church Slavonic and *prosta mova*, but the use of Polish as a language of the court may probably be considered a marker of the Ukrainian specificity with respect to Moscow. The linguistic situation and practice marks a

²⁴ The unique autograph lays unpublished, waiting restoration since 20 years. When will the time arrive to have it at least on a microfilm or scanned on a CD in order to make a printed edition?

²⁵ *Chmarny Andreas. Domus sapientiae ... Joasapho Krokowski Archipraesuli Kiiovensii oblata cum Basilicam Adorem reum intraverit*, Kyiv, Drukarnia lavry, 1708 (quoted in the catalogue of Ja. Zapasko-Ja. Isajevych, *Pam'jatky knyzhkovoho mystectva. Kataloh starodrukiv, vydanyx na Ukrajinii*, II,1, p. 24 (N° 843) and in Estreicher (14, 169). Cf. Xv. Titov, *Materialy dlja istoriji knyzhkovoji spravy na Ukrajinii v XVI-XVIII vv., Vsezbirka peredmov do ukrajins'kyx starodrukiv*, Kyjiv 1924, 533; S.I. Maslov, *Katalog juvylejnoviji vystavy ukrajins'koho drukarstva*, K. 1925, 174).

²⁶ I wrote more about this issue in: *The Hetman and The Metropolitan. Cooperation Between State and Church in The Time Of Varlaam Jasyns'kyj*, in: *Mazepa e il suo tempo: storia, società, cultura – Mazepa and His Time: History, Society, Culture*, a cura di G. Siedina, Dell'Orso Editore, Alessandria 2004, pp. 417-444.

strong differentiation between the princely court of Mazepa and the Imperial Muscovite court, where Polish soon became no longer “fashionable” at the court of the tzars after Sophia’s (and Golitsyn’s) deposition.

The unsatisfactory level of investigation makes it impossible to have exact ideas about the functional status of the languages used in the hetmanate, but the mentioned facts seem to allow the following hypothesis: During the period of Polish political supremacy the most important panegyrics were written in *prosta mova*; in Mazepa’s time, under Muscovite dominance, courtiers preferred Polish. It is hard to believe that this was due only to the greater perfection of Polish language and rhetorical possibilities of expression. I would suggest that the choice of language expressed also the desire to differentiate oneself from the politically dominant culture. Thus, *prosta mova* was used under Polish domination, Polish under Russian domination. At the present state of the art this is only a hypothesis, but it astonishingly fits the linguistic situation of our days. It seems to be a constant ‘marker of self-identification’ for Ukrainian elites...

1.2.3 – *Sermons*. Ukrainian authors wrote in Polish through the whole of the 17th, even in the 18th century. Polish was the language of social and literary prestige, an excellent tool not only for ‘worldly’ communication, but also for religious polemical literature aimed at nobilitating by scholarship the “true faith” and opposing the Polish-speaking adversary (e.g. the works by M. Smotryc’kyj). It was even the language of such important texts as confessions of faith (beginning with Mohyla’s “Lithos”) or hagiographic poetry (Baranovych).

While Polish, as a full-fledged literary language, could be used in very differentiated situations and dominated panegyric literature in the second half of the 17th c., sermons were mostly written in *prosta mova*. The alternative to this language was Church Slavonic. Sermons were addressed to a broad public and had to be written in a comprehensible language, they are both testimonies of the mentality and customs, and containers of rules of behaving of the society where they circulated.

The sermons that were printed in Kyiv were mostly addressed to the classes that represented the nucleus of Ukrainian ‘conscious’ society: *starshyna*, educated monks and priests, a part of burghers, cossacks and landowners that identified themselves with the idea of *hetmashchyna*; *prosta mova* was the language of that kind of communication. It is interesting to remark the difference between Galjatovs’kyj and Radyvylovych on the one side, Baranovych on the other: the latter wrote sermons for the Tsar, the language could not be but Church Slavonic, virtues and vices are classified following the needs and mentality of the highest ranks of an already ‘imperial’ court bound to traditional Orthodox thinking, though expressed through selected features of Western Baroque origin; the former wrote sermons for a society where social stratification was much more differentiated and schools existed even among low strata. In my opinion, the fact that Baranovych’s sermons could not be printed in Moscow only indicate how different that society was, in spite of the author’s (and Simeon Polockij’s) efforts²⁷.

1.2.4 – *Hagiographic poetry*. L. Baranovych is one of the most emblematic and intriguing figures for such issues as: a) the choice of language with relationship to the situation of communication and b) the possibility of ascribing works or authors to one literary canon and/or to other(s). He used Church Slavonic for the sermons he devoted to the tsar and other minor doctrinal writings connected with his activity as an editor and publisher, but his most original works are written in Polish. *Apollo chreściański* (1670) and *Lutnia apollinowa* (1671) follow Polish language and versification and make extremely complex use of Sarbiewski’s teaching of conceptistic poetry. Regardless of their aesthetical value, Baranovych’s verses are the

²⁷ *Mech duxovnyj* and *Truby sloves propovednyx* were printed in Kyiv resp. 1666 and 1674. Cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *Barokova homiletyka u sxidnoslov’jans’komu kul’turnomu prostori*, in: *Contributi italiani al XIV Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti* (Ohrid 10-16 settembre 2008), FUP, Firenze 2008, pp. 179-200, with the quoted bibliography; Eadem, *Lazar’ Baranovich v pol’skoj i cerkovnoslavjanskoj ipostasi*, in: *Verenica liter: K 60-letiju V.M. Zhivova*, otv. red. A. M. Moldovan, M., Jazyki kul’tury 2006, pp. 327-340. A comparative analysis with Simeon Polckij’s sermons (*Obed dushevnyj*, 1681, and *Večerja dushevnaia*, 1683, is badly needed. I will return on the subject here down (§ 2.1 and 2.2).

most comfortably fitting into a canon of Polish literature: indeed, some of them were included into anthologies of Polish poetry²⁸. When looking for markers of a Ukrainian identity of these two collections of Polish poems, the ethnic origin and the belonging to the highest ranks of the hierarchy of the Kyivan Metropolitan jurisdiction are relevant but not self-sufficient. *Lutnia* is probably the most marginal collection of poems in a Ukrainian perspective, though, even in the perspective of Polish ‘canonical’ standards, his hypertrophic conceptism is peculiar and reminds the exceeding length and complexity of the baroque tradition of the Eastern parts of the Rzeczpospolita²⁹. Easier to be collocated is *Apollo chreścijański*, published in another edition with the title *Żywoty świętych* in the same year. There are 3 different variants of the book: the first bears also Latin and Polish dedicatory verses, the second has one variant with dedication to tsar Fedor, the other without dedication. This gives an insight in the destination of the book and the intentions of the author. He wanted the book to circulate in the Polish Commonwealth as a proof of the spiritual dignity of Kyiv, its Cave Monastery, its Orthodox Metropolitan See. He wanted it to circulate also at the court of the tsar (who was an admirer of Polish verse and chants), probably aiming at facilitating the utopical plans of a common Roman Catholic and Muscovite antiosmanic crusade.

The pantheon of saints included in *Żywoty* reveals at the same time the pan-orthodox encompassing frame and the existence of a specific “Kyivan canon”. Among the many saints belonging to the general liturgical calendar, special attention is devoted to the Kyivan saints: Anthony and Theodosius, Volodymyr and his sons, and – among the holy priests – Metropolitans Peter, Aleksij and Ionas. Considering the length and multiplicity of texts devoted to him, st. John the Baptist seems to have enjoyed peculiar veneration. However, the “western” saints Gregory the Great, Benedict and Ambrose are present too. Remarkable is the fact that Volodymyr, Boris and Gleb and Metropolitans Peter, Aleksij and Ionas, though venerated in Muscovy,

²⁸ Cf. *Helikon Sarmacki. Wątki i tematy polskiej poezji barokowej, Wybór...i komentarze* Andrzej Vincenz, Wrocław etc. 1989.

²⁹ As mentioned in the book by J. Niedźwiedź, *Nieśmiertelne teatru sławy...* (cf. here above p. ?? and footnote 15).

were recognised by Western hagiology of Counterreformation and included in the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum*.³⁰ In my opinion, this kind of saintly pantheon aimed at underlining the possibility of uniting Eastern and Western Church traditions for the common Holy War, and the unity of the ancient Metropolia of Rus'. This unity was characterised, however, by the recognition of the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan See, the one that consecrated Peter, Aleksij and (partially) Ionas, and by the evident priority of the Kyivan See with respect to the Muscovite. Baranovych's work appears to be addressed to the whole Eastern-Slavic *ecclesia*, but has special ties with the Cave monastery and with the cultural sphere of Ukraine, both sacred and political. *Żywoty świętych* was published when Kyiv was still under Constantinopolitan jurisdiction.

No less worth to be noted is the specificity of Baranovych's *Apollo* from the point of view of the composition of the single lives. Contrary to traditional hagiographical texts, their narrative elements are very scanty: more than *vitae* they remind short eulogies giving evidence of the specificity of their 'category' (martyrs, witnesses, holy priests, apostles [or 'equal to apostles'], hermits) and singing their praises. Though the influence of Piotr Skarga and Surius is generally admitted and the constant use (and abuse) of the most audacious formal devices (metaphors, word plays, verses and strophe building) and topoi (vanity of earthly goods, life as dream, clepsidre, etc.) make of *Żywoty* a most typical fruit of flourishing European Baroque, they present similarities with the Church Slavonic tradition of the "Prolog", the collections of short lives in verses, current in the Orthodox church liturgical practice since its Medieval Byzantine beginnings.

³⁰ Cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *The utopia of the Ecclesiastical union in the 18th Century: J.S. Assemani*, in: *Filologia e letteratura nei paesi slavi*, Roma 1990, p. 669-679; Eadem, *The Cyrillo-methodian Tradition and the Russian Christianity in the Counter-Reformation*, in: *The Legacy of saints Cyril and Methodius to Kiev and Moscow*, Thessaloniki 1992, p. 521-534; Eadem, *I "Żywoty Świętych" di Łazarz Baranowicz*, in: *Scritti in memoria di Andrzej Litwornia*, a cura di A. Ceccherelli, E. Jastrzebowska, L. Marinelli, M. Piacentini, A.M. Raffo, G. Ziffer, Roma-Varsavia : Accademia Polacca delle Scienze (Conferenze, 120), Biblioteca e Centro di Studi a Roma, 2007, p. 81-97.

Thus, Baranovych's works give the probably brightest evidence of the complexity of the Ukrainian cultural, linguistic and historical pluralism "between East and West", to use Ihor Shevchenko's universally known formula. He represents at the best the Ukrainian literary and cultural canon, being at the same time a part of the Polish literary tradition, a part of a pan-Orthodox Church Slavonic literature, and a concentrate of Ukrainian schooling, literary taste, linguistic use, ecclesiastic thinking, political ambiguity. The 'centrality' or 'marginality' of the belonging to each of the three canons (Polish, Ukrainian, Church Slavonic) may probably best be evaluated when considering each of the poet's works distinctly. As a complex they fit at the best in the Ukrainian canon, mostly as a result of the ideas and the cultural values transmitted in his various languages and formal devises.

2.1 – *Ukrainian literature in Polish and Russian perception.* Polish literary criticism has rarely included Ukrainian panegyrists, theologians, preachers or polemicists in the Polish 'canon' of literature. This suggests that: first, the content, the transmitted ideas, the situational character, the 'set of values' recognized as compelling and dominant by the society of the *hetmashchyna* was sufficiently different with respect to the Polish society, in spite of the fact that the idea of the "rycer", and the military and political patrimony he carried with, was characterized by very similar basic markers in the Ukrainian and the Polish tradition of the Commonwealth; second, the social pressure of the highly developed Polish language was not a fundamental danger for the development of a Ukrainian self-consciousness in both literary and civilizational terms. The iniquities and violences Ukrainians suffered from Polish side notwithstanding, it appears that the cultural and linguistic superiority did not aim at really 'including', assimilating Ukrainian culture, language or literature. The Polish 'refusal' to consider Polish-language Ukrainian literature as its 'own' patrimony unveils an attitude of superiority that may appear 'chauvinistic', but at the same time implies that the attitudes of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was not really 'imperialistic': it allowed, and somehow (inconsciously) fostered the

development of a civic, civilizational and literary – if not politic – self-consciousness. This should be taken into serious consideration when writing the history of Ukraine, mainly when considering the development of that history after the 1660s, under Russian domination.

Indeed, relationship to Russian literature and literary criticism appears more complicated. Ruthenian Baroque literature is traditionally considered as part of the Russian literary discourse, what is partially correct as a consequence of the fact that the Ruthenian erudite monks wrote a considerable part of their most important works at the Muscovite court. Connective ties between Ruthenian and Russian Baroque cultures are very strong, both genetically and typologically. Orthodoxy was a tremendous unifying factor, in spite of the doctrinary disputes between the Muscovite Patriarchs and the Kyivan tradition.

Nonethelss, the question is much more complicated if one analyzes single works in the general context. Is it adequate to consider Javor'skyj's sermon *Vinograd Christov* (1698) or the panegyrics for Mazepa as part of a book devoted to Russian Baroque literature?³¹ One may consider the possibility that panegyrics were written also to implement Mazepa's prestige in Moscow. Nor is it indifferent that the main theme of such an important panegyric as Pylyp Orlyk's *Hyppomenes sarmacki* (1698) is the glorification of the groom – Mazepa's nephew Jan Obidovs'kyj – as the “stolnik” of the tzar: Orlyk's eulogy is very strongly oriented towards the ‘Russian (imperial) horizon’ and perfectly takes into account the political situation of real (and apparently immutable) dependence of the hetmanate from the tsar.

Nonetheless, the textual and intertextual connections of the panegyrics devoted to Mazepa with the complex of literary, social and political ‘markers’ of the Kyivan tradition are so strong that an inclusion in a Russian literary ‘canon’ is problematic: these panegyrics were produced and printed in Ukraine, in one of the languages (Polish) that normally circulated in the *hetmanshchyna* (but did no longer in Russia), addressed to the hetman, its court and the Kyivan ecclesiastic and civic

³¹ L. I. Sazonova, *Literaturnaja kul'tura Rossii. Rannee Novoe vremja*, Moskva 2006 (esp. 483-518).

community, based on a system of values that were essential for the Cossack ‘state’ and its dominant society, but were not peculiar for the Russian state (where they progressively acquired negative significance in the period of growing pressure of Peter’s power). I would add that, in spite of the similarity of Baroque stylistic and topical devices all over Europe, the character of Russian and Ukrainian use of those European devices is not identical: not only the language had to be ‘russianised’, but it is evident that Ukrainians were fond of the most ornate, up to extravagant forms of “flowery” baroque, while Russians tended to more simple, linear forms. The – sometimes exaggerated – cumulation of metaphors and allegories of Ukrainians may be considerably different in stylistic use of techniques and results (in content and form) from the Russian poems often based on simple comparison and characterized by declared and ‘transparent’ quotations from Scriptures or other authorities.³² The issue remains open by now, but it deserves more attention in scholarship. Similar considerations fit to Javors’kyj’s sermon of 1698: written and printed in Ukraine, in *prosta mova* and Church Slavonic, addressed to the public of nobles and Cossacks participating in the wedding of Mazepa’s nephew (and supposed heir), it hardly fits in a history of Russian Baroque literature. All the more so, that nuptial sermons were not foreseen in wedding ceremonies in Russia and remained extraneous to the Russian church until at least the beginning of the 18th c.³³ No nuptial sermon is in Simeon Polockij’s editions.

³² Unfortunately, investigation on the matter is just beginning. Besides the excellent work done by L. Sazonova, I may quote P. Cotta Ramusino, *Un poeta alla corte degli zar. Karion Istomin e il panegirico imperiale*, Alessandria 2002, who devotes much attention to the formal differences in literary style between Karion Istomin and Italian prototypes of emblem literature. Cf. also my tentative analysis of some sermons by Baranovych and its Ukrainian and Russian context quoted in footnote 27.

³³ G. Brogi Bercoff, *Die Kunst der Variation: zur Barockpredigt in der Ukraine und in Russland*, in: *Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia Byzantina. Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag*, a cura di D. Christians, D. Stern, V. Tomelleri, (Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe – 3), Otto Sagner Verlag, München – Berlin 2009, pp. 375-389; Eadem, *Modele teoretyczne i ich aktualizacja w siedemnastowiecznym kaznodziejstwie na przykładzie Mowy duchownej Piotra Mohyły*, in: *Libris satiari nequeo. Oto ksiąg jestem niesyty*, redakcja naukowa: Joanna Partyka, Ariadna Masłowska-Nowak, Wydawnictwo IBL, Warszawa 2010, pp. 55-62. On a rather late and partial penetration of Ruthenian models cf. also H. Rothe, *Religion und Kultur in den Regionen des Russischen Reiches im 18. Jh.*, Opladen 1984.

2.2 – *Self-perception of the authors and modern conceptualisation.* The facts mentioned above do not exclude that in the hetmanate of the late 17th and early 18th c. there were kinds of literature which had less defined lines of delimitation with respect to other literary canons and had less evident ‘markers of specificity’. This literature is mainly written in Church Slavonic and has liturgical, doctrinary or devotional character. This kind of writings was addressed to the broad Orthodox community of believers (and rulers), not only in the Eastern Slavic lands, but also to such areas as Serbia, Moldavia, Romania, Bulgaria. Indeed, it is a well known fact that Ukrainian learned monks had a considerable influence in the development of Serbian Baroque literature: Emanuel Kozachyns’kyj is just the best known of the Kyivan monks who lived and worked in Serbia. In the 1730s he organized a Collegium in Karlowitz and bound his celebrity mainly to a school-drama on Urosh the Fifth. South Slavic history writing was also influenced by Eastern Slavic learning: Dimitrij Tuptalo was venerated and quoted at the end of the 18th c. by the Bulgarian historian Spiridon Savva. It has to be stressed, however, that, in the 18th c., Kyivan Baroque models circulated in the pan-Orthodox Slavic world as part of the Russian-Slavic version of Baroque culture and had a prominently political significance as a ‘marker’ and a ‘carrier’ of Russian imperial anti-osmanic occupation in the Balkans. As a matter of fact, by the time of this Southern expansion of her culture, Ukraine as a separate region had already disappeared in the cultural map of Eastern Orthodox countries and the Russian interpretation of Orthodox Slavic culture gave origin to an imperial pan-Slavic ideology with political significance whose career lasts up to our days.

This does not mean, on the other side, that religious Church Slavonic literature has no specific Ukrainian ‘markers’: they appear at all levels – graphic features, engravings, language, elaboration of Western culture, style, three- (or four-)fold interpretation of texts, philosophical training. The specificity of Baroque literature

appears in every area: the Serbian Baroque is a good example as well, both in word, painting and architecture, so is the Bulgarian Baroque³⁴. Nonetheless, for this kind of works it is not possible to ignore that they all belong to a supranational literary canon and that their position in the ‘national’ canons may be quite variable, sometimes posited in a pritty peripheral location.

For Ukrainian literature, in this sense, the most remarkable work is probably Tuptalo’s *Žitija svjatyh*. It is fully embedded in the Kyivan tradition of learning and writing, but its signification and impact for the whole Slavia Orthodoxa (until our days) locates it in a pan-Orthodox literary canon. What’s more, such was certainly the author’s intention: in the *weltanschauung* of the son of the Cossack *sotnik* Tuptalo, the belonging to the Ukrainian fatherland was in no way contradictory with the highest purpose of his life, i.e. to serve God, the only true Orthodox faith and the community of believers. A double ‘literary belonging’ should be considered ‘normal’ in the 17th-18th c., just as the ‘double identity’ (and loyalty) in the national self-consciousness of the time. For our contemporary need of finding parameters for description and definition of conceptual ‘grids’, this allows to look at the same works from several points of view. The same work or author may be considered as part of the evolution of a Polish, Russian or Church Slavonic literary canon, of a pan-Orthodox canon or a general European Baroque system of literary, mental, social, communicative paradygmes.

To conclude: The Russian literary canon and Russian literary criticism is much more inclusive with respect to Ukrainian baroque literature and much more work is needed to create a correct methodology and give a correct evaluation of the differentiations and overlappings between a Ukrainian and a Russian canon. Evidence is given by the last part of this paper, devoted to the literary activity of Javor’skyj and Tuptalo in emigration.

³⁴ M. Pavić, *Istorija srpske književnosti baroknog doba (XVII i XVIII vek)*, Beograd 1970 (esp. 260-283 and *passim*); *Il Barocco letterario nei paesi slavi*, a cura di G. Brogi Bercoff, NIS, Roma 1996.

2.3. – *The canon and the individual*. The fact notwithstanding that many of the dominant Baroque ‘markers’ of the 17th c. had their *longue durée* in the 18th c.³⁵, the year 1700 marks a real shift in the paradygme and the parameters of evaluation of a Ukrainian ‘canon’ and of its possible demarcation lines from other literary canons. Peter’s order to nominate Stefan Javors’kyj and Dmytro Tuptalo metropolitans of two sees in Russia marks a turning point in the evolution of the two leading writers and – with them – with the whole of Ukrainian intelligentsia. Apparently nothing changed until 1708: Prokopovych went on writing his sermons and treatises, his tragicomedy (devoted to Mazepa, *notabene!*); the College became an Accademy and had a brilliant activity; Mazepa’s court continued to function with its poets, colonels and learned monks; arts and architecture flourished as never before. Let us look, however, at the evolution of the literary activity of the two new Russian metropolitans: their example may serve as metonyms for the destiny of Ukrainian Baroque culture in the 18th century.

As a metropolitan of Rostov, Tuptalo wrote sermons for the main feasts of the Church Calender, adapting the written language to the Russian use of Church Slavonic.³⁶ His homiletic practice was mostly purely ecclesiastical, a differentiation with the sermons of the Kyivan period is probably difficult besides for language. Though, the issue needs to be investigated. Tuptalo tried to implant a school and ‘transplant’ scholastic theatre from Kyiv to Rostov: his efforts were soon frustrated by the “ministry” of church affairs by cutting financial support. In the last years of his life Tuptalo wrote a world-chronicle intended to transmit to priests, monks and believers basic knowledge of sacred history from the beginning of the world until

³⁵ Chyzhevskij’s *History of Russian literature* gives a good insight on the issue (esp. pp. 398-429). Still interesting are his remarks on the continuity between late 16th and 18th c., and the degree of acceptance of Western Baroque elements in Russia (pp. 320-326, 346-357). Cf. also C. Backvis, *Dans quelle mesure Deržavin est-il un baroque?*, in *Studies in Russian and Polish literature*, in honor of Waclaw Lednicki. Edited by Zbigniew Folejewski, The Hague 1962. The most recent and full discussion on the mentioned questions is obviously in L. I Sazonova’s books mentioned above.

³⁶ How did he pronounce his sermons is another question: it would be extremely interesting to investigate this aspect, though difficult it may be because of the lack of autographs.

Christ's incarnation: it was a blend between church history and biblical exegesis footing on Roman (Caesar Baronius' *Annales ecclesiastici*) and Flemish (Cornelius' a Lapide *Commentaria*) erudition of the Counter-Reformation, late Byzantine chronicles and patristic (Eastern and Western) tradition. In spite of Javors'kyj's efforts, nobody in Moscow or Petersburg was interested in publishing this work. One of Tuptalo's most remarkable works is the panegyric sermon written by the occasion of the death of Varlaam Jasyns'kyj (1707): it was published in the 19th c. Tuptalo's Church hymns are well known and beloved in both Russia and Ukraine, though mediocre as poetry, but his main work remain the 4 volumes of *Žitija svjatyh*, published in Kyiv.

All of Tuptalo's literary works are deeply rooted in the typically Kyivan syncretism of Western erudition of (Roman and German or Flemish) Counter-Reformation with copious remnants of the *long durée* of Western Medieval heritage, and of Slavo-Byzantine tradition represented by Metaphrastes, late chronicles, Makarij's *Chetii minej*, patristic literature. Western influence appears dominant, in spite of the constant use of Middle Ukrainian or Church Slavonic³⁷. The influence of Piotr Skarga was determinant, quotes from Western Church fathers are as numerous as from Eastern fathers. If we consider the general set of markers mentioned at the beginning, Tuptalo will certainly belong to a Ukrainian literary canon by his origin, self-consciousness, schooling, place of printing of the works, popularity. It is difficult however not to consider his pan-Slavic and pan-Orthodox significance, both in the Russian empire and outside. After his canonisation in the 1750s he belongs to the most venerated saints of the Russian Church, his cult began immediately after death in Rostov. To be sure, the Russian refusal to support his school and theater activity and to print his works written in Russia creates a gap between the writer and the public he wanted to address to, while in Ukraine he was fully integrated, from any

³⁷ Significantly enough, however, Tuptalo wrote the most of his *Diariusz* in Polish. About the letters I will write at the end. Cf. G. Marker, *A Saint's Intimate Life: The 'Diariusz' of Dimitrii Rostovskii*, in *Everyday Life in Russian History, Quotidian Studies in Honor of Daniel Kaiser*. G. Marker, J. Neuberger, M. Poe, and S. Rupp, eds. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2010, pp. 127–44.

point of view. However, after Peter's death, more specifically with the reign of Elisabeth, he became one of the most popular personalities of the Russian culture and pre-modern literature, both as a saint and as a writer. For Russia he was, and is, Dimitrij Rostovskij, not Dmytro Tuptalo. Russia appropriated him. Whether this is fair or not is another question, but it responds to the facts and also to the 'deep layers' his own personality from any point of view: his mind and his soul were oriented towards religious values. Values as state or nation were feeble concerns in his *weltanschauung*. He died – symbolically again – in october 1709.

The final destiny of Stefan Javors'kyj has several points in common with Tuptalo's, though differencies are deep in character, literary output and intellectual life.

In Russia, in his capacity of highest representative of the Russian Church (at least until the mid 1710s)³⁸, Javors'kyj wrote polemical tracts against "heretics", an important treatise about the opportunity of restoring an ecclesiastic authority connected with the Constantinopolitan patriarchal see³⁹, sermons for the feasts of the liturgical calendar, for baptisms and burials, for birth- and namedays of the imperial family, for Peter's victories or other political events. Beginning with 1714 he wrote his major work, *Kamen' very*, the first Church Slavonic theological treatise of the Orthodox faith, organised as a description and commentary to the sacraments. More erudite and philosophically

³⁸ He named himself "Exarque", probably not as a 'substitute' of the Patriarche of Moscow, but thinking of the Patriarche of Constantinople as the highest authority of jurisdiction, following the 'model' of the Kyivan Metropolitan see (cf. G. Brogi Bercoff, *A Marginal Note on Marginal Notes. The Library of Stefan Javorskij*, in: *Palaeoslavica*, X/ 2002, N. 1, p. 11-25; V. Zhivov, *Iz cerkovnoj istorii vremen Petra Velikogo...*, cit.

³⁹ V. M. Zhivov, *Iz cerkovnoj istorii vremen Petra Velikogo...*, cit.

trained, Javors'kyj made use of exactly the same kind of sources as Tuptalo: Counter-Reformation theology (Bellarmino as a main point of reference), Eastern and Western patristic literature, later Slavo-Byzantine tradition (rather sparingly, however), the whole organized following the system of Western neo-scholastic logical philosophy. The 1000-page thick volume could not be printed before his own and Peter's death. In Russia, Javors'kyj never wrote again panegyrics in the style of the ones he had written for Mazepa and Jasyms'kyj. Laudatory hyperboles for Peter appear in some of his sermons called by Russian scholars "pochvalitel'nye slova": as a matter of fact they represent only about 10% of his homilies, the others being of purely ecclesiastical character. A comparative analysis with the sermons of the Ukrainian period⁴⁰ has never been done, but there are elements to judge of the functional value of the sermons of the Russian period. The manuscript indicates that the preacher conceived his work basically as an ecclesiastical duty and a religious affair. Encomiastic sermons are the only ones published several times and (at least superficially) investigated: they are not necessarily the most convincing in literary and intellectual terms. Just to make an example, the sermon pronounced on the day of the anathema against Mazepa is rhetorically excellent, but ideologically at least ambiguous: the reader has often the impression to have to do with a laudation of the hetman rather than with his

⁴⁰ Unpublished until now.

cursing, though officially the latter was declared a bandit ("vor"), a Judas, an instrument of the Devil.⁴¹

To properly appreciate the function of Javors'kyj's huge homiletic activity and his interest for the juridic aspects of the position of Church and State, it is necessary to consider his deeds and intentions as a complex 'structure'. I will focus just one aspect: the monastery in Nizhin. Indeed, writing sermons for Peter and being his adviser for church affairs⁴² was a quite lucrative deal for the Metropolitan of Rjazan'. However, he did not use that money for his own benefit, even less for wordly sumptuousness: he invested the money to build the well-known monastery in Nizhin, an institution he wanted to be a center of monastic learning, a sort of haven for the culture he represented and he felt to be profoundly threatened in Peter's Russia. Significantly enough, he had to wait years to overcome Peter's refusal to let him go to Ukraine for the consecration of the new monastery church: by all evidence Peter was conscious of the ideological danger Javors'kyj and his milieu represented for him and his plans.

Javor'skyj worked the whole of his Russian life for the 'sacred' goal of 'his' monastery. Before dying, he wanted to send there his remarkable library and wrote the famous Latin *Elegy* to accompany the books: this remains probably his most beautiful poem, a fruit of Classical

⁴¹ Cf. my paper *Poltava: A Turning Point in History of Preaching* (to be published next in: *Poltava 1709: Revisiting a Turning Point in European History*, Marika Whaley S. Plokhii Eds.)

⁴² In Javors'kyj's marginal notes on his books there is evidence that he tried to be a 'guidance' for the tzar in the first years of his Russian life, when the still young tsar was just at the beginning of his reform activity (cf. G.Brogi Bercoff, *A Marginal Note on Marginal Notes...*, cit).

lyrical heritage filled with antique quotes (Ovid, Horace) though faithful to orthodox religious tradition.

During his Russian years Javors'kyj did not write other verses besides the *Elegy* mentioned above and two short poems, *Symbola* and *Emblemmata*, for the death of V. Jasyns'kyj: they were probably thought as epitaphs, but were never published before 1961. The 2 poems are written Church Slavonic, but their style and set of images is typical of the kind of poetry written in the author's Kyivan period. They were addressed to the Kyivan milieu, to his own 'master' and spiritual guide, to the greatest ecclesiastic and intellectual authority he recognized in this world.

Let us try now to arrange the mentioned works in a grid permitting to consider them part of one (or more) literary canon(s).

Javors'kyj's Kyivan works lay in the very center of a literary system that we may name a "Ukrainian canon": content, language(s), addressees and circulation conditions, author's intentions, ideological and political message, set of images, dimensions and 'flourishing' baroque 'taste' makes of the panegyrical works and the nuptial sermon⁴³ typical works of the Ukrainian tradition. To be sure, they are connected by deep intertextual links with the literary culture of the Polish Commonwealth, beginning with Polish language and versification, and the typical blending of Ancient and Christian tradition, as taught by Sarbiewski's most

⁴³ It is difficult to judge about the other Kyivan sermons, since they have not been investigated.

popular literary theories: in my mind, they belong to a Polish canon as well, though in a peripheral position. The 'most Polish' of Javors'kyj's works is probably a poem for the Virgin Mary dating back to the years of his education in Jesuit colleges: the autograph of the poem is in a book he bought in Poland; unfortunately there is no definitive evidence that he composed – and not simply copied – it. At the present state of the art, however, the poem may certainly be considered one of the hundreds of Polish Marian poems of the time⁴⁴. On the contrary, a belonging to a Russian canon of Javors'kyj's Polish-language works written in Ukraine seems problematic, though they were written within the boundaries of the Russian political system in its growing imperial nature and dimension. The influence of and the fashion of Polish culture and language was rapidly fading in Moscow since the 1690s. As for Latin language and poetry, they began to be used in academic training, but a real impact was probably to be felt mainly after Prokopovych's arrival in S. Petersburg: by that time Latin language and Classical culture spread, but were used mostly as means of propaganda for European powers, though they also acted for internal propaganda (e.g. in triumphal architecture)⁴⁵.

⁴⁴ Cf. my publication and analysis of the text in: *Niepublikowany wiersz Stefana Jaworskiego?*, in: "Terminus" (Kraków), 2004, N. 2, pp. 53-64.

⁴⁵ For the function of Latin in Russia, cf. my article *Plurilinguism in Russia and in the Ruthenian Lands ...*, cit., pp. 13-9. On the late knowledge of Classics in Russia cf.: M.J. Okenfuss, *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia*, Leiden etc., 1995, sp. 93 ff., . As far as the penegyric literature is concerned, the Ukrainian example of Mazepa's time was certainly most influential in this direction, though Prokopovych and his colleagues had probably Western models in mind as well (cf. *Panegiricheskaja literatura petrovskogo vremeni*, Izd. Izgotovil V.P.

Ambiguity in the 'canon belonging' of Javors'kyj's works begin after his (forced) emigration to Russia. The polemical tracts may be considered as part of Russian literature of the time, the fact notwithstanding that violent antiprotestant attitudes, nurtered by both Orthodox tradition and Jesuit schooling, are the probably most constant feature in the author's *Weltanschauung*, and that - on the other side - they belong to a general Eastern Slavic Orthodox canon. The sermons after 1700 may be ascribed to a Russian literary canon: they were written for Russian listeners in the context of the Russian church and state, in Russianised Church Slavonic, probably sometimes adapted to Peter's taste for brevity and intelligibility⁴⁶. Though, it is not deprived of significance that the autograph was prepared by the preacher himself to be possibly printed in Kyiv, not in Russia. The manuscript was only partially published as late as the 19th century⁴⁷ in Moscow. Moreover, such sermons would never have been written, not even conceived of without Kyivan, Polish and Western Catholic erudition. The 'ground of culture' from which the sermons grew out was implanted rather late and only partially in Russian tradition and the reception of Metropolitan Stefan's sermons in 18th c. Russia was not always enthousiastic⁴⁸:

Grebenjuk, p. red. O.A. Derzhavinoj, Moskva 1979; L.I. Sazonova, *Literaturnaja kul'tura...*, cit., esp. 363-425).

⁴⁶ Lacking scholarly investigation, mainly in comparison with the Kyivan period sermons, makes judgement difficult.

⁴⁷ *Propovedi*, I-III, 1804-5.

⁴⁸ As historians have it, in 1700 Peter was so impressed by Stefan's sermon for general Shein's death that he obliged Stefan to stay in Moscow. There were certainly other, deeper reasons for Peter's programmatical appointments of Ukrainians as church hierarches. Nonetheless, the clash

Prokopovych soon took Javors'kyj's place in the mind and heart of Peter, and Stefan's oppositors were always numerous in both 'capitals'. These 'functional' facts do not put Javors'kyj's sermons out of the Russian literary canon, but in a somewhat peripheral position: they have an aura of novelty, a shadow of estrangement in the Russian literary system where they penetrated as a constituent part only late. Indeed, a deep appropriation of Javors'kyj's homiletic heritage as 'really Russian' became definitive in the 19th century: by that time the Ukrainianness of the sermons was forgotten, while his orthodox and imperial components were stressed.

Somewhat analogous is the fate of *Kamen' very*, though this extraordinary achievement was soon recognized as a 'corner stone' for both Russian and pan-Orthodox culture and philosophy. The 'Ukrainianness' of this work is even more neglected by scholarship and public opinion: since the end of the 18th c. the work functions as the first testimonial of 'modern' Russian theology and the accomplishment of Russia's definitive acceptance of Western culture, hence of her own right to be considered a part of European culture. A reassessment of the proper place of this work (and others similar may be added, e.g. Tuptalo's *Letopisec*) should expressly acknowledge, – without adding or taking away anything to anybody – that the Ukrainian 'matrix' and the Western European and Polish cultural components had a primary role in the conception and fulfillment of Javors'kyj's master-piece, though the author's intentions and achievement expanded over the scope of their cultural

between Javors'kyj and the tsar soon became numerous and harsh, up to even longlasting periods of prohibition of preaching.

roots and belong to both a Russian and a pan-Orthodox literary, philosophical and cultural system.

Quite interesting and intriguing is the history of reception of the 'farewell' *Elegy to the books*.⁴⁹ Written 1721 in Latin for Ukrainian monks and for an institution that was intended to represent the best of the Ukrainian culture of the 17th century, the poem was immediately perceived by Russia as a chef-d'oeuvre of her own, Russian culture: it was translated several times and copied in all the parts of the Empire. By all evidence, by the 1720s, Latin tradition began to function in Russia at all levels of cultivated society, the *Elegy's* lyrical subtlety and intense use of Classical referencies suited the expectations of literates and readers in the whole Empire. The sense of the 'Ukrainian belonging' of the *Elegy* was completely lost beyond Ukraine itself and one may speak of the *Elegy* as a 'Russian bestseller' of the 18th c.

The success of the *Elegy* may reflect the appearance of a beginning interest for individual feelings. Indeed, this work is remarkable as an early and rare testimonial of lyrical poetic expression in the literary tradition of Russia and *Slavia orthodoxa* at the eve of modern times. There is however another group of texts where personal feelings, moods, melancholy, bitterness are expressed with an intensity very unfrequent in pre-modern Eastern Slavonic literature, especially in Russia proper. I have in mind the letters the leading literati and church hierarchs wrote one another when they lived and worked in Russia. Tuptalo's letters are now available in a recent,

⁴⁹ For an analysis of the poem cf. D.L. Liburkin, *Russkaja novolatinskaja poëzija: materialy k istorii XVII-perv. Pol. XVIII veka*, Moskva 2000, pp. 121-129.

scientific edition, together with some of Javors'kyj's answers to his friend⁵⁰. As I already wrote some years ago, the epistolary exchange of these two leading personalities is among the most impressive testimonies of their actual way of thinking and feeling. The extant letters were written between 1707 and 1709. They concerned the literary works Tuptalo was preparing, their genre and scope, the possibility of having them printed, the apprehensions and distresses caused by the growing pressure of Peter's policy based on cultural models different from the Kyivan tradition: models that were oriented to laical technical knowledge, in search of influences from "truely-Western" (no longer Polish) cultural systems (the Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy). Tuptalo's and Javors'kyj's letters were conceived as literary works, feelings and ideas continued to be expressed following the Baroque patterns, through Classical or biblical quotations, metaphoric languages and symbolic images. This notwithstanding, they testify of a different world than the scholarly, homiletic, panegyric or doctrinary writings. Irony had a primary role, solitude and estrangement glimmer in any line. The letters are written in a peculiar mixed language that already Ternovskij called "shchegol'stvo"⁵¹, a sort of "linguistic code" used among Ruthenian literati separated by space but united by a common cultural and literary heritage, and secret common feelings. Though less sophisticated and complex, the same plurilingual 'code' was familiar to Simeon Polockij and L. Baranovych three decades earlier. It remained unknown to the Russian fellows of the Ruthenian writers.

Plurilinguism was not only an 'internal code' for this 'Ruthenian emigration' of the 17th-18th century. It was a uniquely effective means of expression for ideas and feelings that had not yet their own linguistic code. Just as an example I will

⁵⁰ М.А. Федотова, *Эпистолярное наследие Дмитрия Ростовского. Исследование и тексты*, М. 2005, pp. 451-453; 132-134.

⁵¹ Ternovskij F., *Pis'ma Mitropolita Stefana Javorskogo*, "Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii", 1866, I, N. 4, p. 538. Javors'kyj used mixed language when writing to the fellow-members of the Synod, in order to convince them how to vote his Ukrainian candidates (*Opisanie dokumentiv i del xranjashchixsja v arxive Sv. Pravitel'stvujushchago Sinoda*, SPb. 1869, I, CCCCLXXIV, N. XLVI).

mention Tuptalo's letter to the hegumen of the monastery of the Holy Spirit in Vilnius (28. 12.1707):

[...] *Eheu quam levibus pereunt ingentia causis* (Mantuanus). A barziej samego WMM pana **терпению святому** compatiator, z większym to przewielebności twojej będzie zbawieniem. *Dulcior est fructus per multa pericula ductus* (Cornel. Gal.). **Егоже Бог любит, наказует** [Hebr. 12:6] [...] Wielkie są po prawdzie u świątobliwości Waszey ruiny, tylkoż i u nas nie wiem jeżeli mniejsze. [...] W tym chyba jedynym *differimus* między sobą, że nam **бѣда от своих**, a WWM państwu **от чуждых**. *Ale nociva a quocunque exercita non sunt iucunda, nec quemque iuvant* [...] Ne dziw temu, czas jest woieny. *Nervus belli pecunia*.⁵²

In no other words than Latin quotations or Polish moral didacticism could Tuptalo express his slightly ironic position towards the grievances of his friend in Lithuania under Polish rule; the anguish caused by the fact that oppression came from the very authority that should be the defenders of ethic and religious traditions (the tsar and the Russian state), is expressed by two extremely short exclamations in Ruthenian-Church Slavonic placed among Polish and Latin wordings or quotations.

One more example of playful elegance and intellectual complicity is offered by the automatic code switching from CS to Latin, when Javors'kyj was confronted with the concept of 'irony': the word was lacking in CS, but once he introduced Latin he went on quoting the Gospel in Latin, resuming CS after the end of the phrase in a moralizing (though still slightly ironical) context:

Аще бых не ведал, яко сицево именованіе от любленія происходит, непшевал бых быти *ironiam, simili illi, ubi lupo ovium pastor appellatur: o praeclarum ovium custodem lupo*. **но понеже любве закон ...**⁵³

⁵² М.А. Федотова, *cit.*, pp. 135, 137-8, 161-162, 252.

⁵³ Ternovskij F., *Pis'ma...*, *cit.*, 1866, I, N. 4, p. 548.

Let us now try to place these letters in one of the canons we are discussing about. They were not intended to be published, they served as personal communication among educated individuals who followed the ‘international’ rhetorical rules forseen for epistolography: elegance but simplicity, moderate ornamentation through quotations, colloquial ‘register’ of expression (a letter is always a half-dialogue) allowing so-called ‘macheronisms’. In this sense they may be considered as part of a general European ‘humanistic canon’ where Polish and Latin, or Latin, French and Flemish were commonly used by such prominent ‘models’ as resp. Jan Kochanowski or Just Lipsius. Beneath the pan-European tradition, one may posit the Polish-Ruthenian tradition, where our letters belong by all rights for various reasons: the origin and education of the authors, the ‘internal’ circulation forseen for the letters, the mixed language (that probably reflected also a spoken use), the kind of quotations coming from such authors as the ‘ancients’ Ovide, Horace, Virgil, Martial, the ‘modern’ Lipsius or other unidentified ‘neoterici’, Church fathers as Augustin or Ambrosius, and other Eastern and Western spiritual authorities, besides the always present Gospel, or Books as Proverbs and Psalter. In an ideal Ukrainian canon the letters lay in the very centre.

The question arises how far an inclusion in the Russian ‘canon’ is possible. I would suggest that reasons to include them in the Russian literary system are rather non-existent. Though written in Russia, they were not intended to be known by anybody besides the addressee or his nearest environment (if ever)⁵⁴, they expressed a set of values that were universally accepted in their original milieu and homeland, while the attitude towards the Russian society where they lived appears negative. Though this is not *per se* a sufficient ‘marker’ to exclude the letters from the Russian literature, it gives the measure of the deep alienation the authors felt in the milieu were they were obliged to live, deprived by the possibility of expressing the set of

⁵⁴ A special case is the letter Javors’kyj wrote to his Ukrainian friends in the newly founded Holy Synod in December 1721. He suggested whome to nominate metropolitans and recommended his protégés for election in the Synod: he then adopted the mixed language of the ‘homely milieu’, a perfect tool of communication that might have reflected the spoken use, but also a ‘private’ jargon among people belonging to a similar political and cultural ‘party’ (cf. above, note)

values at the basis of their rank, education, ethic principles, traditional heritage, personal feelings.

Some conclusions.

1) The Ukrainian literature of the 17th and early-18th centuries possesses a number of features allowing to 'read' it as a 'viable' system. It is possible to speak about a canon rooted in the time and the society where it functioned, capable of evolution and developement into a new, modern system adapting itself to new linguistic codes, genres, ideas, literary devises, social functions and international trends. The marking and delimitation lines of that Ukrainian canon are not easy to be pinpointed: internal difficulties (plurilinguism, strong differentiations in Ukraine's social body, historical turmoils, the lack of a court – besides the period of Mazepa: extreemly intense and crucial, but too short) make a theoretical conceptualisation of the system as a 'canon' uneasy. Scholarship of all nationalities and tendencies have great responsibility for this matter of fact. Seen as a peripheral manifestation of Polish literature, as part of Church Slavonic Russian-Orthodox or plainly Russian literature, or simply as a 'carrier', a 'transmitter' of fashions and rhetorical rules coming from European baroque through Poland to Russia – in all these perspectives Ukrainian literature has mostly been cosidered 'peripheral' with respect to Polish literature and 'ancillary' with respect to Russian literature. The lack of available editions considerably worsen the state of the art.

However, our analysis seems to allow a new consideration of the different attitude the Polish and the Russian 'literary self-consciousness' had towards Ukrainian Baroque literature: the weak inclination of Polish literary consciousness and of its critical conceptualisation to include the Polish-language Ukrainian literature in its own canon, has probably fostered the creation, consolidation and conceptualisation of a Ukrainian literary system already in the 16th-17th century. The clash of religious and social consciousness was instrumental. On the contrary, the proximity with the Russian political, cultural and social system has revealed itself as extremely

‘inclusive’ already at the eve of Mazepa’s fall: the religious and ethnic ‘fraternal’ ties, the common Church Slavonic linguistic heritage, the dominant role of the Church and its elites, the lack of a laic educational system, the whole carefully paccaged in Russia’s constantly growing imperial statalism – all this easily brought to a plain cancellation of the very existence of a Ukrainian literary system. A cancellation that lasted until 1991 and has not yet been overcome by now.

2) If we accept (as I suggest) the existence of a Ukrainian ‘canon’ in the 17th c., we have to accept that this ‘canon’ was plurilingual. This makes the comparative and intertextual analysis with the neighboring (Polish and Russian, but Belorussian and Lithuanian as well) literary systems inevitable and crucial. It is no less important, however, to remind that plurilinguism was a ‘normal’ condition of any literature by that time: any literary system in Europe in the 16th-18th centuries was at least bilingual. Phenomena of cross-linguistic creativity are well known in ‘borderline’ societies, mainly in East-Central Europe up to Romanticism; as late as the 18th c. French as a dominant international language did not wipe off Latin nor the national languages. Literary and linguistic methodologies would not allow to-day to consider those multilingual fruits as separate parts of national canons, though their evaluation as components of other systems, or of a supra-national system should in no-way be considered as a contradiction.

3) Plurilinguism, plurality of ‘identities’ and ‘belongings’, *pogranicze*, intertextuality are all important components of the contemporary discourse in literature and literary research. As any other literary system, the Ukrainian system and its ‘canon’ can not be correctly investigated without taking in due account genetic and typologic connections to the neighbouring literatures, whereas the word ‘neighboring’ may include any of the literatures that had more or less close contacts with Ukrainian literature and its ‘actors’ (including its ‘receivers’).

Nonetheless, in consideration of the peculiar situation of Ukraine and its culture to-day, no effort should be disregarded (or plainly scorned: this still happens) to find out and describe with appropriate methods the specificity of the Ukrainian literature as an

autonomous system, governed by its own 'rules of the game', reflecting a specific system of values, and rooted in its own historical and social context. This involves the late-Renaissance and Baroque literature no less than the modern times. It involves also Medieval and proto-Humanist literature, though appropriate methods and plurifunctional points of view have to be adopted in that cases.

4) Romanticism and Modernism have priority when considering the crucial passages of the creation of Ukrainian modern literature and its own self-consciousness.⁵⁵ The period of Baroque, however, has probably not been less crucial, as testified also by the explosion and blooming of interest for Baroque in the last 30 years. I will add two final considerations. The 17th century gathered and assembled the dispersed members of a collective memory that had undergone several linguistic, cultural, political and social shifts between the 12th and the 15th centuries. It began to put the 'useful' parts together and elaborate their significance. Circumstances allowed to create a 'canon' of memories and a set of works recognized as the most valuable for a certain *socium*. No less important is the fact that the complex of those works and the memories carried about by them became "a factor that insures cultural continuity" (as Głowinski put it). Shevchenko would not have existed without the Cossack myth (and all the cultural system around it), but the same may be said for contemporary literature. It is not fortuitous that a good part of literature of independent Ukraine draws full hands from the deep roots of Baroque tradition, beginning with its set of images and rhetorical devices and ending with serious or playful elaboration of themes, stories, symbols, characters, style. Or again: how may one sever the modern and contemporary love of Ukrainian literature for the 'clues' of grotesque and fantastic (and of varieties of kitch!) from the parallel manifestations already dominant in 16th-17th century tradition?

I would conclude that a Ukrainian canon existed in the 17th-18th century with well recognisable markers and lines of delimitation, that it was crucial in the creation of modern and contemporary literature and its canon, that it was instrumental

⁵⁵ Let alone the question of the new Ukrainian language, an issue that would bring us too far and must be for 'granted' by now.

in developing collective memory, sets of recognized values, tastes and horizons of expectations of writers and readers, continuity of culture and self-consciousness. It is our duty to continue to work on the Ukrainian literature of the 17th-18th centuries, conceived as a polifunctional and polisemantic set of works, forms and ideas, that only very recently begins to be recognized as a system having its own autonomy and dignity.